

# ROAD: Reflective Optimization via Automated Debugging for Zero-Shot Agent Alignment

Natchaya Temyingyong<sup>\*,1</sup>, Daman Jain<sup>\*,2</sup>, Neeraj Kumarsahu<sup>\*,2</sup>, Prabhat Kumar<sup>\*,2</sup>,  
Rachata Phondi<sup>\*,1</sup>, Wachiravit Modecrua<sup>\*,1</sup>, Krittanon Kaewtawee<sup>1</sup>, Krittin Pachtrachai<sup>1</sup>  
Touchapon Kraisingkorn<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Automatic Prompt Optimization (APO) has emerged as a critical technique for enhancing Large Language Model (LLM) performance, yet current state-of-the-art methods typically rely on large, labeled **gold-standard** development sets to compute fitness scores for evolutionary or Reinforcement Learning (RL) approaches. In real-world software engineering, however, such curated datasets are rarely available during the initial **cold start** of agent development, where engineers instead face messy production logs and evolving failure modes. We present **ROAD (Reflective Optimization via Automated Debugging)**, a novel framework that bypasses the need for refined datasets by treating optimization as a dynamic debugging investigation rather than a stochastic search. Unlike traditional mutation strategies, ROAD utilizes a specialized multi-agent architecture, comprising an **Analyzer** for root-cause analysis, an **Optimizer** for pattern aggregation, and a **Coach** for strategy integration to convert unstructured failure logs into robust, structured **Decision Tree Protocols**. We evaluated ROAD across both a standardized academic benchmark and a live production Knowledge Management engine. Experimental results demonstrate that ROAD is highly sample-efficient, achieving a **5.6% increase in Success Rate** (73.6% to 79.2%) and a **3.8% increase in Search Accuracy** within just three automated iterations. Furthermore, on complex reasoning tasks in the Retail domain, ROAD improved agent performance by approximately 19% relative to the baseline. These findings suggest that mimicking the human engineering loop of the fail analysis patch offers a viable, data-efficient alternative to resource-intensive RL training for deploying reliable LLM agents.

## 1 Introduction

The integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) into complex software systems has necessitated a shift from traditional coding to prompt engineering [1, 2]. However, optimizing these LLM systems is rarely a straightforward path. While recent academic research has introduced powerful algorithms for Automatic Prompt Optimization (APO)—utilizing evolutionary strategies or Reinforcement Learning (RL) to refine agent behaviors [8, 4, 9, 3]—applying these methods within the constraints of an active engineering organization reveals a critical bottleneck: the data itself.

Standard optimization methodologies, such as those relying on gradient-like feedback or declarative compilation [5, 6], typically operate on the assumption that a “gold-standard” dataset exists. These approaches require a curated training set ( $D_{train}$ ) consisting of high-quality inputs paired with verifiable evaluation metadata, such as correct answers or unit tests, to drive the evolutionary loop. In academic settings, such datasets are often readily available [17]. However, in the rapid “fail-fix-deploy” cycles of real-world software development, engineers rarely have the luxury of curating a refined dataset upfront. Instead, development teams are frequently confronted with the “Cold Start” problem, working with messy production logs, evolving edge cases, and complex failure modes that do not fit neatly into a static Question-and-Answer format [19, 18]. The cost of pausing development to manually label thousands of examples creates a friction that renders traditional data-heavy optimization algorithms impractical for many production environments.

To bridge the gap between academic optimization algorithms and the iterative needs of real-world software development, we introduce **ROAD (Reflective Optimization via Automated Debugging)**. ROAD is a novel framework designed to automate the failure analysis loop without requiring a perfect dataset from day one. Unlike traditional approaches that rely on static training data or stochastic text mutations, ROAD treats

<sup>\*</sup>Co-first authors

<sup>1</sup>Amity AI Research and Application Center, {natchaya, rachata.pho, wachiravit}@amitysolutions.com

<sup>2</sup>Tollring, {daman.jain, neeraj.kumarsahu, prabhat.kumar}@tollring.com

optimization as a dynamic debugging investigation. By analyzing the “messy” logs of failed interactions, the framework utilizes a multi-agent architecture to identify root causes and systematically evolve the agent’s core instructions, drawing inspiration from automated fault localization and self-correction techniques [21, 20, 11, 10, 12].

The ROAD framework diverges from conventional prompt engineering by shifting the output format from unstructured natural language to structured **Decision Tree Protocols**. By mapping out the logic gaps where models fail, ROAD generates rigorous operational frameworks that enforce strict sequencing and safety guardrails, effectively reducing hallucination and logic errors [23, 32].

We validated the ROAD workflow across two distinct environments: the standardized academic benchmark and a live production Knowledge Management (KM) engine. Our experiments demonstrate that ROAD achieves significant performance gains with high sample efficiency. In a real-world deployment, the framework delivered a 5.6% increase in Success Rate and a 3.8% boost in Search Accuracy within just three automated iterations. Furthermore, on complex retail domain tasks using the Qwen3-4B model [29], ROAD improved performance by **approximately 19% relative to the baseline**. These results confirm that by “trading tokens for time”—utilizing LLMs to automate the role of a lead engineer [30]—ROAD offers a scalable solution for building robust, self-correcting agents in data-scarce environments.

## 2 Related Work

Prior work on aligning and optimizing LLM-based agents has largely relied on large, curated datasets and heavy training. Early approaches framed agent behavior as a reinforcement learning (RL) problem, tuning policies based on scalar rewards or human feedback. For example, Ziegler et al. (2020) demonstrated RL from human preferences to align language models, but it required tens of thousands of labeled comparisons to achieve good performance. Similarly, automated prompt engineering methods have emerged: *soft* prompt tuning uses gradient descent on embedding vectors, but these prompts lack interpretability and portability across models. Discrete prompt optimization is more challenging. Shin et al. (2020) introduced *AutoPrompt*, a gradient-guided search to generate fill-in-the-blank prompts, but this method suffered from training instability and limited gains in practice. More recently, RLPROMPT (Deng et al., 2022) used reinforcement learning to train a policy network that directly generates optimized discrete prompts, achieving state-of-the-art results on few-shot classification and style-transfer tasks. Notably, these methods still assume a fixed reward signal or labeled evaluation set for training.

Other work has shown that prompting strategies which elicit reasoning or self-analysis can improve LLM performance. Chain-of-Thought prompting (Wei et al., 2022) demonstrated that providing a sequence of intermediate reasoning steps dramatically boosts reasoning accuracy on arithmetic and symbolic reasoning tasks. Independent of reward tuning, instructing a model to *reflect* on its outputs has been shown to improve problem solving. Renze and Guven (2024) found that LLM agents significantly improve when asked to analyze and correct their own mistakes. In the code generation domain, Song et al. (2024) proposed a best-first tree search (BESTER) framework in which an LLM generates multiple self-reflection comments on its buggy code and then repairs each variant; this iterative debugging yielded state-of-the-art results on code benchmarks.

The Genetic-Pareto (GEPA) approach is another recent development: it treats prompts as “genetic” candidates that are iteratively mutated and tested, learning high-level rules via natural language reflection. GEPA showed that optimizing prompts through language-based mutation and selection can outperform RL methods by  $\sim 10\%$  on average while using orders of magnitude fewer evaluations. However, like other methods, GEPA still relies on a gold-standard training set to evaluate prompt fitness. In contrast, our ROAD framework automates a human-like *debugging* loop, extracting corrections from raw failure logs. To our knowledge, no prior work has combined multi-agent LLM pipelines to perform automated root-cause analysis and policy-guided prompt rewriting in a data-scarce setting.

## 3 Methodology

We propose **ROAD** (Reflective Optimization via Automated Debugging), a framework designed to reconcile the theoretical efficacy of evolutionary algorithms with the data-constrained reality of production software engineering. While standard optimization methods rely on curated, “gold-standard” datasets ( $\mathcal{D}_{train}$ ) to compute dense reward signals, ROAD operates on the premise that high-entropy production failures offer a higher-density learning signal than successful executions.

Our approach shifts the optimization paradigm from stochastic search to structured, semantic debugging. We implement this as a Multi-Agent System (MAS) comprising three specialized Large Language Models (LLMs)—

the *Analyzer*, *Optimizer*, and *Coach*—which collaborate to iteratively refine the instructions of a primary agent, the *Contestant*.

### 3.1 System Architecture

The ROAD framework orchestrates a closed-loop interaction between the following modules:

- **The Contestant ( $\mathcal{A}$ ):** The primary agent parameterized by a system prompt  $P$ . It interacts with an environment  $\mathcal{E}$  (e.g., a benchmark or live production engine) to generate interaction trajectories.
- **The Analyzer ( $\mathcal{M}_{analysis}$ ):** A diagnostic agent responsible for Semantic Root Cause Analysis (RCA). It transforms raw error logs into structured causal explanations.
- **The Optimizer ( $\mathcal{M}_{opt}$ ):** A pattern-recognition agent that aggregates discrete failure reports into global strategy updates.
- **The Coach ( $\mathcal{M}_{coach}$ ):** An integration agent that maps abstract strategies into concrete prompt syntax, modifying  $P$  to strictly enforce new logic.

### 3.2 The Optimization Pipeline

The workflow proceeds through a cyclical pipeline formalized in Algorithm 1.

#### 3.2.1 Phase 1: Execution and Selective Filtering

The cycle initiates with the deployment of the Contestant  $\mathcal{A}$  on a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ . Unlike traditional Reinforcement Learning (RL), which updates policies based on scalar rewards across all trajectories, ROAD employs a *Selective Filtering* mechanism. We define a filter function  $\Phi$  that discards successful interactions and explicitly retains only failure cases ( $\mathcal{F}$ ). This focuses computational resources on “hard negatives”—such as hallucinations, loops, or retrieval failures—thereby maximizing sample efficiency.

#### 3.2.2 Phase 2: Semantic Root-Cause Analysis

Raw execution logs (e.g., stack traces) lack the semantic context required for high-level reasoning adjustments. In this phase, the Analyzer  $\mathcal{M}_{analysis}$  performs deep-dive diagnosis on each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . For each failure, it generates a structured report  $r$  containing:

1. **Diagnosis:** A natural language explanation of the logic gap (e.g., “*Context loss regarding user’s previous request*”).
2. **Prescription:** A corrective instruction (e.g., “*Merge context from turns  $t_{-1}$  and  $t_0$  before querying*”).

#### 3.2.3 Phase 3: Pattern Recognition and Decision Tree Synthesis

To mitigate regression cycles, the Optimizer  $\mathcal{M}_{opt}$  aggregates the set of failure reports  $\mathcal{R}$  to identify holistic patterns [cite: 26]. A critical innovation of ROAD is the output format: rather than unstructured prose, the Optimizer synthesizes a formal **Decision Tree Protocol** ( $\mathcal{T}$ ). This tree enforces deterministic reasoning paths, including:

- **Ambiguity Resolution:** Decomposing high-level goals into strict sub-routines (e.g., mapping “*authenticate*” to steps 1.1–1.3).
- **Sequencing Rules:** Explicitly ordering operations to prevent state conflicts (e.g., “*Modify Address*  $\rightarrow$  *Modify Items*”).
- **Safety Guardrails:** Introducing binary check-nodes (e.g., requiring literal “YES” tokens) to preclude probabilistic hallucinations.

#### 3.2.4 Phase 4: Targeted Prompt Evolution

Finally, the Coach  $\mathcal{M}_{coach}$  integrates  $\mathcal{T}$  into the system prompt  $P$ . The integration strategy is adaptive: the Coach may append the tree as a reasoning framework or rewrite core instructions to align with the new logic. The evolved prompt  $P_{new}$  is then evaluated in the next epoch.

### 3.3 Algorithmic Formalization

The complete iterative process is formalized in **Algorithm 1**. The algorithm initializes with a base prompt and iteratively refines it by converting unstructured error patterns into rigid logical frameworks.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Reflective Multi-Agent Prompt Optimization (ROAD)

---

**Require:** Pre-trained agent  $\mathcal{A}$ , initial prompt  $P_0$ , validation dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , max iterations  $T_{max}$ , patience limit  $K$

```

1:  $P \leftarrow P_0$ 
2:  $t \leftarrow 0$ 
3:  $k \leftarrow 0$                                 ▷ Counter for consecutive non-improvements
4: while  $t < T_{max}$  do
5:    $t \leftarrow t + 1$ 
6:   Execution: Run  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $P$  on  $\mathcal{D}$ , collect outputs  $\mathcal{O}$ 
7:   Filtering:  $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \text{FilterFailures}(\mathcal{O})$ 
8:   if  $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$  then break
9:   end if
10:   $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
11:  for each failure  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  do
12:     $r \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{analysis}(f)$ 
13:     $\mathcal{R}.\text{append}(r)$ 
14:  end for
15:  Optimization:
16:   $patterns \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{opt}(\mathcal{R})$ 
17:   $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \text{BuildDecisionTree}(patterns)$ 
18:  Evolution:
19:   $P_{new} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{coach}(P, \mathcal{T})$ 
20:  if  $\text{Eval}(\mathcal{A}, P_{new}, \mathcal{D}) > \text{Eval}(\mathcal{A}, P, \mathcal{D})$  then
21:     $P \leftarrow P_{new}$ 
22:     $k \leftarrow 0$                                 ▷ Reset patience on improvement
23:  else
24:     $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
25:    if  $k \geq K$  then
26:      break                                ▷ Stop after  $K$  failed attempts
27:    end if
28:  end if
29: end while
30: return  $P$ 

```

---

To illustrate the data flow and agent interaction, **Figure 1** depicts the full pipeline. The diagram highlights the transformation of raw failure logs into the structured Decision Tree Protocol.




Figure 1: The ROAD Framework Pipeline. (1) The Contestant executes tasks; (2) Failures are filtered; (3) The Analyzer diagnoses root causes; (4) The Optimizer synthesizes a Decision Tree ( $\mathcal{T}$ ); (5) The Coach updates the system prompt ( $P$ ).

## 4 Experiments

To evaluate the efficacy and robustness of the ROAD framework, we designed a dual-environment experimental protocol. We tested the methodology across two distinct settings: a rigorous, standardized academic benchmark to ensure theoretical soundness, and a live production environment to validate real-world applicability. This dual-validation strategy allows us to assess the framework’s performance in both controlled, “clean” scenarios and the noisy, unstructured data regimes typical of active software engineering.

### 4.1 Experimental Setup 1: Academic Benchmarking ( $\tau^2$ -bench)

#### 4.1.1 Benchmark Selection

For our controlled evaluation, we utilized  $\tau^2$ -bench, a state-of-the-art framework designed to test conversational agents in **dynamic, persistent-state** environments. Unlike static Q&A benchmarks where the user acts as a passive interrogator,  $\tau^2$ -bench employs a **goal-oriented user simulator** that interacts with the agent over multiple turns. This setup creates a highly interactive scenario where the conversation evolves based on the agent’s tool execution and the user’s hidden constraints.

#### 4.1.2 Domain Specifics (Retail)

We specifically focused our experiments on the Retail Domain within  $\tau^2$ -bench. This domain was selected because it demands complex tool usage and multi-step reasoning, presenting a high difficulty curve for standard prompting techniques. The tasks involved intricate workflows such as:

- **Order Modifications:** Users requesting changes to shipping addresses or item quantities for pending orders.
- **Refund Processing:** Handling financial logic and policy checks.
- **Authentication Protocols:** Managing user verification via multiple lookup methods (Email vs. Name + Zip) before granting account access.

### 4.1.3 Model Configuration

Our experimental design distinguishes between the *Target Agents* (the models being optimized) and the *Optimization Backbone* (the model powering the ROAD framework’s internal agents).

**Target Agents (The Contestants)** To test the generality of the ROAD framework across different model architectures, we benchmarked performance using two primary Large Language Models (LLMs):

1. **o4-mini**: Representing a highly capable, efficient reasoning model.
2. **Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507**: A specialized, smaller-parameter model designed for chain-of-thought reasoning.

**Optimization Backbone (GPT-5)** We utilized **GPT-5** as the foundational LLM to instantiate the three meta-agents defined in our System Architecture: the **Analyzer** ( $\mathcal{M}_{analysis}$ ), the **Optimizer** ( $\mathcal{M}_{opt}$ ), and the **Coach** ( $\mathcal{M}_{coach}$ ). We selected this frontier-class model for these distinct roles due to its high-fidelity context window and superior reasoning capabilities, which are essential for:

- Performing deep root cause analysis on failure logs (Analyzer).
- Aggregating failure patterns into global strategies (Optimizer).
- Synthesizing strict prompt syntax without regression (Coach).

### 4.1.4 Baseline vs. ROAD

- **Baseline**: The models were initialized with a “Base Prompt” written in standard natural language prose. These instructions were conversational and open to interpretation (e.g., “At the beginning, you have to authenticate the user”).
- **ROAD Implementation**: We applied the ROAD workflow over a course of 6 iterations. In each iteration, the GPT-5 driven Optimizer diagnosed failure cases from the validation set and injected structured Decision Trees back into the system prompt to resolve logic gaps.

## 4.2 Experimental Setup 2: Real-World Production (Industrial RAG)

### 4.2.1 System Environment: The Accentix KM Engine

To validate the ROAD framework in a data-scarce “Cold Start” scenario, we deployed it within a live production environment. We utilized an industrial Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) system, internally referred to as the **Accentix Knowledge Management (KM) Engine**.

Functionally, this engine operates as an autonomous retrieval agent. It interfaces with a vector database containing extensive proprietary documentation. For each user interaction, the agent performs a two-step logic process:

1. **Query Generation**: The agent analyzes the user’s question and context to formulate a specific search query (e.g., converting a natural language question into database keywords).
2. **Retrieval & Synthesis**: The system executes this query to retrieve specific document segments (identified by a unique **Chunk ID**). The agent then synthesizes a final answer based solely on these retrieved chunks.

### 4.2.2 Data Characteristics

Unlike the academic benchmark, the interaction data in this environment is characterized by high entropy and noise. The input queries often include:

- **Multi-turn Context Dependencies**: Users frequently provide partial information across multiple messages (e.g., specifying “private hospital” in a second turn after mentioning “disability” in the first), requiring the agent to maintain state.
- **Speculative Queries**: Users asking out-of-scope or opinion-based questions (e.g., predicting future financial solvency), which require the agent to trigger “no-answer” guardrail.

### 4.2.3 Implementation Strategy

We operated under strict resource constraints with zero pre-labeled training data, using production failure logs as the sole optimization signal. The evaluation metric focused on the agent’s precision in the retrieval step. Specifically, we measured the alignment between the *Actual Chunk ID* retrieved by the agent’s generated query and the *Expected Chunk ID* required to answer the question correctly.

The ROAD pipeline (powered by GPT-5) was executed for 3 automated iterations to optimize the following behaviors:

1. **Intent Detection:** Distinguishing between answerable domain questions and out-of-scope chatter.
2. **Query Reformulation:** Converting vague user terms into precise search queries that target the correct *Chunk ID* in the vector database.

## 4.3 Evaluation Metrics

For both environments, we tracked performance using the following key metrics:

- **Success Rate (Task Completion):** The percentage of interactions where the agent successfully resolved the user’s intent without hallucination or logic errors.
- **Search Accuracy (Retrieval Precision):** Specifically for the KM environment, we measured the “Search Found Result” rate—the frequency with which the agent retrieved valid, relevant document chunks from the vector database.
- **Iteration Efficiency:** The number of optimization cycles required to reach convergence or significant performance improvement.

## 5 Results

We evaluated the performance of the ROAD framework across two distinct dimensions: standardized capability improvement on the  $\tau^2$ -bench academic benchmark, and operational reliability enhancement within the live Accentix KM production engine. In both scenarios, the automated loop of failure analysis and decision tree evolution yielded significant quantitative gains over the baseline prompts.

### 5.1 Quantitative Analysis: $\tau^2$ -bench (Retail Domain)

Our primary evaluation utilized the  $\tau^2$ -bench framework, specifically focusing on the Retail domain which requires agents to navigate complex, multi-step workflows such as refund processing and order modification. We benchmarked two models: the lightweight o4-mini and the specialized chain-of-thought model Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507.

#### 5.1.1 Performance Gains

As illustrated in Figure 2, the application of the ROAD framework yielded significant quantitative gains, though the optimization dynamics differed between architectures.

- **o4-mini (Rapid Convergence):** The model demonstrated immediate responsiveness to the framework, jumping from a baseline of 68.3% to a peak of **78.1%** by Iteration 2. However, performance regressed to 72.8% in Iteration 3, suggesting that further constraint injection beyond the second round may yield diminishing returns or over-constrain the model’s reasoning flexibility.
- **Qwen3-4B-Thinking (Exploratory Learning):** The smaller model exhibited a more volatile learning curve. Starting at 53.5%, it quickly climbed to 65.2% (Iterations 2–3). The subsequent dip in Iterations 4–5 (dropping to 58.2%) indicates a phase of *exploration* or instability as the Analyzer adjusted its feedback logic. Crucially, the system self-corrected in Iteration 6, recovering to reach a global maximum of **66.1%**.

These results suggest that while ROAD is effective for both classes of models, larger models like o4-mini may require fewer optimization rounds (early stopping), whereas smaller models benefit from extended feedback loops to stabilize their reasoning.

### 5.2 Real-World Application: Accentix KM Engine

While academic benchmarks required six iterations to mature, our deployment in the Accentix Knowledge Management (KM) engine demonstrated rapid convergence, achieving optimal results within just 3 iterations.




Figure 2: Trajectory of performance improvements over ROAD iterations. While o4-mini peaked early at Iteration 2, Qwen3-4B exhibited non-monotonic learning behavior before converging to a higher maxima at Iteration 6.

This efficiency validates the “Zero-Shot Data Curation” hypothesis, suggesting that production failure logs provide a high-density learning signal.

### 5.2.1 Metric Improvements

We observed measurable improvements across primary Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the real-world deployment environment. As demonstrated in Figure 3, the system achieved consistent gains in both resolution accuracy and retrieval efficacy.




Figure 3: Performance comparison on real-world knowledge management cases. The ROAD framework (Iteration 3) outperformed the baseline in both overall task success and document retrieval accuracy.

- **Success Rate (+5.6%):** The overall task completion rate improved from **73.6%** (Base Prompt) to **79.2%** (Iteration 3). This metric indicates that the decision trees generated by the Optimizer effectively resolved ambiguity in user intents that had previously resulted in conversational dead ends.
- **Search Hit Rate (+3.8%):** The agent’s ability to retrieve valid documentation chunks increased from **86.8%** to **90.6%**. This improvement confirms that the failure analysis successfully diagnosed suboptimal query patterns—such as the use of overly specific keywords—allowing the Coach to implement broader, more robust search strategies.

## 5.3 Qualitative Analysis: Evolution of Logic

To understand the mechanism behind the quantitative gains, we analyzed the specific semantic shifts in the system instructions. The ROAD framework successfully transitioned the agent from interpreting vague con-



versational prose to executing strict operational protocols. This evolution is visualized below, comparing the initialization state against the output of Iteration 6.

### 5.3.1 Baseline State: Vague Prose (Before)

The initial instructions were written in standard natural language. They were conversational and open to interpretation, often leading to execution errors because the agent lacked specific guidance on the order of operations for complex tasks.

#### Seed Prompt for agent of $\tau^2$ -bench style

At the beginning, you have to authenticate the user by locating their user id via email or name + zip code. [...] For a pending order, you can modify shipping address or items. If the address and items both need changes, just make sure to update them.

**Critique:** The phrase “just make sure to update them” is non-deterministic. It fails to specify which update should happen first, leading to potential database locking errors or logical conflicts.

### 5.3.2 Optimized State: Strict Decision Tree (After Iteration 6)

By the sixth iteration, the Coach LLM had completely restructured the prompt. It injected a numbered Decision Tree Protocol, enforcing rigid branching logic and safety checks that were absent in the baseline.

#### ROAD Optimized’s Decision Tree for agent of $\tau^2$ -bench, Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507

```
DECISION TREE (Operational Framework)
1. Authentication (Strict Protocol)
  1.1 If user provides Name + Zip: Ensure Last name is present -> Call find_user_id.
  1.2 If user provides Email: Call find_user_id_by_email.
  1.3 Recovery: If all Lookups fail STOP and transfer to human agent.
[...]
5. Branch: Modify Pending Order
  5B.5 Sequencing Rule: If user wants BOTH address and item changes:
    Step 1: Execute modify_address FIRST.
    Step 2: Execute modify_items SECOND.
  5C.4 Safety Check: Ask for a Literal "YES". If user says "Okay" or "Sure",
    DO NOT execute. Ask for "YES" again.
```

#### Key Structural Improvements:

- **Ambiguity Removal:** The vague instruction to “authenticate the user” was converted into a precise step-by-step workflow (Steps 1.1–1.3), covering specific edge cases like missing last names.
- **Logic Injection:** The optimized prompt explicitly enforces a Sequencing Rule (Step 5B.5), dictating that address modifications must precede item modifications, resolving the “order of operations” failure mode.
- **Safety Guardrails:** The generic requirement for confirmation was tightened into a Safety Check (Step 5C.4) that rejects ambiguous affirmations like “Okay” in favor of a literal “YES” token, significantly reducing accidental executions.

### 5.3.3 Case Study 1: Contextual Query Reformulation

A primary failure mode in the baseline was the loss of context across conversational turns. In the KM engine, the agent often failed to carry over the subject (e.g., “disability”) to subsequent queries (e.g., “private hospital”), resulting in irrelevant searches for the generic term “Private”.

As shown in Table 1, the ROAD-optimized agent correctly merged the context, reformulating the query to “Disability case outpatient cost private hospital” to retrieve the correct document chunk.

### 5.3.4 Case Study 2: Hallucination Prevention & Scope Management

The baseline agent frequently hallucinated answers to speculative questions, such as predicting the future bankruptcy of the Social Security fund. The ROAD optimization introduced a “No Data / Out of Scope”

Table 1: Case Study 1, Contextual Query Reformulation. Comparison of retrieval performance before and after implementing ROAD logic.

State	Agent Action / Query	Retrieval Result	Analysis
<b>Before</b>	Query: “Private”	Chunks: 0, 2, 7, 21, 38 (Irrelevant results)	The agent lost the context of “disability,” searching only for the keyword in the second turn.
<b>After</b>	Query: “Disability case out-patient cost private hospital”	Chunks: 4, 2, 14, 30, 38. Expected Chunk: 4 (Found)	ROAD logic forced the agent to rewrite the query by merging context from previous turns.

decision node. As detailed in Table 2, the optimized agent correctly identified the query as speculative and returned a standard disclaimer rather than fabricating a prediction.

Table 2: Case Study 2, Hallucination Prevention & Scope Management. Comparison of agent behavior on out-of-scope queries.

State	Agent Response	Result
<b>Before</b>	Returns a long, generic explanation about how the Social Security fund works, how contributions are calculated, and pension formulas.	<b>Fail:</b> The answer is factually correct but <b>does not answer the specific question</b> about the fund’s future bankruptcy risk. It creates a “soft hallucination”.
<b>After</b>	“Apologies, this information is not currently available in the system database.”	<b>Success:</b> The agent correctly triggered the “ <b>No Data / Out of Scope</b> ” decision node, preventing the spread of unverified information.

## 6 Discussion

The experimental results presented in the previous section suggest a paradigm shift in how we approach the optimization of agentic systems. By moving away from stochastic search methods and towards a structured, reflective debugging process, the ROAD framework addresses the critical friction points of real-world software engineering. In this section, we analyze the mechanisms behind these gains, discuss the economic trade-offs of the multi-agent architecture, and acknowledge the boundaries of the methodology.

### 6.1 The Efficiency of Semantic Debugging

Traditional Automatic Prompt Optimization (APO) often mimics evolutionary biology: generating a large population of prompts and selecting the fittest survivors. While theoretically robust, this approach is inherently wasteful, often requiring thousands of inference calls to converge. ROAD diverges from this “black box” optimization by adopting a “glass box” approach we term Semantic Debugging.

By explicitly analyzing why an agent failed—rather than simply noting that it failed—ROAD converts low-fidelity error signals into high-fidelity logic updates. The rapid convergence observed in our experiments (3 iterations for the KM engine) indicates that a single “debugged” failure often provides more information gain than hundreds of successful rollouts. The shift from vague prose to Decision Tree Protocols effectively reduces the search space for the model, forcing it into a deterministic reasoning path that prevents the recurrence of known error patterns.

### 6.2 Strategic Leverage: The “Token Tax” Trade-off

A potential criticism of the ROAD framework is the computational overhead, or “Token Tax,” incurred by utilizing three distinct LLMs (Analyzer, Optimizer, Coach) to refine a single agent. In a purely academic vacuum, this might appear inefficient compared to gradient-based updates. However, in the context of an engineering organization, we argue this represents Strategic Leverage.

We are effectively trading commoditized computational credits for invaluable engineering hours. In a traditional workflow, a lead engineer would spend days manually reviewing logs, hypothesizing root causes, and tweaking prompts—a process that is both expensive and unscalable. ROAD automates this “lead engineer” loop, identifying logic gaps and patching errors in hours. The cost of the additional tokens is negligible compared to the

velocity gained by removing humans from the debugging loop. Thus, the “Token Tax” should be viewed not as an expense, but as an investment in deployment velocity.

### 6.3 Solving the “Cold Start” Problem

Perhaps the most significant contribution of ROAD is its ability to operate in Zero-Shot Data Curation environments. Standard Reinforcement Learning (RL) techniques, such as GRPO, often require curated datasets ( $D_{train}$ ) with verifiable gold standards to drive the reward function. In the “Cold Start” phase of product development, such datasets rarely exist.

ROAD bypasses this bottleneck by learning directly from “messy” production logs and partial failures. By treating the failure itself as the training signal, it eliminates the need for manual data labeling. This capability is what allowed the Accentix KM deployment to achieve production-grade improvements without a pre-existing “gold” dataset, proving that we no longer have to choose between deploying fast and deploying smart.

### 6.4 Limitations and Future Work

While ROAD demonstrates high sample efficiency, it is important to acknowledge its theoretical limits. As an in-context learning optimizer, it likely cannot reach the theoretical performance ceiling of a massive, 20,000-rollout Reinforcement Learning training run. For domains requiring hyper-optimization at the limit of a model’s capabilities, traditional fine-tuning remains superior.

However, for the vast majority of business applications, the goal is not to reach the theoretical global maximum, but to deploy a reliable, high-quality agent quickly. ROAD serves as the bridge that takes a prototype from “messy” to “robust,” solving the immediate problem that matters to businesses: getting a working agent into production now. Future work will explore hybrid approaches, using ROAD to bootstrap a high-quality dataset that can subsequently be used for fine-tuning smaller, more efficient models.

## 7 Conclusion

The rapid integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) into industrial software engineering has exposed a fundamental disconnect between academic optimization theory and the practical realities of deployment. While the literature is rich with algorithms for prompt tuning, the majority operate under the assumption of data abundance—specifically, the existence of “gold-standard” datasets for calculating reward functions. In the “Cold Start” phase of real-world development, such data is conspicuously absent. This paper presented ROAD (Reflective Optimization via Automated Debugging), a framework designed to bridge this chasm. By inverting the optimization paradigm—focusing on the “messy” signal of production failures rather than the clean signal of curated benchmarks—ROAD demonstrates that we no longer have to choose between deploying fast and deploying smart.

### 7.1 Synthesis of Contributions

Our primary contribution is the validation of Zero-Shot Data Curation. While foundational algorithms like GEPA revolutionized academic benchmarks by reducing sample requirements, they still necessitated a curated training set ( $D_{train}$ ). ROAD takes the next evolutionary leap by proving that a system can effectively “bootstrap” its own intelligence using only its failure logs.

Through the implementation of a multi-agent architecture—comprising an Analyzer, Optimizer, and Coach—we successfully automated the semantic debugging loop. In our live deployment on the Accentix Knowledge Management engine, this approach yielded a 5.6% increase in Success Rate and a 3.8% boost in Search Accuracy. Crucially, these gains were realized in just three automated iterations, confirming the hypothesis that analyzing specific logic gaps (failures) provides a higher-density learning signal than reinforcing general successes.

### 7.2 The Shift to Deterministic Protocols

Methodologically, ROAD advances the field by shifting the target of optimization from unstructured prose to structured Decision Tree Protocols. Our qualitative analysis revealed that standard “conversational” prompts are prone to interpretation errors and hallucinations. By utilizing the Optimizer agent to aggregate failure patterns into rigid branching logic (e.g., explicit sequencing rules and binary safety checks), ROAD effectively reduces the search space for the model. This ensures that the agent’s reasoning path becomes deterministic and auditable, a critical requirement for enterprise software that is often missing in stochastic “black box” optimization methods.

### 7.3 Economic Implications: The “Token Tax” as Strategic Leverage

A significant portion of this research focused on the economic viability of the framework. Critics may argue that the “Token Tax”—the computational cost of utilizing three distinct LLMs to refine a single agent—is prohibitive. However, when viewed through the lens of organizational velocity, this cost represents Strategic Leverage.

In a traditional engineering workflow, the “Human-in-the-Loop” is the bottleneck; senior engineers must spend days manually reviewing logs, hypothesizing root causes, and iteratively tweaking prompts. ROAD effectively trades commoditized compute credits for these invaluable engineering hours. By identifying logic gaps and patching “stupid” errors in hours rather than days, the framework transforms prompt engineering from a manual operational expense into an automated investment in velocity.

### 7.4 Limitations and Future Trajectories

We acknowledge that ROAD is not a replacement for full-scale Reinforcement Learning (RL) in all contexts. As an in-context learning optimizer, it likely cannot reach the theoretical performance ceiling of a massive, 20,000-rollout RL training run, which remains superior for squeezing the final percentage points of performance out of a frozen task.

However, ROAD solves the problem that defines the majority of business needs: the “Cold Start.” It acts as the bridge that carries a system from a fragile, unrefined prototype to a robust, self-correcting agent. Future work will explore hybrid architectures, where ROAD is used to rapidly bootstrap a high-quality dataset which is subsequently used to fine-tune smaller, cheaper models, effectively combining the speed of in-context learning with the efficiency of weights-based training.

In conclusion, we are moving beyond the era of manual prompt grinding. With frameworks like ROAD, we are not just building better agents; we are building systems that possess the agency to build themselves.

## References

- [1] Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwen Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. *Large language models are human-level prompt engineers*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.01910>.
- [2] Chengrun Yang, Xuezhi Wang, Yifeng Lu, Hanxiao Liu, Quoc V. Le, Denny Zhou, and Xinyun Chen. *Large language models as optimizers*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.03409>.
- [3] Lakshya A. Agrawal, Shangyin Tan, Dilara Soylu, Noah Ziemis, Rishi Khare, Krista Opsahl-Ong, Arnav Singhvi, Herumb Shandilya, Michael J. Ryan, Meng Jiang, Christopher Potts, Koushik Sen, Alexandros G. Dimakis, Ion Stoica, Dan Klein, Matei Zaharia, and Omar Khattab. *GEPA: Reflective Prompt Evolution Can Outperform Reinforcement Learning*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.19457>.
- [4] Qingyan Guo, Rui Wang, Junliang Guo, Bei Li, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Guoqing Liu, Jiang Bian, and Yujiu Yang. *Connecting large language models with evolutionary algorithms yields powerful prompt optimizers*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.08532>.
- [5] Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Joseph Boen, Sheng Liu, Zhi Huang, Carlos Guestrin, and James Zou. *TextGrad: Automatic “differentiation” via text*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07496>.
- [6] Omar Khattab, Arnav Singhvi, Paridhi Maheshwari, Zhiyuan Zhang, Keshav Santhanam, and Matei Zaharia. *DSPy: Compiling declarative language model calls into self-improving pipelines*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03714>.
- [7] Krista Opsahl-Ong, Michael J. Ryan, Josh Purtell, David Broman, Christopher Potts, Matei Zaharia, and Omar Khattab. *Optimizing instructions and demonstrations for multi-stage language model programs*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11695>.
- [8] Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. *Automatic prompt optimization with “gradient descent” and beam search*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.03495>.
- [9] Chrisantha Fernando, Dylan Banarse, Henryk Michalewski, Simon Osindero, and Tim Rocktäschel. *Prompt-breeder: Self-referential self-improvement via prompt evolution*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16797>.
- [10] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, and others. *Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17651>.

- [11] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Edward Berman, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. *Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11366>.
- [12] Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Yujiu Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. *CRITIC: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.11738>.
- [13] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, and others. *Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.02155>.
- [14] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. *Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18290>.
- [15] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, and others. *DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03300>.
- [16] Shunyu Yao, Noah Shinn, Pedram Razavi, and Karthik Narasimhan.  $\tau^2$ -bench: A benchmark for tool-agent-user interaction in real-world domains, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12045>.
- [17] Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, and others. *AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as agents*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.03688>.
- [18] Shuyan Zhou, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, and others. *WebArena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13854>.
- [19] Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. *SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world GitHub issues?*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06770>.
- [20] Sungmin Kang, Gabin An, and Shin Yoo. *A quantitative and qualitative evaluation of LLM-based explainable fault localization*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.05487>.
- [21] Yihao Qin and others. *AgentFL: Scaling LLM-based fault localization to project-level context*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.16362>.
- [22] Jialun Cao, Meiziniu Li, Xiao Chen, and others. *DeepFD: Automated fault diagnosis and localization for deep learning programs*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.01938>.
- [23] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. *Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10601>.
- [24] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, and others. *Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903>.
- [25] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. *Large language models are zero-shot reasoners*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.11916>.
- [26] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, and others. *Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.11171>.
- [27] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, and others. *Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.11401>.
- [28] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, and others. *Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.10997>.
- [29] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, and others. *Qwen3 technical report*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388>.
- [30] Aaron Jaech and others. *OpenAI o1 system card*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.16720>.
- [31] Tianyang Zhong and others. *Evaluation of OpenAI o1: Opportunities and challenges of AGI*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.18486>.
- [32] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, and others. *A survey on hallucination in large language models*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.05232>.

- [33] Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liustie, and Mark J. F. Gales. *SelfCheckGPT: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative language models*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08896>.

## A Optimized Logic for $\tau^2$ -bench (Retail Domain)

This appendix illustrates the structural transformation of the agent’s core instructions. The ROAD framework replaced the ambiguous natural language of the baseline prompt with a strict, generated Decision Tree to resolve logic sequencing errors.

### A.1 Baseline Prompt (Before)

The initial instructions were written in conversational prose. As highlighted in the snippet below, critical operations like updating both address and items were described vaguely ("just make sure to update them"), lacking a defined order of operations.

#### Baseline: Unstructured Prose

```
# Retail agent policy

As a retail agent, you can help users:

- **cancel or modify pending orders**
- **return or exchange delivered orders**
- **modify their default user address**
- **provide information about their own profile, orders, and related products**

At the beginning of the conversation, you have to authenticate the user identity
    by locating their user id via email, or via name + zip code. This has to be
    done even when the user already provides the user id.

Once the user has been authenticated, you can provide the user with information
    about order, product, profile information, e.g. help the user look up order
    id.

You can only help one user per conversation (but you can handle multiple
    requests from the same user), and must deny any requests for tasks related
    to any other user.

Before taking any action that updates the database (cancel, modify, return,
    exchange), you must list the action details and obtain explicit user
    confirmation (yes) to proceed.

You should not make up any information or knowledge or procedures not provided
    by the user or the tools, or give subjective recommendations or comments.

You should at most make one tool call at a time, and if you take a tool call,
    you should not respond to the user at the same time. If you respond to the
    user, you should not make a tool call at the same time.

You should deny user requests that are against this policy.

You should transfer the user to a human agent if and only if the request cannot
    be handled within the scope of your actions. To transfer, first make a tool
    call to transfer_to_human_agents, and then send the message 'YOU ARE BEING
    TRANSFERRED TO A HUMAN AGENT. PLEASE HOLD ON.' to the user.

## Domain basic

- All times in the database are EST and 24 hour based. For example "02:30:00"
    means 2:30 AM EST.

### User
```

Each user has a profile containing:

- unique user id
- email
- default address
- payment methods.

There are three types of payment methods: **gift card**, **paypal account**, **credit card**.

### Product

Our retail store has 50 types of products.

For each **type of product**, there are **variant items** of different **options**.

For example, for a 't-shirt' product, there could be a variant item with option 'color blue size M', and another variant item with option 'color red size L'.

Each product has the following attributes:

- unique product id
- name
- list of variants

Each variant item has the following attributes:

- unique item id
- information about the value of the product options for this item.
- availability
- price

Note: Product ID and Item ID have no relations and should not be confused!

### Order

Each order has the following attributes:

- unique order id
- user id
- address
- items ordered
- status
- fulfillment info (tracking id and item ids)
- payment history

The status of an order can be: **pending**, **processed**, **delivered**, or **cancelled**.

Orders can have other optional attributes based on the actions that have been taken (cancellation reason, which items have been exchanged, what was the exchange price difference etc)

### Generic action rules

Generally, you can only take action on pending or delivered orders.

Exchange or modify order tools can only be called once per order. Be sure that all items to be changed are collected into a list before making the tool call!!!

### Cancel pending order

An order can only be cancelled if its status is 'pending', and you should check its status before taking the action.

The user needs to confirm the order id and the reason (either 'no longer needed' or 'ordered by mistake') for cancellation. Other reasons are not acceptable.

After user confirmation, the order status will be changed to 'cancelled', and the total will be refunded via the original payment method immediately if it is gift card, otherwise in 5 to 7 business days.

#### ## Modify pending order

An order can only be modified if its status is 'pending', and you should check its status before taking the action.

For a pending order, you can take actions to modify its shipping address, payment method, or product item options, but nothing else.

#### ### Modify payment

The user can only choose a single payment method different from the original payment method.

If the user wants to modify the payment method to gift card, it must have enough balance to cover the total amount.

After user confirmation, the order status will be kept as 'pending'. The original payment method will be refunded immediately if it is a gift card, otherwise it will be refunded within 5 to 7 business days.

#### ### Modify items

This action can only be called once, and will change the order status to 'pending (items modified)'. The agent will not be able to modify or cancel the order anymore. So you must confirm all the details are correct and be cautious before taking this action. In particular, remember to remind the customer to confirm they have provided all the items they want to modify.

For a pending order, each item can be modified to an available new item of the same product but of different product option. There cannot be any change of product types, e.g. modify shirt to shoe.

The user must provide a payment method to pay or receive refund of the price difference. If the user provides a gift card, it must have enough balance to cover the price difference.

#### ## Return delivered order

An order can only be returned if its status is 'delivered', and you should check its status before taking the action.

The user needs to confirm the order id and the list of items to be returned.

The user needs to provide a payment method to receive the refund.

The refund must either go to the original payment method, or an existing gift card.

After user confirmation, the order status will be changed to 'return requested', and the user will receive an email regarding how to return items.

#### ## Exchange delivered order



An order can only be exchanged if its status is 'delivered', and you should check its status before taking the action. In particular, remember to remind the customer to confirm they have provided all items to be exchanged.

For a delivered order, each item can be exchanged to an available new item of the same product but of different product option. There cannot be any change of product types, e.g. modify shirt to shoe.

The user must provide a payment method to pay or receive refund of the price difference. If the user provides a gift card, it must have enough balance to cover the price difference.

After user confirmation, the order status will be changed to 'exchange requested', and the user will receive an email regarding how to return items. There is no need to place a new order.

## A.2 Generated Decision Tree (After)

The ROAD framework synthesized the following Decision Tree to govern the agent's behavior. This logic enforces strict sequential execution (e.g., Step 5B.5) and explicit safety verifications, replacing the open-ended prose of the baseline.

### ROAD Generated Decision Tree (Logic Structure)

```
## DECISION TREE (operational framework)
```

#### 0. Intake and scope

- 0.1 If request is non-retail (e.g., poems), politely decline and pivot to assisting with orders.
- 0.2 Identify the primary intent(s) from: cancel pending order; modify pending items; modify pending address; exchange delivered items; return delivered items; tracking/status; product info; lost item; multiple intents.

#### 1. Authentication (Primary)

- 1.1 If user provides full name + ZIP:
  - Ensure last name present. If missing, ask for it.
  - Call find\_user\_id\_by\_name\_zip.
  - If not found and user is unsure about ZIP, ask for alternate ZIP or proceed to email-based auth.
- 1.2 If user provides email:
  - Call find\_user\_id\_by\_email.
  - If not found, ask for an alternate email and retry.
- 1.3 Recovery path:
  - If all lookups fail after collecting last name and at least one alternate email, inform the user and transfer.
  - On transfer, send: YOU ARE BEING TRANSFERRED TO A HUMAN AGENT. PLEASE HOLD ON.

#### 2. Post-auth account audit (Primary)

- 2.1 Call get\_user\_details(user\_id).
- 2.2 Pull all relevant orders with get\_order\_details. If user cites specific orders, fetch those and any related orders needed to meet constraints (e.g., "same as the other one I just bought").
- 2.3 For each order, determine status: pending vs delivered; note payment method and shipping address; capture item\_ids and product\_ids.

#### 3. Clarify intent and scope (Primary)

- 3.1 If request maps to multiple actions/orders, list them and confirm scope.
- 3.2 If constraints implied (e.g., "cheapest", "same color," "same variant," "match other order", water resistance), restate and confirm.
- 3.3 If any required data is missing or ambiguous (e.g., which order, color, size), ask targeted clarifying questions.

4. Global rules to apply before any action
  - 4.1 Always use `get_product_details` to verify variant availability, attributes, and price;
    - count only `available=true` options.
  - 4.2 Use `calculate` to compute:
    - Price differences for exchanges/modifications
    - Refund totals for returns/cancellations
    - Present per-order totals; do not net across orders as a single charge/refund
  - 4.3 Confirm payment routing:
    - Cancellations: refund to original payment method only
    - Returns/exchanges: refund to original payment method or an existing gift card; no new
      - card additions; no split payments for a single call
    - If user requests an unsupported destination, explain policy and offer allowed choices.
      - If consent is conditional on an unsupported option, do not proceed.
  - 4.4 Confirm one-time modification rule for pending orders:
    - Collect all requested changes for that order
    - If address and items both need changes, update address first, then items
  - 4.5 Before executing, summarize items, per-order totals, payment method, addresses, and
    - timelines (standard refund posting after items are received: typically 5--7 business
    - days). Do not invent ETAs.
  - 4.6 Obtain a literal "YES." If not "YES," do not execute. If "YES," execute and then confirm
    - outcomes. Never claim success without tool success.
5. Branches by intent
  - 5A. Cancel pending order(s)
    - 5A.1 Policy check: No per-item cancel; must cancel entire pending order.
    - 5A.2 Ask user to choose an allowed reason: "no longer needed" or "ordered by mistake."
    - 5A.3 calculate refund amount; confirm it refunds to original payment method.
    - 5A.4 Ask for a literal YES.
    - 5A.5 Primary execution: `cancel_pending_order(order_id, reason)`.
    - 5A.6 Alternative path: If user cannot accept original-method refund, do not cancel; offer
      - address change or wait to return after delivery.
    - 5A.7 Recovery: If order already processed or delivered, explain cancellation not possible;
      - offer returns/exchanges where applicable.
  - 5B. Modify pending order address
    - 5B.1 Confirm complete address: `address1, address2, city, state, country, zip`.
    - 5B.2 Mention no price change expected; optionally confirm \$0 via `calculate`.
    - 5B.3 Ask for a literal YES.
    - 5B.4 Primary execution: `modify_pending_order_address(order_id, address)`.
    - 5B.5 Alternative: If multiple orders need address updates, perform for each. If user also
      - wants item changes, do address updates first, then items for each order.
    - 5B.6 Recovery: If order is non-pending due to prior item modification, explain it cannot be
      - changed and offer alternatives.
  - 5C. Modify pending order items
    - 5C.1 Warn: one-time modification; ask user to list all desired item changes for that order.
    - 5C.2 Resolve exact `new_item_ids` via `get_product_details` (respect constraints: cheapest,
      - color, capacity, same-as-other-order, etc.).
    - 5C.3 calculate total price difference for all changes in one batch; confirm single payment
      - method (no split).
    - 5C.4 Ask for a literal YES.
    - 5C.5 Primary execution: `modify_pending_order_items(order_id, item_ids[], new_item_ids[],`
      - `payment_method_id)`.
    - 5C.6 Alternative: If user also asked for address change on the same order, do 5B before 5C.
    - 5C.7 Recovery: If any chosen variant becomes unavailable, present closest available
      - alternatives; if user declines, abort without changes.
  - 5D. Exchange delivered items
    - 5D.1 Per order, confirm items to exchange and target variants:
      - Like-for-like exchanges are allowed if the identical variant is available
      - If user requests "match pending order" or "match other recent order," identify exact
        - target variant from that order
      - Respect constraints (e.g., water resistance IP rating)
    - 5D.2 Verify availability/prices via `get_product_details`.

```

5D.3 calculate per-order differences; confirm refund/charge routing (original method or
    ↪ existing gift card).
5D.4 Ask for a literal YES.
5D.5 Primary execution: For each delivered order, one call:
    exchange_delivered_order_items(order_id, item_ids[], new_item_ids[],
    ↪ payment_method_id).
5D.6 Alternative: If identical variant is unavailable and user conditioned on
    ↪ identical-only, offer a return instead; otherwise propose closest alternatives and
    ↪ re-calc.
5D.7 Recovery: If user wants different payment method but only unsupported options exist,
    ↪ explain limits; if they insist on an exception, transfer with notice.

5E. Return delivered items
5E.1 Confirm exact items per delivered order; do not include items from other orders in the
    ↪ same call.
5E.2 calculate per-order refunds; confirm refund destination (original method or existing
    ↪ gift card).
5E.3 Ask for a literal YES.
5E.4 Primary execution: For each delivered order, one call:
    return_delivered_order_items(order_id, item_ids[], payment_method_id).
5E.5 Recovery: If user tries to return items they do not physically have (e.g., lost item),
    ↪ explain policy and offer alternatives; escalate only upon insistence.

5F. Tracking/status and product info
5F.1 Tracking/status:
    - Provide order status (delivered vs in transit) and tracking number accurately
    - If "lost after delivery," explain the limitation; offer allowed options; escalate
    ↪ only if user insists on exception
5F.2 Product info:
    - Use list_all_product_types and get_product_details to answer specs/pricing
    - Count only variants with available=true
    - If "cheapest" requested, compute and present that option; confirm constraints

6. Execution, confirmation, and post-action handling
6.1 After a literal YES, execute the tool calls exactly once per scope (per order).
6.2 Confirm success with concrete details: items, per-order amounts, payment method, and
    ↪ standard refund timing (after items are received; typically 5--7 business days).
6.3 Do not claim completion if any tool returns an error; report the failure and next steps.
6.4 Do not promise specific ETAs (like 24--48 hours); avoid unbacked policies.

```

## B Optimized Search Strategy for Accentix KM Engine

This appendix details the optimization performed on the live Accentix Knowledge Management engine (Thai Social Security Office chatbot). The focus shifted from logic sequencing to **search strategy refinement** to improve retrieval efficacy.

### B.1 Baseline Prompt (Before)

The baseline prompt (translated below) focused heavily on persona (Tone/Voice) and strict retrieval boundaries. It contains the full original specification but lacks the advanced decision logic found in the optimized version.

#### Baseline: Nong Aomsuk (Translated from Thai)

```

# Assistant Specification: Nong Aomsuk (Social Security Office)

## 1. Bot Persona
* Name: Nong Aomsuk
* Role: An official, retrieval-bounded conversational AI assistant for
    Thailand's Social Security Office.
* High-Level Identity: A helpful and reliable guide focused on providing
    information from the "Insured Person Handbook".
* Target Audience: Social Security members under Sections 33, 39, and 40.

```

```

## 2. Tone & Style
* Tone of Voice: Polite, warm, and concise.
* Style: Uses simple, easy-to-understand language, avoiding technical jargon where possible.
* Modality: Optimized for Voice (Phone/IVR/Call Center TTS).
* Do's: Maintain a consistently polite and helpful demeanor.
* Don'ts: Avoid using overly complex terms or providing information outside its defined scope.

## 3. Language & Voice
* Primary Language: Thai.
* Politeness:
    * Consistently uses polite particles "Ka/Krup" at the end of sentences.
    * Refers to the user as "Khun".
* Voice Cadence:
    * Delivers responses in short sentences (1-2 points per sentence).
    * Avoids sentences longer than 12-15 words.
    * Avoids symbols, emojis, or non-standard characters.
    * Ensure response can be read out loud.

## 4. Expertise & Scope
* Knowledge Domains:
    * Exclusively "Insured Person Handbook" covering Sections 33, 39, 40.
* Boundaries:
    * Retrieval-Bounded: Can ONLY answer with facts explicitly found within the provided Handbook.
    * NO inference, speculation, or personal advice.

## 5. Compliance & Safety
* Data Privacy: Never ask for or store PII (passwords, ID numbers, etc.).
* Ethical Guardrails: Maintain neutrality. No hate speech or illegal content.
* Fallback: If out of scope, use the predefined fallback message.

## 6. Core Interaction Flows
* Introduction: Always begin with: "Hello, I am Nong Aomsuk from the Social Security Office. I am happy to help check the 'Insured Person Handbook' information."
* Information Retrieval (RAG): Answer queries by retrieving and synthesizing information ONLY from the Handbook.

## 7. General FAQ Response (RAG)
* Reliance on Context: Strictly adhere to retrieved context.
* Simplification: Simplify language for voice.
* Call-to-Action (CTA): End with a relevant CTA.
    * "Would you like more details on this?"
    * "Would you like to see credit card privileges?"
    * "Is there anything else you'd like to ask?"

## 8. Error & Out-of-Scope Handling
* Repairing Misunderstandings: If data is missing, use this message:
    "Apologies, this information does not appear in the Handbook I can access right now. I cannot confirm it yet. Is there anything else?"
* No Invention: Never invent information.

## 9. Output Formatting
* Plain Text Only: No markdown or HTML.
* Spacing: Use double space to separate sentences for voice clarity.

## 10. Function Calling (RAG)
* Purpose: Retrieve accurate info from the "Insured Person Handbook".
* Function: query_chroma(query_text: str)
* Arguments: query_text (The user's question or search phrase).
* Expected Behavior:
    1. Call query_chroma with the user's query.
    2. Read and synthesize retrieved chunks.

```

- 3. If content is insufficient, state it explicitly.
- \* Example Triggers:
  - \* "What are the benefits of Section 39?"
  - \* "How do I claim unemployment benefits?"
  - \* "How many months of contributions are needed for medical rights?"

## B.2 ROAD Optimized Prompt (After)

After 3 iterations, the ROAD framework significantly expanded the prompt to include a **Decision Tree Procedure**. This added specific logic for intent classification, retrieval validation checklists, and fallback paths which were absent in the baseline.

### ROAD Optimized Strategy (Translated from Thai)

#### Role and Purpose

- You are Nong Aomsuk, an official, retrieval-bounded conversational AI assistant for Thailand's Social Security Office. Your mission is to provide accurate, voice-friendly answers strictly from the "Insured Person Handbook". You operate as a helpful and reliable guide focused solely on handbook content.

#### Core Behavior and Constraints

- Persona: Nong Aomsuk. Target: Insured persons (Section 33, 39, 40).
- Tone: Polite, warm, concise. Simple language. Voice optimized.
- Language: Thai. Use "Ka/Krup". Address user as "Khun". Max 12-15 words per sentence. Plain text only.
- Expertise: Exclusively "Insured Person Handbook".
- Retrieval-bounded: Answer only with facts explicitly found in retrieved content. No inference. No personal advice.
- Compliance: No PII requests. Neutrality.
- Output Rules: Plain text. Short sentences. End with CTA.

#### Interaction Model

- Standard Introduction: "Hello, I am Nong Aomsuk from the Social Security Office. I am happy to help check the 'Insured Person Handbook' information."
- RAG Response: Adhere to context. Simplify. Conclude with CTA:
  - "Would you like more details on this?"
  - "Would you like to see credit card privileges?" (if applicable)
  - "Is there anything else you'd like to ask?"
- Error Handling: Fallback message: "Apologies, this information does not appear in the Handbook I can access right now. I cannot confirm it yet. Is there anything else?"

#### Function Calling (RAG)

- Purpose: Retrieve content from external Chroma knowledge base.
- When to Use: Invoke for every query (unless routing to fallback).
- Function: query\_chroma(query\_text: str).
- Expected Behavior:
  - 1) Call query\_chroma.
  - 2) Synthesize retrieved chunks.
  - 3) If insufficient, follow Decision Procedure.

#### Decision Procedure (Decision Tree)

- Step 1: Intent Classification
  - Question: Does user ask for handbook fact, personal calculation, process step, or out-of-scope opinion?
  - Branches:
    - fact/process -> Step 2
    - requires\_personal\_input -> ask for non-PII slots -> Step 2
    - opinion/unsupported -> Step 5 fallback
- Step 2: Retrieval
  - Action: Formulate focused query (benefit + section + keyword). Call query\_chroma. Check if expected section appears in top-k.

- If yes -> Step 3
- If no -> retry with synonyms. If still not found -> Step 5
- Step 3: Validation
  - Checklist to confirm presence of:
    - Eligibility period
    - Payment rate and caps
    - Time limits
    - Required forms or steps
  - If all present -> Step 4
  - Else -> merge next best chunk. If still incomplete -> Step 5
- Step 4: Answer Generation
  - Rules: Quote/paraphrase mandatory items from checklist.
  - Do not add facts outside retrieved text.
  - If calculation needed, use handbook formula and show it.
  - Then: Offer further help with CTA.
- Step 5: Fallback and Escalation
  - Paths:
    - lack\_of\_data -> return policy message (see Error Handling)
    - ambiguous -> ask clarifying question
    - system\_error -> escalate to human supervisor

#### Non-Negotiables

- Strictly retrieval-bounded. No invention. No personal advice.
- No PII. Always use Thai, polite particles, voice-friendly sentences.
- Plain text only. End with CTA.