
TRANSDUCTION IS ALL YOU NEED FOR STRUCTURED DATA WORKFLOWS

Alfio Gliozzo
IBM Research
gliozzo@us.ibm.com

Naweed Khan
IBM Research
naweed.khan@ibm.com

Christodoulos Constantinides
IBM Software, Expert Labs
christodoulos.constantinides@ibm.com

Nandana Mihindukulasooriya
IBM Research
nnandana@ibm.com

Nahuel Defosse
IBM Research
nahuel.defosse@ibm.com

Junkyu Lee
IBM Research
junkyu.lee@ibm.com

ABSTRACT


This paper introduces Agentics, a modular framework for building agent-based systems capable of structured reasoning and compositional generalization over complex data. Designed with research and practical applications in mind, Agentics offers a novel perspective on working with data and AI workflows. In this framework, agents are abstracted from the logical flow and they are used internally to the data type to enable logical transduction among data. Agentics encourages AI developers to focus on modeling data rather than crafting prompts, enabling a declarative language in which data types are provided by LLMs and composed through logical transduction, which is executed by LLMs when types are connected. We provide empirical evidence demonstrating the applicability of this framework across domain-specific multiple-choice question answering, semantic parsing for text-to-SQL, and automated prompt optimization tasks, achieving state-of-the-art accuracy or improved scalability without sacrificing performance. The open-source implementation is available at <https://github.com/IBM/agentics>.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have revolutionized how we think about computation, enabling machines to interpret and generate natural language with remarkable fluency. Yet, despite their success in unstructured settings, LLMs remain poorly suited for working with *structured data* which defined by explicit schemas, identifiers, and deterministic semantics, as commonly found in enterprise systems, databases, and analytics pipelines (Hopkins et al., 2022). Current agentic AI frameworks address this gap by embedding structured data into natural language prompts, which breaks down in enterprise use cases such as business analytics or data transformation that demand precision, reproducibility, and scale (Sarirete et al., 2022; Heck, 2024; Putri and Athoillah, 2024).

Figure 1a illustrates the common GenAI workflow involving Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), LLM agents, and Software Engineers (SWEs) in a feedback loop: SMEs describe tasks and provide iterative feedback, while agents generate outputs. The SMEs describes the data transformation task and negotiating requirements with LLM agents using natural language in multi-turn conversions and provides feedback on the output quality, which iterates until acceptable results are generated. However, this process is fragile in tasks like API calls, database queries, or data transformation pipelines that demand precise, verifiable input at scale. Moreover, iterative clarification and validation often lead to errors and inefficiency. Even in the best-case scenario, agents typically return human-readable summaries or small data samples, not the structured tabular datasets that SMEs need for further analysis. In practice, business analysts use structured data that they can manipulate within business intelligence (BI) tools, and therefore, they request supports from SWEs to scale data workflows in production. Thus, contemporary agentic solutions remain ill-suited for enterprise-grade structured data operations.

In this paper, we introduce a data-centric paradigm for structured workflows that departs from anthropomorphic metaphors such as memory, tools, and conversation, which dominate current agentic frameworks. Instead of treating



(a) Interaction Pattern in Conventional Agentic AI

(b) Proposed Data-Centric Interaction Paradigm in Agentics

Figure 1: Comparison of Interaction Patterns in GenAI Solutions for Data Transformation Tasks

agents as conversational entities, we view them as stateless transducers that operate over well-defined data types. The main concept we present is logical transduction—the transformation of a data object of type X into type Y by inferring each field in Y from X under the constraints of a target schema. These transformations can be implemented by lightweight, stateless agents that are composable, parallelizable, and verifiable.

As shown in Figure 1b, SMEs declaratively define workflows by specifying Pydantic schemas and linking them via transductions. This no-code approach enables ingestion and transformation of data, optionally guided by few-shot examples, and direct integration with analytics pipelines and Python code. Unlike traditional agents operate on serialized conversational dependencies, the agents in our approach are stateless and context-free, enabling fully asynchronous execution. Built on the asynchronous nature of transduction, we also introduce the asynchronous Map/Reduce programming model, which enables scalable execution of complex workflows that blend LLM inference with program logic.

Contributions Our key contributions are:

1. formalizing logical transduction and its algebra as the foundation for data-centric agentic AI,
2. introducing *Agentics*, a framework implementing logical transduction and an asynchronous Map/Reduce model,
3. demonstrating robustness, accuracy, and scalability across tasks such as domain-specific QA, text-to-SQL, and prompt optimization for structured workflows,
4. releasing an open-source implementation ¹ to support further research and adoption.

2 Agentic AI

For decades, AI has been framed as an effort to emulate human intelligence. The Turing Test exemplifies this anthropomorphic ideal: a machine is deemed intelligent if its conversation is indistinguishable from a human’s. The rise of LLMs has amplified this framing. By enabling rapid prototyping of intelligent systems through natural language prompts, developing AI agents has become more intuitive and accessible. Consequently, many agentic AI frameworks adopt agentic metaphors such as memory, planning, and tool use, often realized via chat-based interfaces.

This approach has driven remarkable progress in consumer applications. Yet, as tasks demand greater semantic precision, prompt-centric methods often prove brittle, opaque, and hard to scale, especially in structured data environments where reproducibility and accuracy are paramount. Agentic frameworks typically position the agent as the locus of intelligence, with data as passive input. While effective for open-ended tasks, this model struggles in deterministic workflows. In enterprise settings where querying, transformation, and integration of structured data are common, conversational agents can introduce error propagation and unpredictable behavior.

¹<https://github.com/IBM/agentics>

We argue that these limitations stem not from LLM capabilities, but from the design paradigms embedded in current frameworks that prioritize human-like behavior over the strengths of traditional computing, which manages structured, semantically rich data with precision and reliability. `Agentics` proposes a shift towards computation centered on data semantics and type-driven transformations, enabling more robust, scalable, and interpretable workflows.

2.1 Concepts

Recent demands in Agentic AI have led to a surge of interest in frameworks and methodologies for building intelligent systems composed of multiple interacting agents. Several foundational works provide context for this development.

- Han et al. (2024) propose a unified framework for LLM-based multi-agent systems, structured around five components: profile, perception, self-action, mutual interaction, and evolution. They highlight the potential of LLMs to simulate human-like intelligence through coordinated agent behavior, while identifying key challenges such as memory management and scalability.
- Huang and Huang (2025) explore collaborative problem-solving in multi-agent networks, emphasizing the role of LLMs in enabling dynamic communication and negotiation. Their study distinguishes between cooperative and competitive agent behaviors and demonstrates the flexibility of LLMs in real-world coalition formation.
- Moshkovich and Zeltyn (2025) focus on the lifecycle of agentic systems, introducing tools for observability, diagnostics, and optimization. They argue that as agentic workflows grow in complexity, traditional debugging methods fall short, and propose structured metrics for alignment, coherence, and task success.
- Acharya et al. (2025) present a comprehensive survey of agentic AI, covering autonomy, memory, planning, and tool use across various domains. They discuss coordination strategies, ethical considerations, and the societal impact of deploying autonomous agents at scale.

Together, these works underscore the growing importance of agentic AI as a paradigm for building intelligent, goal-driven systems. They also highlight the limitations of current frameworks in terms of flexibility, transparency, and integration with structured data workflows—motivating the need for alternatives such as `Agentics`, which emphasize semantic modeling and logical transduction.

2.2 Software Frameworks

Recent years have seen the emergence of a variety of frameworks for building agentic AI systems, each adopting a different philosophy in orchestrating agent behavior, workflow logic, and semantic alignment. These systems aim to harness the capabilities of large language models (LLMs) for complex reasoning, structured data manipulation, and autonomous task execution.

To address the limitations of prompt-centric systems, recent research has introduced techniques such as guardrails (Ouyang et al., 2022; Dong et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024), self-reflection (Shinn et al., 2023; Asai et al., 2024), and correction strategies (Madaan et al., 2023; Pan et al., 2024). While these methods enhance reliability, most frameworks still depend on free-form text or loosely structured prompts that remain fragile and difficult to verify—especially in tasks requiring high semantic precision.

In response, a new generation of frameworks has emerged that emphasize structured data computation, type safety, and modular orchestration. These include:

- `LangGraph` (LangChain, 2025), a graph-based orchestration system supporting stateful agents and structured data flows
- `CrewAI` (CrewAI Inc., 2025), a multi-agent coordination framework integrating `Pydantic` for structured task definitions
- `Pydantic-AI` (Pydantic, 2025), a data-centric agent framework built around `Pydantic` schemas
- `DSPy` (Khattab et al., 2024), a declarative abstraction for prompt engineering and optimization
- `AutoGen` (Wu et al., 2024), a flexible multi-agent framework supporting tool use, planning, and structured messaging
- `SmolAgents` (SmolAI, 2024), a lightweight agentic framework for simplicity
- `Atomic Agents` (AtomicAI, 2024), a modular, type-safe agentic system for real-time observability.

These frameworks reflect a growing movement toward more interpretable, modular, and data-aware agentic systems that lay the foundation for robust, enterprise AI workflows.




Figure 2: Crystallization as an Analogy for Transduction

3 Logical Transduction Algebra

Agentics is a framework that leverages asynchronous and parallel LLM inference to support enterprise-scale structured data workflows. To formalize this approach, we present *Logical Transduction Algebra* which provides a principled foundation for composing and optimizing LLM-powered workflows at scale.

3.1 Transduction and Large Language Models

According to Simondon (1958, 1964), transduction is a process through which a structure progressively arises from within a metastable system. It could be understood in analogy with the process of crystallization as shown in Figure 2, in which a seed crystal triggers growth, organizing the solution molecule by molecule and each layer emerges from the prior, following internal dynamics. This notion resonates with Johnson (1924), where a general concept is made specific through a process of specification or transformation, which can be seen as a form of logical transduction.

Gammerman et al. (1998) define transductive inference as reasoning from observed, specific training cases directly to specific test cases, without necessarily inferring a general function or model for the entire input space as an intermediate step.

LLM inference can be viewed as a form of transductive inference where the model directly predicts the next token or sequence of tokens for a given specific input prompt, without necessarily learning a fully general, explicit rule that applies to all possible linguistic inputs beyond the observed context.

<pre>class ProductReview(BaseModel): reviewer: str text: str stars: int</pre>	<pre>class SentimentSummary(BaseModel): sentiment: Literal["positive", "neutral", "negative"] reason: str</pre>
<pre>{ "reviewer": "Alice", "text": "Excellent product quality and fast delivery!", "stars": 5 }, { "reviewer": "Bob", "text": "It's okay, but the package was damaged", "stars": 3 }, { "reviewer": "Carol", "text": "Terrible experience, broken after one use!", "stars": 1 }</pre>	<pre>{ "sentiment": "positive", "reason": "Excellent quality and fast delivery" }, { "sentiment": "neutral", "reason": "Okay product, but package issues" }, { "sentiment": "negative", "reason": "Broke after one use" }</pre>

Listing 1: Source Class & Payload

Listing 2: Target Class & Payload

Figure 3: Logical Transduction in Sentiment Summary

3.2 Concepts

Logical transduction is a structured, and inference-driven transformation of a data object x of type X into a new object y of type Y , such that each field in y can be logically explained based on the information in x . This transformation is grounded in the semantics of the source and target types, and guided by the constraints encoded in their schemas.

Figure 3 illustrates a simple example, where *ProductReview* object containing a reviewer’s name, review text, and rating is transduced into a new object that includes a sentiment label and a rationale. The LLM infers new fields based on source and target schemas, filling structured templates with semantically meaningful content. The target schema guides the transduction by catching malformed generations via type validation, filling with defaults in the missing fields, and introducing optional fields that could support downstream tasks or improve the interpretability.




Figure 4: Logical Transduction as Negotiation of Meaning

Beyond a single transformation, logical transduction can be viewed as a negotiation of meaning between two agents, as illustrated in Figure 4. The source agent, $AG[X]$, which holds data of type X , inspects the target agent $AG[Y]$ ’s schema, with data type Y , to understand its requirements. The source agent then constructs a prompt that selects or renders relevant information from the source state x and adds task-specific instructions. This prompt is applied to x , and messages are sent to the target, yielding states y asynchronously. The target may provide few-shot feedback from the transduced states for further refinement. This agentic negotiation supports high levels of parallelism, as messages are processed in asynchronous batches.

3.3 Formalization

We present an abridged version of the formal Logical Transduction Algebra in the main paper. Our work is closely related to relational algebra (Codd, 1970) and the MapReduce programming model (Dean and Ghemawat, 2008). This enables the composition of data transformation pipelines and supports an efficient programming model that leverages the stateless and asynchronous nature of LLM inference. The full details are provided in the Appendix.

We define types and meta-types, collectively referred to as the Agentic Structure (AG), and establish a sound algebra over the types and states within it.

Definition 1 (Types). Let Θ denote the universe of all possible *types*, $\Theta = \{X, Y, Z, T, \dots\}$, where each type $T \in \Theta$ is a collection of named fields (s_i, T_{s_i}) :

$$T := \{(s_1, T_{s_1}), (s_2, T_{s_2}), \dots, (s_n, T_{s_n})\},$$

with each s_i representing a string-valued slot name, and each $T_{s_i} \in \Theta$ denoting the corresponding type of that slot.

Types are denoted by uppercase letters and instances by lowercase, e.g., $t : T$ indicating t is of type T . Lists use boldface, so $\mathbf{t} : T$ is a list of instances of type T .

Definition 2 (Agentic Structure AG). An *Agentic structure* AG is a meta-type that bundles a type schema s_{atype} ² and a corresponding list of instances, referred to as **states** s_{states} :

$$AG := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} s_{\text{atype}} : \Theta, \\ s_{\text{states}} : \text{List}[\Theta] \end{array} \right\}$$

For clarity, we write $AG[X]$ for an Agentic structure with $s_{\text{atype}} = X$, and $\mathbf{x} = AG[X]$ for its instance. The i -th state is accessed via $x_i = \mathbf{x}[i] = \mathbf{x}.s_{\text{states}}[i]$.

In Logical Transduction Algebra, we focus on structured data and its transformation around agents encapsulating LLMs. The algebraic structure of composing two Agentic instances of the same type can be shown as follows.

Proposition 1 (Monoid of Agentic Instances). Let $AG[X]$ be an Agentic structure and let ξ be the set of all instances of $AG[X]$. Define a binary operation \circ on ξ such that for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \xi$, their composition $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 \circ \mathbf{x}_2$ is an Agentic instance whose state list is the concatenation: $\mathbf{x}.s_{\text{states}} := \mathbf{x}_1.s_{\text{states}} \circ \mathbf{x}_2.s_{\text{states}}$. Then, the pair (ξ, \circ) forms a *monoid*, where the identity element is the Agentic instance with an empty state list: $\mathbf{e}.s_{\text{states}} := []$.

The standard operators follow standard algebraic principles such as the product, $\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{y}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in AG[X]$ and $\mathbf{y} \in AG[Y]$, the equivalence, $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathbf{x}_2$ for $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in AG[X]$, and the quotient, \mathbf{z}/\mathbf{y} for $\mathbf{z} \in AG[X \times Y]$ and $\mathbf{y} \in AG[Y]$, as detailed in the Appendix.

Equipped with Agentic structures that form a monoid, we obtain a sound abstraction for composing the data workflows in a functional programming style. This foundation enables the introduction of the *logical transduction operator*, which utilizes LLMs as transductive inference engines.

3.3.1 Transduction Operator

We now define a series of overloaded logical transduction operators, which are designed with explicit consideration of the Agentic structure.

Definition 3 (Transduction). Given an information object x and a target Agentic structure $AG[Y]$, the *transduction* of x into $AG[Y]$ is defined as:

$$\mathbf{y} := Y \ll x = \bigcup_i (y_i, T_{s_i}),$$

where each $y_i \in T_{s_i}$ is a value assigned to slot s_i of type T_{s_i} , logically inferred from x . Here, the operator \ll denotes a logical transduction process, implemented via an LLM, that maps x to a structured output conforming to the type Y .

To support the definition of logical transduction operators, we introduce a generic function that renders typed objects into textual representations suitable for LLM input.

Definition 4 (Prompt Function). Given a type $T \in \Theta$, a *prompt function* P is a mapping that renders a list of states $\mathbf{t} : T$ into an information object, leveraging the string-valued slot names associated with T . Formally, $P : \text{List}[T] \rightarrow \text{str}$.

Prompt functions serve as a bridge between structured data and natural language, enabling logical transduction operators to interface with LLMs by converting typed instances into semantically meaningful prompts.

We now define two specific forms of logical transduction: zero-shot and few-shot.

Definition 5 (Zero-Shot Logical Transduction). Let $\mathbf{x} = AG[X]$ and $\mathbf{y} = AG[Y]$ be Agentic structures over types X and Y , respectively. A *zero-shot logical transduction* from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{y} is defined component-wise as:

$$\mathbf{y}[i] = Y \ll P(\mathbf{x}[i]),$$

where $P : X \rightarrow \text{str}$ is a prompt function that renders each instance $\mathbf{x}[i]$ into a textual prompt.

In Appendix, we also show more overloaded transduction operators in the case of the few-shot transduction, $\mathbf{y}[i] = Y \ll (P(\mathbf{x}[i]) \oplus FS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$ with a few-shot function $FS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := P((\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}'))$, and a syntactic sugar such as self-transduction.

Next, we formalize key properties of the transduction operator. These properties are foundational for enabling scalable, parallel, and composable computation.

²Given two types X and Y , the standard set operations such as union, intersection, complement, and product can be defined component-wise.

Proposition 2 (Conditional Determinism). Let σ denote a fixed transduction context, which may include components such as a few-shot context, additional instructions, external tools, or memory. Let the LLM configuration—comprising model weights, temperature, and decoding strategy—also be fixed. Then, for any input x_i , the transduction $y_i := Y \ll x_i$ is deterministic.

Proposition 3 (Statelessness). Logical transduction operators are stateless. The output of a transduction $y_i := Y \ll x_i$ depends only on x_i and the transduction context, and not on any prior or future transductions.

Proposition 4 (Compositionality). Let $AG[X]$, $AG[Y]$, and $AG[Z]$ be Agentic structures over types X , Y , and Z , respectively. Suppose $y' = Y \ll x$, and $z' = Z \ll y'$. Then the composite transduction holds, $z' = Z \ll Y \ll x$.

These properties make the transduction operator \ll particularly well-suited for distributed and concurrent computing paradigms. The *Conditional Determinism* ensures reproducibility and traceability in distributed pipelines, the *Statelessness* enables parallel execution, allowing transductions to be mapped across shards of data without coordination or shared state, and the *Compositionality* supports modular pipeline construction, akin to functional composition in MapReduce, where intermediate Agentic structures can be chained and reused.

3.3.2 Asynchronous MapReduce

The programming model of the `Agentic`s supports asynchronous execution of mapping and reduction operations over Agentic structures, enabling scalable and composable data workflows. We formalize these operations as `aMap` and `aReduce`, which extend the MapReduce by Dean and Ghemawat (2008).

Definition 6 (Asynchronous Map (`aMap`)). Let $AG[X]$ be an Agentic structure over type X , and let $f : X \rightarrow \text{List}[Y]$ be an asynchronous mapping function. Then the asynchronous map operator is defined as:

$$\text{aMap} : (AG[X], f) \rightarrow AG[Y],$$

where the output Agentic structure $\mathbf{y} = \text{aMap}(\mathbf{x}, f)$ satisfies: $\mathbf{y}.s_{\text{states}} = \bigcup_i f(x_i)$, and the union preserving the original order of inputs.

The function f may return an empty list by removing x_i from the output acting as a filter, map each x_i to a single output acting as a transformer, or map each x_i to multiple outputs acting as fan-out. Note that `aMap` operator is executed asynchronously across all input states, enabling parallelism and scalability in distributed environments.

Definition 7 (Asynchronous Reduce (`aReduce`)). Let $AG[X]$ be an Agentic structure and let $f : \text{List}[X] \rightarrow Y$ be an asynchronous reduction function. Then the asynchronous reduce operator is defined as:

$$\text{aReduce} : (AG[X], f) \rightarrow AG[Y],$$

where the output Agentic structure $\mathbf{y} = \text{aReduce}(\mathbf{x}, f)$ satisfies: $\mathbf{y}.s_{\text{states}} = f(\mathbf{x})$.

Unlike `aMap`, which applies f to each state individually, `aReduce` applies f to the entire states \mathbf{x} at once. This is useful for summarization or aggregation, such as generating a report or computing statistics over the full dataset. Since LLMs have limited context windows, applying `aReduce` to a large dataset may be intractable. In such cases, scalable strategies such as hierarchical or batched reduction can be employed by applying `aReduce` to random subsets and merging the results.

`aMap` and `aReduce` can be composed with the logical transduction operator \ll to build expressive and modular workflows. For example, $\mathbf{y} = \text{aMap}(\mathbf{x}, x \mapsto Y \ll x)$, where the transduction $Y \ll x$ is embedded within the mapping function.

3.4 Implementation

The `Agentic`s framework provides a concrete realization of the logical transduction algebra. This section introduces the core components that provide a concrete realization of the logical transduction algebra.

3.4.1 Meta-Class `AG`

At the heart of the framework is the `AG` class, a meta-class that binds a Pydantic type, which we call `atype`, with its associated `states`. The use of Pydantic schemas enables seamless integration with Python’s type system while supporting flexible and robust data modeling. Each state is an instance of the specified `atype`, allowing it to behave like a standard Python object with validation and serialization capabilities.

```

class AG(BaseModel):
    atype: Type[BaseModel]
    states: List[BaseModel]
    llm: Any

```

Listing 3: Definition of AG class

3.4.2 PydanticTransducer




Figure 5: Pydantic Transducer Architecture in Agentics

Logical transduction is implemented via the \ll (left-shift) operator that performs transduction from a source state (or list of states) to a target *AG* instance. This operator triggers the creation and execution of a *PydanticTransducer*, which is a stateless agent whose sole purpose is to generate a valid instance of the target *atype* from a textual input. As shown in Figure 5, it reads the input, performs inference, and populates the target schema with logically consistent values.

The textual input can represent virtually any concept accessible to an LLM, while the structured output ensures reliability in downstream tasks. Because *Agentics* avoids shared conversational memory, it naturally supports asynchronous execution and efficient scale-out.

To ensure high throughput and responsiveness across datasets of varying sizes, the transduction operator processes data in configurable batches, typically between 8 and 32 items. Then, the standard transduction pipeline consists of the following steps: (1) Each source state is serialized according to its Pydantic schema, (2) The prompt is enriched with few-shot examples and relevant memory passages to guide inference, (3) A *PydanticTransducer* is instantiated for the target type, and (4) Transduction is performed in batches using asynchronous calls to the LLM. In the event of a failure such as rate limits, network interruptions, or parsing errors, we implement a fallback mechanism. The affected batch is retried synchronously, processing each state individually. This graceful degradation ensures that all data is processed reliably.

Example 1. The following example illustrates how the *AG* class and the *PydanticTransducer* work together. The former defines the target schema and execution context, while the latter performs the actual transformation.

```

class Answer(BaseModel):
    answer: Optional[str] = None
    justification: Optional[str] = None
    confidence: Optional[float] = None
async def main():
    answers = AG(atype=Answer)
    answers = answers << ["What is the capital of Italy?"]
    answers = await answers

```

This will return a structured state with an answer Rome with a justification and a confidence score.

```
{
  "Answer": "Rome",
  "Justification": "The capital of Italy is a well-known fact, and Rome is the
    correct answer.",
  "Confidence": 1.0
}
```

We elaborate various design patterns and use cases for domain-specific multiple choice QA, text-to-SQL pipelines, and automatic prompt optimization in the Appendix.

3.4.3 Execution Context

An `Agentics` structure can serve as either the source or the target of a transduction operation, depending on the context. This polymorphic behavior could be enhanced by a set of additional parameters that define the execution context, such as specialized prompt templates, external tool access during transduction, and the retrieval augmented memory.

These additional parameters collectively guide the *semantic negotiation* required for logical transduction. By wrapping Pydantic models within the `Agentics` class, the framework creates a highly customizable and modular execution environment. Prompt templates, in particular, offer fine-grained control over transformation logic, allowing developers to specify how data should be interpreted and structured. This design abstracts away the need for domain-specific prompt engineering. Instead, developers define type systems and the agents operate independently of the content, allowing the transduction process to dynamically infer the necessary transformations. As a result, the \ll operator remains simple and expressive, enabling transduction chains to be modeled as directed graphs with uniform edge semantics. This makes the underlying algebra intuitive, and easy to implement.

4 Experiments

In this section, we demonstrate that the proposed framework achieves state-of-the-art performance on domain-specific multiple-choice QA, enables flexible composition of text-to-SQL pipelines with improved performance on the BIRD-bench evaluation, and supports efficient automatic prompt optimization in logical transduction algebra, enhancing both downstream task performance and runtime.

In the experiments, we benchmark open-weight instruct tuned models ranging from larger or smaller parameter version of Llama-3, Llama-4, Qwen-3, and Mistral. For the experiment that measures the running time, we host LLMs in local vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023) server with four A-100-80GB GPUs for Llama-3-3-70B model, and one A-100-80GB GPU for other 8B parameter models.

4.1 Computing Infrastructure

- In the MCQA experiment, we used instruction-tuned models such as Qwen3-8B, Llama-3.3-70B, Mistral-Large, and Llama-3-405B. We locally hosted the Qwen3-8B model to measure running time, while the other three models were used in a cloud computing environment.
- In automatic prompt optimization experiment, we locally hosted Qwen3-8B and Llama-3.3-70B models.
- In the Text-to-SQL experiment, we used Llama-3.3-70B, Mistral-Large, and Llama-4-Maverick-17B models. These models were also run in a cloud computing environment.

The following shows the parameters for hosing Qwen3-8B and Llama-3.3-70B models with vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023).

```
GPUS=4
CPUS=16
MEM=200GB
MODEL="meta-llama/Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct"
LEN=16000
vllm serve ${MODEL} \
--max-model-len ${LEN} \
--tensor-parallel-size ${GPUS} \
--gpu-memory-utilization 0.9
```

```

GPUS=1
CPUS=8
MEM=64GB
LEN=8000
MODEL="Qwen/Qwen3-8B"
vllm serve ${MODEL} \
  --max-model-len ${LEN} \
  --tensor-parallel-size ${GPUS} \
  --gpu-memory-utilization 0.9

```

Listing 4: vLLM parameters and computing resources

4.2 Domain-Specific Multi-Choice Question Answer

FailureSensorIQ benchmark (Constantinides et al., 2025) is recently proposed domain-specific multiple choice QA benchmark to test LLMs’ ability to reason about failure modes and sensor relationships. The leaderboard shows that the best performing `openai/o1` model scores 60.4%³, unlike many saturated datasets.

Dataset We evaluated 2,667 single-correct MCQA instances spanning various industrial assets, with questions around identifying the right sensor which can detect a given failure mode for a given asset, or identifying the right failure mode that a given asset and sensor can detect. This requires nuanced understanding of sensor behavior, failure propagation, and asset-specific operational logic, and performing logical deductions across the different knowledge about the asset. An example query may be:

```

{
  "Question": "For electric motor, if a failure event rotor windings fault occurs, which sensor out of the choices is the most relevant sensor regarding the occurrence of the failure event?",
  "Options": ["A. partial discharge", "B. resistance", "C. oil debris", "D. current", "E. voltage"]
}

```

Methods Baseline results are obtained from the leaderboard that evaluates the standardized prompts with at most three trials for invalid responses.

Our approach leverages the `Agentics` framework to perform schema-constrained transduction from structured input to structured output. Each input instance is represented using a subset of fields from the FailureSensorIQ schema—specifically, the question, asset name, option ids, options, and subject—which are sufficient to ground the reasoning process in both linguistic and domain-specific context.

To improve inference efficiency, `Agentics` supports *parallel batch execution* via the `aMap` operation. This distributes multiple structured prompts across concurrent model invocations, significantly reducing total runtime. Unlike sequential prompting, which processes one question at a time, batch transduction enables scalable evaluation and deployment.

Experimental Configuration We evaluate four models ranging from 8B to 405B parameters: **Qwen3-8B** (Yang et al., 2025), **Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct** (Touvron et al., 2023), **Mistral-Large-Instruct-2407** (Jiang et al., 2024), **Llama-3-405B-Instruct** (Touvron et al., 2023). Models are tested using both the original FailureSensorIQ baseline pipeline and the `Agentics` framework. The baseline uses loosely formatted natural language prompts and retries up to three times if the output is invalid. In contrast, `Agentics` uses structured prompting and schema-constrained decoding. To measure execution time, we host `Qwen3-8B` on a dedicated node with an A100 80GB GPU running VLLM (Kwon et al., 2023). Other models are accessed via cloud computing platform. We vary batch sizes to assess scalability and throughput.

Accuracy Improvement Table 1 shows the accuracy comparison. `Agentics` improves the performance on all evaluated models, with smaller models benefiting the most. Notably, `Qwen3-8B` achieves a major improvement of +14.32%, getting right behind `openai-o1`, 60.4%. This suggests that prompting through logical transduction helps unlock latent reasoning capabilities, even in models with limited parameter counts.

³<https://alpha-ollama.hf-mirror.com/spaces/cc4718/FailureSensorIQ>

Model	# Params	Baseline	Agentics
Qwen3-8B	8B	45.86	60.18 (+14.32)
Llama-3.3-70B	70B	41.69	50.73 (+9.04)
Mistral-Large	123B	50.09	58.41 (+8.32)
Llama-3-405B	405B	51.26	52.90 (+1.64)


Table 1: Accuracy (%) of on 2,667 FailureSensorIQ instances.

Running Time Figure 6a illustrates the average time (sec) per question for Qwen3-8B across varying batch sizes. As shown, parallel batch execution yields substantial speedups, from 8 seconds per question at batch size 1 to less than 1 second per question at batch sizes greater than 16. This improvement is nearly linear as the batch size increases from 1 to 4, after which it begins to saturate.


Perturbation Study We follow FailureSensorIQ’s perturbation study using the Agentics framework to study if there are any robustness benefits that comes with the structured workflows that our framework offers. We experiment with the following knowledge invariant perturbations:

- Option letter renaming; changing the option letters from of A., B., C., to other letters like P., Q., R. We’ll call this “Simple” Perturbation.
- Option letter renaming and question rephrasing done by an LLM. We’ll call this “Complex” Perturbation.

We use the already prepared perturbed datasets from the original paper.



(a) Average time per question for Qwen3-8B across varying batch sizes.



(b) Performance remains high even after the perturbations with minimal drop.

Figure 6: Domain Specific MCQA Running Time and Perturbation Results.

Summary of Experiments

- **Accuracy Gains:** All models show a major performance improvement under Agentics, with smaller models benefiting most. This suggests that structured prompting helps unlock latent reasoning capabilities, even in models with limited parameter counts.
- **Efficiency Gains:** Agentics supports scalable batch execution, significantly reducing inference time and making large-scale evaluation practical.
- **Perturbation Robustness:** Agentics seems to be robust against knowledge invariant perturbations. In the original FailureSensorIQ experiments, all the models experienced significant drop in performance. We believe this is due to the decoupling that Agentics provides, where option ids and options are provided as separate fields and this makes the models easier to attend to the right information.

4.3 Prompt Optimization

Automatic prompt optimization (APO) is essential, as LLM performance is highly sensitive to prompt structure, tone, and formatting. The prompt function in Definition 4 plays a central role in logical transduction, which can be conceptualized as a negotiation of meaning between agents. Among various APO approaches (Ramnath et al., 2025; Li

et al., 2025), logical transduction algebra naturally supports OPRO-style methods (Yang et al., 2024; Ye et al., 2024; Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024), which follow a local search procedure based on a cycle of generate-select-evaluate. In the *Agentics* framework, the candidate prompt templates are generated by logical transduction from the meta-type that describes the prompt optimization task. Additionally, logical transduction algebra naturally parallelizes local search, such as generating and evaluating candidate prompts⁴.

Dataset We evaluated GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) and FailureSensorIQ (Constantinides et al., 2025) benchmarks. The former enables direct comparison with existing APO techniques. For GSM8K, we use the first 500 training examples for prompt optimization and evaluate the final performance on the full test set. The latter benchmark allows us to assess additional gains beyond the default prompting provided by logical transduction. We randomize the dataset, selecting 500 examples for training and fixing 1,000 examples for the test set. In APO, the training set is used to construct demonstrations for candidate generation and to evaluate candidates during optimization.

Methods We designed the meta-prompt for prompt generation by analyzing those from OPRO (Yang et al., 2024) and PE2 (Ye et al., 2024)⁵. Our focus is on the impact of local search hyperparameters on final test performance and the overall running time. Following Yang et al. (2024), the optimization meta-prompt includes 3 demonstration tasks and the top 8 candidates, along with their evaluated scores in ascending order. In our experiments, we vary the number of parallel candidate generations from 1 to 8, and the batch size for asynchronous LLM API calls from 1 to 20.

Optimization Scope Following the common experiment settings (Yang et al., 2024; Ye et al., 2024; Zheng et al., 2025; Spiess et al., 2025), we optimize the prompt template for the zero-shot chain of thought technique (Kojima et al., 2022) by specifying the role, goal, expected output types, and the description of input task as well. This can be flexibly incorporated into APO, as candidate generation follows logical transduction from field descriptions to a prompt template. We initialize all prompt components as empty strings and iteratively refine them.

To understand the impact of prompt components, we manually constructed a prompt using the parameters and evaluated it with the LLaMA-3.3-70B model. The default prompt, which only shows the input and output field names, achieved just 5% accuracy. Adding an expected output description increased accuracy to 66%, and including all prompt parameters further improved it to 67%. These results suggest that optimizing both output expectations and imperative phrasing is essential for effective prompt design.

Performance Improvement We present experiment results showing the improvement of test scores on both the GSM8K and MCQA datasets.

- The optimized prompt templates improve the test scores to 85 for Llama-3.3-70B and 91 for Qwen3-8B, which is consistent with findings reported in the literature. For the FailureSensorIQ dataset, the test score of Llama-3.3-70B was further improved to 54%.
- The plots with batch size 1 indicate that the Llama-3.3-70B model discovered better prompts when using a larger batch size. In contrast, the Qwen3-8B model identified a good prompt with a smaller batch size. However, it’s important to note that the Qwen3 series models have been trained on data derived from the GSM8K dataset as well as other math-related datasets. This prior exposure may contribute to their relatively strong performance on GSM8K, even with smaller batch sizes or less prompt optimization effort, and should be considered when interpreting the results.

Running Time Figure 8 shows the average running time per iteration during prompt optimization for the GSM8K and MCQA dataset.

- In GSM8K, we observe that the improvement in running time is most significant at a batch size of 4, after which the gap gradually decreases. Beyond a batch size of 10, the running time saturates or increases due to the overhead caused by invalid outputs in the batch results.
- The running time results from the MCQA dataset follow similar trends to those observed with the GSM8K dataset. For smaller models like Qwen3-8B, if the model fails to follow instructions and produce output in the expected structured format, the transduction step often fails to return a valid JSON object. This leads to increased running time due to the additional overhead of the error recovery process.

⁴See Appendix for implementation details.

⁵Relevant open-source implementations are <https://github.com/psunlpgroup/GreaterPrompt>, <https://github.com/stanfordnlp/dspy>, <https://github.com/google-deepmind/opro>.




Figure 7: Improvement of test score over iterations: The x-axis represents the number of iterations, and the y-axis shows the test score evaluated using the best prompt template found up to that iteration.




Figure 8: Average running time per iteration: The x-axis represents the batch size of the asynchronous execution, and the y-axis shows the average running time in seconds.

4.4 Text-to-SQL

We evaluated various text-to-SQL pipelines on the challenging Bird-bench (Li et al., 2023) dataset. We observe that by composing various components such as few-shot examples, schema linker outputs, keywords from topic models, and sub-questions with optimized prompts, each model significantly improves execution match results, achieving up to a 10.33% increase over the baseline performance of Llama-3.3-70B.

Summary of Experiments The resultant Table 2 highlights the performance gains on average by including additional transductions on top of the base prompt. We aggregate five runs. This includes setting a high model temperature of 0.9, thus diversifying the generated transduction samples.

- **Individual Component:** We note that every individual transduction (i.e. FS / KW / SQ / SL / OP) does not in fact improve average performance on all models.
- **Schema Linker and Propmt Optimization Gains:** Techniques such as schema linking and propmt-optimization yield greater improvements on a few models than the other approaches.
- **Adding All:** Interestingly, when including all the transductions together (i.e. FS + KW + SQ + SL + OP), **performance significantly improves in a manner that is greater than the sum of its parts.** This result indicates that models can be pushed into greater performance by stipulating the right prompt programs to captures the task.

Method	Model		
	llama-3-3 70b-instruct	mistral-large	llama-4-maverick 17b-128e-instruct-fp8
P	50.51 ± 0.71	47.20 ± 0.78	53.88 ± 1.37
P+FS	50.32 ± 0.52 (−0.19)	45.63 ± 0.9 (−1.57)	53.47 ± 0.56 (−0.41)
P+KW	50.32 ± 0.32 (−0.19)	45.09 ± 0.81 (−2.11)	53.03 ± 0.82 (−0.85)
P+SQ	51.58 ± 0.58 (+1.07)	46.15 ± 0.44 (−1.05)	52.33 ± 0.62 (−1.55)
P+SL	52.75 ± 0.07 (+2.24)	49.54 ± 1.23 (+2.34)	50.46 ± 0.05 (−3.42)
P+OP	54.90 ± 0.53 (+4.39)	48.93 ± 0.5 (+1.73)	53.15 ± 0.65 (−0.74)
P+FS+KW+SQ+SL+OP	60.84 ± 0.7 (+10.33)	55.41 ± 1.2 (+8.21)	56.94 ± 0.23 (+3.06)

Table 2: Execution accuracy on BIRD-dev, testing a prompt **P** with the simplified task vs. additional transductions in the composite workflow. **SL** replaces the full DDL schema with a linked schema, **KW** includes keyword topic modeling, **FS** randomly generates sql-validated few-shot question-query pairs, **SQ** extracts sub-questions, and **OP** optimizes the prompt template.

Agentics framework allows for more sophisticated augmentations and feedback loops to improve the creation of such programs. Future attempts at modeling more complex prompt programs include the addition of feedback and self-correction loops by running failed samples on the database and re-prompting. Additionally, model-dependent optimizations can be illuminated upon, since the performance of the executed program is dependent on the model itself and should therefore be guided by the model more closely.

5 Comparison of Agentic AI Frameworks

We compare our system, Agentics, with five representative frameworks: LangGraph, CrewAI, PydanticAI, AutoGen, and DSPy. Unlike these systems, which often foreground agent behavior and control flow, Agentics is centered on semantic modeling of data and logical transduction.

- LangGraph provides fine-grained control over agent states and transitions via graph-based workflows, but requires manual wiring and memory management. In contrast, Agentics eliminates explicit workflow construction by leveraging Pydantic types and algebraic transduction operators (\ll), modeling logic internally through structured schemas.
- CrewAI introduces a team-based model with autonomous agents communicating via messages. While this supports collaborative multi-agent systems, it introduces coordination overhead. Agentics avoids this by using a type-driven architecture where transductions are declaratively executed based on semantic alignment between source and target structures.
- PydanticAI focuses on type-safe LLM interaction using Pydantic models. Agentics builds on this foundation but extends it into a full transduction system, treating datasets as semantic structures and enabling composable pipelines for expressive data manipulation.
- AutoGen simplifies orchestration through high-level abstractions but sacrifices fine-grained data modeling and type safety. Agentics offers stronger guarantees by validating data against Pydantic types and embedding semantic hints directly into schemas, reducing reliance on prompt engineering.
- DSPy emphasizes prompt optimization and imperative control flows, but its fixed data model and reliance on verbose string templates limit flexibility. Agentics, by contrast, supports dynamic type creation, batch processing, and external execution logic—making it more suitable for structured tasks like text-to-SQL.

While recent agentic AI frameworks have made significant strides in enabling modular, prompt-driven, and multi-agent orchestration, several limitations remain when compared to the design of Agentics.

- Many frameworks require developers to explicitly define logical control flow through specialized modules or components. These often rely on string-based prompt manipulation, which, although sometimes abstracted

away, can introduce fragility and reduce transparency. For complex applications such as text-to-SQL or structured data transformation, developers may need to construct entire programs from low-level building blocks, as native support for external execution logic or dynamic schema evolution is often lacking.

- The data models in these systems are typically rigid, with input and output fields predefined in static schemas. This restricts dynamic type creation and makes it difficult to express transformations between fields or adapt to evolving data structures. The lack of flexibility can be compared to a neural network framework that disallows architectural changes during training—limiting experimentation and adaptability.
- While some frameworks enrich user-provided task descriptions with verbose metadata, they often do not make explicit how these transformations are applied or interpreted. This opacity can hinder debugging, reproducibility, and the ability to reason about the system’s behavior.
- Although modern LLM inference APIs support efficient features such as batch processing and multi-sample generation, many frameworks may not natively expose these capabilities.

In contrast, `Agentics` adopts a data-centric and type-driven approach. Logical transductions and asynchronous map/reduce operations are composed declaratively, allowing developers to focus on semantic alignment and structured transformation. LLM calls are treated as native asynchronous functions, making it natural to embed them within general-purpose Python programs. This design simplifies development while preserving flexibility, type safety, and composability.

6 Conclusion

We present a principled framework for agentic AI, grounded in a novel logical transduction algebra and a scalable programming model. The proposed framework redefines how agents interact with data through a declarative, type-driven approach. Its successful application to tasks such as multiple-choice QA, text-to-SQL parsing, and prompt optimization demonstrates state-of-the-art performance and scalability, offering a new perspective on building intelligent systems.

References

- Acharya, D. B., Kuppan, K., and Divya, B. (2025). Agentic AI: Autonomous intelligence for complex goals—a comprehensive survey. *IEEE Access*.
- Asai, A., Wu, Z., Wang, Y., Sil, A., and Hajishirzi, H. (2024). Self-RAG: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- AtomicAI (2024). Atomic Agents and Pydantic AI: Modular and type-safe agentic frameworks.
- Cobbe, K., Kosaraju, V., Bavarian, M., Chen, M., Jun, H., Kaiser, L., Plappert, M., Tworek, J., Hilton, J., Nakano, R., Hesse, C., and Schulman, J. (2021). Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Codd, E. F. (1970). A relational model of data for large shared data banks. *Communications of the ACM*, 13(6):377–387.
- Constantinides, C., Patel, D., Lin, S., Guerrero, C., Patil, S. D., and Kalagnanam, J. (2025). FailureSensorIQ: A multi-choice QA dataset for understanding sensor relationships and failure modes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03278*.
- CrewAI Inc. (2025). CrewAI. 2025-07-15.
- Dean, J. and Ghemawat, S. (2008). Mapreduce: simplified data processing on large clusters. *Communications of the ACM*, 51(1):107–113.
- Dong, Y., Mu, R., Jin, G., Qi, Y., Hu, J., Zhao, X., Meng, J., Ruan, W., and Huang, X. (2024). Building guardrails for large language models. In Bennett, K. and Srikumar, V., editors, *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 235–249. PMLR.
- Gamerman, A., Vovk, V., and Vapnik, V. (1998). Learning by transduction. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 148–155, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Han, S., Zhang, Q., Yao, Y., Jin, W., Xu, Z., and He, C. (2024). LLM multi-agent systems: Challenges and open problems. *CoRR*, abs/2402.03578.
- Heck, P. (2024). What about the data? a mapping study on data engineering for AI systems. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 3rd International Conference on AI Engineering-Software Engineering for AI*, pages 43–52.
- Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S., Zou, A., Mazeika, M., Song, D., and Steinhardt, J. (2021). Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

-
- Hopkins, D., Rickwood, D. J., Hallford, D. J., and Watsford, C. (2022). Structured data vs. unstructured data in machine learning prediction models for suicidal behaviors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 4:945006.
- Huang, K. and Huang, J. (2025). AI Agent Tools and Frameworks. In *Agentic AI: Theories and Practices*, pages 23–50. Springer.
- Jiang, A. Q., Sablayrolles, A., Roux, A., Mensch, A., Savary, B., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D. S., Casas, D. d. l., Hanna, E. B., Bressand, F., et al. (2024). Mixtral of Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*.
- Johnson, W. E. (1921–1924). *Logic*. Cambridge University Press. 3 volumes.
- Khattab, O., Singhvi, A., Maheshwari, P., Zhang, Z., Santhanam, K., Vardhamanan, S., Haq, S., Sharma, A., Joshi, T. T., Moazam, H., Miller, H., Zaharia, M., and Potts, C. (2024). DSPy: Compiling declarative language model calls into state-of-the-art pipelines. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Kojima, T., Gu, S. S., Reid, M., Matsuo, Y., and Iwasawa, Y. (2022). Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213.
- Kwon, W., Li, Z., Zhuang, S., Sheng, Y., Zheng, L., Yu, C. H., Gonzalez, J. E., Zhang, H., and Stoica, I. (2023). Efficient memory management for large language model serving with PagedAttention. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.
- LangChain (2025). LangGraph. 2025-07-15.
- Li, J., Hui, B., Qu, G., Yang, J., Li, B., Li, B., Wang, B., Qin, B., Geng, R., Huo, N., et al. (2023). Can llm already serve as a database interface? a big bench for large-scale database grounded text-to-sqls. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:42330–42357.
- Li, W., Wang, X., Li, W., and Jin, B. (2025). A survey of automatic prompt engineering: An optimization perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11560*.
- Li, Z., Guan, Y., Yan, C., Li, X., Li, J., Li, Y., Jin, X., Ji, S., and Wei, Y. (2020). MedQA: A dataset of medical question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.03233*.
- Madaan, A., Tandon, N., Gupta, P., Hallinan, S., Gao, L., Wiegrefe, S., Alon, U., Dziri, N., Prabhunoye, S., Yang, Y., et al. (2023). Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46534–46594.
- Moshkovich, D. and Zeltyn, S. (2025). Taming uncertainty via automation: Observing, analyzing, and optimizing agentic AI systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.11277*.
- Opsahl-Ong, K., Ryan, M., Purtell, J., Broman, D., Potts, C., Zaharia, M., and Khattab, O. (2024). Optimizing instructions and demonstrations for multi-stage language model programs. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9340–9366.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C. L., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Askell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P., Leike, J., and Lowe, R. (2022). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Pan, L., Saxon, M., Xu, W., Nathani, D., Wang, X., and Wang, W. Y. (2024). Automatically correcting large language models: Surveying the landscape of diverse automated correction strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:484–506.
- Putri, R. K. and Athoillah, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence and machine learning in digital transformation: Exploring the role of AI and ML in reshaping businesses and information systems. In *Advances in Digital Transformation-Rise of Ultra-Smart Fully Automated Cyberspace*. IntechOpen.
- Pydantic (2025). Pydantic-AI. 2025-07-15.
- Ramnath, K., Zhou, K., Guan, S., Mishra, S. S., Qi, X., Shen, Z., Wang, S., Woo, S., Jeoung, S., Wang, Y., et al. (2025). A systematic survey of automatic prompt optimization techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16923*.
- Russell, S. and Norvig, P. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach (4th Edition)*. Pearson.
- Sarirete, A., Balfagih, Z., Brahimi, T., Lytras, M. D., and Visvizi, A. (2022). Artificial intelligence and machine learning research: Towards digital transformation at a global scale. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, 13(7):3319–3321.
- Shinn, N., Cassano, F., Gopinath, A., Narasimhan, K., and Yao, S. (2023). Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8634–8652.

-
- Simondon, G. (1958). *Du mode d'existence des objets techniques*. Aubier.
- Simondon, G. (1964). *L'individu et sa genèse physico-biologique (l'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information)*. Presses Universitaires de France.
- SmolAI (2024). SmolAgents: Lightweight agentic framework.
- Spiess, C., Vaziri, M., Mandel, L., and Hirzel, M. (2025). Autopdl: Automatic prompt optimization for llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.04365*.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. (2023). Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Wu, Q., Bansal, G., Zhang, J., Wu, Y., Li, B., Zhu, E., Jiang, L., Zhang, X., Zhang, S., Liu, J., et al. (2024). Autogen: Enabling next-gen LLM applications via multi-agent conversations. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Yang, A., Li, A., Yang, B., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Zheng, B., Yu, B., Gao, C., Huang, C., Lv, C., et al. (2025). Qwen3 Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*.
- Yang, C., Wang, X., Lu, Y., Liu, H., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., and Chen, X. (2024). Large language models as optimizers. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ye, Q., Ahmed, M., Pryzant, R., and Khani, F. (2024). Prompt engineering a prompt engineer. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 355–385.
- Zhang, Z., Lei, L., Wu, L., Sun, R., Huang, Y., Long, C., Liu, X., Lei, X., Tang, J., and Huang, M. (2024). SafetyBench: Evaluating the safety of large language models. In Ku, L.-W., Martins, A., and Srikumar, V., editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15537–15553, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zheng, W., Das, S. S. S., Zhang, Y., and Zhang, R. (2025). Greaterprompt: A unified, customizable, and high-performing open-source toolkit for prompt optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.03975*.

Appendices

Appendix A Logical Transduction Algebra

A.1 Formalization

We present an abridged version of the formal Logical Transduction Algebra in the main paper. Our work is closely related to relational algebra (Codd, 1970) and the MapReduce programming model (Dean and Ghemawat, 2008). This enables the composition of data transformation pipelines and supports an efficient programming model that leverages the stateless and asynchronous nature of LLM inference. The full details are provided in the Appendix.

Algebraic Structures

Types and Agentic Structure We define types and meta-types, collectively referred to as the Agentic Structure (AG), and establish a sound algebra over the types and states within it.

Definition 1 (Types). Let Θ denote the universe of all possible *types*, $\Theta = \{X, Y, Z, T, \dots\}$, where each type $T \in \Theta$ is a collection of named fields (s_i, T_{s_i}) :

$$T := \{(s_1, T_{s_1}), (s_2, T_{s_2}), \dots, (s_n, T_{s_n})\},$$

with each s_i representing a string-valued slot name, and each $T_{s_i} \in \Theta$ denoting the corresponding type of that slot.

Definition 8. Given two types X and Y , we define standard set operations component-wise:

$$\begin{aligned} X \cup Y &= \{(s_i, T_{s_i}) \mid (s_i, T_{s_i}) \in X \text{ or } (s_i, T_{s_i}) \in Y\}, \\ X \cap Y &= \{(s_i, T_{s_i}) \mid (s_i, T_{s_i}) \in X \text{ and } (s_i, T_{s_i}) \in Y\}, \\ X \setminus Y &= \{(s_i, T_{s_i}) \mid (s_i, T_{s_i}) \in X \text{ and } (s_i, T_{s_i}) \notin Y\}, \\ X \times Y &= \{((s_i, T_{s_i}), (s_j, T_{s_j})) \mid (s_i, T_{s_i}) \in X, (s_j, T_{s_j}) \in Y\} \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2 (Agentic Structure AG). An *Agentic structure* AG is a meta-type that bundles a type schema s_{atype} ⁶ and a corresponding list of instances, referred to as **states** s_{states} :

$$AG := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} s_{\text{atype}} : \Theta, \\ s_{\text{states}} : \text{List}[\Theta] \end{array} \right\}$$

Notation conventions: Types are denoted by uppercase letters. Instances of types are denoted by lowercase letters, with $t : T$ indicating that t is an instance of type T . Lists are written in boldface, so $\mathbf{t} : T$ represents a list of instances of type T . We use the shorthand $AG[X]$ to denote an Agentic structure with $s_{\text{atype}} = X$. A boldface lowercase symbol, such as $\mathbf{x} = AG[X]$, represents an instance of $AG[X]$. We also overload the notation to access the list of states: $x_i = \mathbf{x}[i] = \mathbf{x}.s_{\text{states}}[i]$ refers to the i -th state of the Agentic instance \mathbf{x} .

In Logical Transduction Algebra, we focus on structured data and its transformation around agents encapsulating LLMs. The algebraic structure of composing two Agentic instances of the same type can be shown as follows.

Proposition 1 (Monoid of Agentic Instances). Let $AG[X]$ be an Agentic structure and let ξ be the set of all instances of $AG[X]$. Define a binary operation \circ on ξ such that for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \xi$, their composition $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 \circ \mathbf{x}_2$ is an Agentic instance whose state list is the concatenation: $\mathbf{x}.s_{\text{states}} := \mathbf{x}_1.s_{\text{states}} \circ \mathbf{x}_2.s_{\text{states}}$. Then, the pair (ξ, \circ) forms a *monoid*, where the identity element is the Agentic instance with an empty state list: $\mathbf{e}.s_{\text{states}} := []$.

Proof. We verify the three monoid properties:

Closure: Let $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \xi$. Then $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 \circ \mathbf{x}_2$ has a state list formed by concatenating two valid state lists, which is itself valid. Hence, $\mathbf{x} \in \xi$.

Associativity: For any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3 \in \xi$,

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathbf{x}_1 \circ \mathbf{x}_2) \circ \mathbf{x}_3).s_{\text{states}} &= (\mathbf{x}_1.s_{\text{states}} \circ \mathbf{x}_2.s_{\text{states}}) \circ \mathbf{x}_3.s_{\text{states}} \\ &= \mathbf{x}_1.s_{\text{states}} \circ (\mathbf{x}_2.s_{\text{states}} \circ \mathbf{x}_3.s_{\text{states}}) \\ &= (\mathbf{x}_1 \circ (\mathbf{x}_2 \circ \mathbf{x}_3)).s_{\text{states}} \end{aligned}$$

⁶Given two types X and Y , the standard set operations such as union, intersection, complement, and product can be defined component-wise.

Identity: Let $e \in \xi$ be the Agentic instance with an empty state list. Then for any $x \in \xi$,

$$\begin{aligned} (e \circ x).s_{\text{states}} &= [] \circ x.s_{\text{states}} = x.s_{\text{states}}, \\ (x \circ e).s_{\text{states}} &= x.s_{\text{states}} \circ [] = x.s_{\text{states}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (ξ, \circ) satisfies closure, associativity, and identity, and is therefore a monoid. \square

The standard operators follow standard algebraic principles such as the product, $x \times y$ for $x \in AG[X]$ and $y \in AG[Y]$, the equivalence, $x_1 \sim x_2$ for $x_1, x_2 \in AG[X]$, and the quotient, z/y for $z \in AG[X \times Y]$ and $y \in AG[Y]$.

Product of the Agentic Structure Next, we define the product of Agentic structures, a construction that plays a foundational role in modeling and executing complex, multi-dimensional data workflows. By combining two Agentic structures into a single product structure, we can represent composite types—such as paired entities, coupled processes, or input-output relationships—within a unified algebraic framework. This formulation ensures that operations applied to states remain well-defined, type-safe, and composable, preserving the monoidal properties of each component. The product structure is especially valuable in scenarios involving joint reasoning, parallel transformations, or structured transductions across heterogeneous data streams.

Definition 9 (Product of Agentic Structures). Let $AG[X]$ and $AG[Y]$ be two Agentic structures defined over distinct types X and Y , respectively. We define their product as a new Agentic structure $AG[T]$, where the type T is the Cartesian product of the two types:

$$T : X \times Y.$$

Given instances $x : AG[X]$ and $y : AG[Y]$, we define an instance $t : AG[T]$ such that:

$$t.s_{\text{states}} = (x.s_{\text{states}}, y.s_{\text{states}}),$$

i.e., the state list of t is the pair of state lists from x and y .

Proposition 5 (Monoid of Agentic Product). Let ξ_X and ξ_Y be the set of all instances of $AG[X]$ and $AG[Y]$, respectively, and let ξ_T be the set of all instances of $AG[T]$.

Define a binary operation \circ on ξ_T as follows:

$$(x_1, y_1) \circ (x_2, y_2) := (x_1 \circ x_2, y_1 \circ y_2),$$

where \circ on each component denotes concatenation of state lists:

$$(x_1 \circ x_2).s_{\text{states}} := x_1.s_{\text{states}} \circ x_2.s_{\text{states}},$$

and similarly for $y_1 \circ y_2$.

Then, the structure (ξ_T, \circ) forms a *monoid*, with the identity element given by the pair of Agentic instances with empty state lists:

$$e_T := (e_X, e_Y), \quad \text{where } e_X.s_{\text{states}} = [], \quad e_Y.s_{\text{states}} = [].$$

Proof. We verify the three monoid properties for (ξ_T, \circ) .

Closure: Let $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \xi_T$. Then their composition is:

$$(x_1 \circ x_2, y_1 \circ y_2),$$

where each component is a valid Agentic instance due to closure in (ξ_X, \circ) and (ξ_Y, \circ) . Hence, the result is in ξ_T .

Associativity: Let $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3) \in \xi_T$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} ((x_1, y_1) \circ (x_2, y_2)) \circ (x_3, y_3) &= (x_1 \circ x_2, y_1 \circ y_2) \circ (x_3, y_3) \\ &= ((x_1 \circ x_2) \circ x_3, (y_1 \circ y_2) \circ y_3) \\ &= (x_1 \circ (x_2 \circ x_3), y_1 \circ (y_2 \circ y_3)) \\ &= (x_1, y_1) \circ ((x_2, y_2) \circ (x_3, y_3)), \end{aligned}$$

using associativity in each component.

Identity: Let $e_T := (e_X, e_Y)$, where e_X and e_Y are identity elements in ξ_X and ξ_Y , respectively. Then for any $(x, y) \in \xi_T$:

$$\begin{aligned} (e_X, e_Y) \circ (x, y) &= (e_X \circ x, e_Y \circ y) = (x, y), \\ (x, y) \circ (e_X, e_Y) &= (x \circ e_X, y \circ e_Y) = (x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, e_T is the identity element. \square

Quotient of the Agentic Structure To complement the expressiveness of product structures, the quotient of Agentic structures provides a principled mechanism for abstraction and generalization. By defining an equivalence relation over Agentic instances—such as grouping together states that differ only in irrelevant or redundant dimensions—we can collapse fine-grained distinctions into coarser, semantically meaningful categories. This is especially useful in scenarios involving behavioral equivalence, or clustering of similar agentic behaviors. The quotient structure enables reasoning at a higher level of abstraction while preserving the algebraic properties of the original system. In distributed settings, it supports compression, deduplication, and aggregation of stateful computations.

Definition 10 (Equivalence Relation on Agentic Instances). Let ξ_X be the set of Agentic instances over type X .

An equivalence relation \sim on ξ_X is defined by a relation \mathcal{R} on state lists $\mathbf{s} : X$ such that for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \xi_X$,

$$\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{y} \iff \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{x}.s_{\text{states}}, \mathbf{y}.s_{\text{states}}),$$

where \mathcal{R} satisfies the following properties:

- *Reflexivity*: $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s})$ for all state lists \mathbf{s} .
- *Symmetry*: If $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2)$, then $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{s}_2, \mathbf{s}_1)$.
- *Transitivity*: If $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{s}_2, \mathbf{s}_3)$, then $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_3)$.

The specific form of \mathcal{R} depends on the semantics of the Agentic structure. A common choice is *statewise equivalence*, defined below.

Definition 11 (Statewise Equivalence of Agentic Instances). Let ξ_X be the set of Agentic instances over type X .

Define an equivalence relation \sim on ξ_X such that for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \xi_X$,

$$\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{y} \iff \mathbf{x}.s_{\text{states}} \equiv \mathbf{y}.s_{\text{states}},$$

where \equiv denotes elementwise equivalence of state lists. That is,

$$\mathbf{x}.s_{\text{states}} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n], \quad \mathbf{y}.s_{\text{states}} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n],$$

and for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have $x_i \approx y_i$ under a given equivalence relation \approx on X .

The relation \approx on X may be defined in various ways, such as:

- *Syntactic equality*: $x_i = y_i$.
- *Observational equivalence*: $f(x_i) = f(y_i)$ for some observable function $f : X \rightarrow O$.
- *Abstract equivalence*: x_i and y_i belong to the same equivalence class under a domain-specific partition of X .

This relation groups Agentic instances whose state trajectories are equivalent up to the equivalence of individual states.

Definition 12 (Quotient of Agentic Structure). Let $AG[X]$ be an Agentic structure over type X , and let \sim be an equivalence relation on the set of Agentic instances ξ_X .

The *quotient Agentic structure*, denoted $AG[X/\sim]$, is defined as follows:

- The type X/\sim is the set of equivalence classes of X under the induced relation \approx on individual states.
- The set of instances $\xi_{X/\sim}$ consists of equivalence classes $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ of Agentic instances $\mathbf{x} \in \xi_X$, where

$$\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle := \{ \mathbf{y} \in \xi_X \mid \mathbf{y} \sim \mathbf{x} \}.$$

- The state list of an equivalence class $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ is defined as:

$$\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle.s_{\text{states}} := \{ \mathbf{y}.s_{\text{states}} \mid \mathbf{y} \sim \mathbf{x} \}.$$

This structure abstracts over individual Agentic instances by identifying those whose states are equivalent.

Proposition 6 (Monoid Structure on Quotient Agentic Structure). Let (ξ_X, \circ) be a monoid of Agentic instances over type X , and let \sim be a congruence relation on ξ_X , i.e., for all $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathbf{x}_2$ and $\mathbf{y}_1 \sim \mathbf{y}_2$, we have:

$$\mathbf{x}_1 \circ \mathbf{y}_1 \sim \mathbf{x}_2 \circ \mathbf{y}_2.$$

Then, the quotient structure $(\xi_X/\sim, \circ)$ forms a monoid, where:

- Elements are equivalence classes $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$.
- The operation is defined by:

$$\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \circ \langle \mathbf{y} \rangle := \langle \mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y} \rangle.$$

- The identity is $\langle \mathbf{e} \rangle$, where \mathbf{e} is the identity in (ξ_X, \circ) .

Proof. We verify the monoid properties on the quotient structure:

Well-definedness: If $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathbf{x}_2$ and $\mathbf{y}_1 \sim \mathbf{y}_2$, then by congruence:

$$\mathbf{x}_1 \circ \mathbf{y}_1 \sim \mathbf{x}_2 \circ \mathbf{y}_2,$$

so $\langle \mathbf{x}_1 \circ \mathbf{y}_1 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x}_2 \circ \mathbf{y}_2 \rangle$.

Associativity: Follows from associativity in ξ_X :

$$\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \circ (\langle \mathbf{y} \rangle \circ \langle \mathbf{z} \rangle) = \langle \mathbf{x} \circ (\mathbf{y} \circ \mathbf{z}) \rangle = \langle (\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y}) \circ \mathbf{z} \rangle = \langle (\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \circ \langle \mathbf{y} \rangle) \circ \langle \mathbf{z} \rangle.$$

Identity: For any $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$,

$$\langle \mathbf{e} \rangle \circ \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e} \circ \mathbf{x} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle, \quad \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \circ \langle \mathbf{e} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{e} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle.$$

□

Example 2 (Quotient of a Product Agentic Structure). Let $AG[X]$ and $AG[Y]$ be Agentic structures over types X and Y , respectively. Their product $AG[T]$ is defined by

$$s_{\text{atype}} = X \times Y, \quad s_{\text{states}} = (\mathbf{x}.s_{\text{states}}, \mathbf{y}.s_{\text{states}})$$

for instances $\mathbf{x} \in AG[X]$ and $\mathbf{y} \in AG[Y]$.

We define an equivalence relation \sim on ξ_T such that for any $\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2 \in \xi_T$,

$$\mathbf{t}_1 \sim \mathbf{t}_2 \iff \forall i, x_i^{(1)} \approx x_i^{(2)},$$

where $x_i^{(1)}$ and $x_i^{(2)}$ are the first components of the i -th state in \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 , respectively, and \approx is an equivalence relation on X .

As a concrete example, let the types and the equivalence \approx be defined as:

- $X = \{\text{Red, Green, Blue}\}$ (colors),
- $Y = \{\text{Circle, Square}\}$ (shapes),
- Define \approx on X by:

$$\text{Red} \approx \text{Green}, \quad \text{Blue} \not\approx \text{Red}, \quad \text{Blue} \not\approx \text{Green}.$$

Consider two Agentic instances:

$$\mathbf{t}_1.s_{\text{states}} = [(\text{Red, Circle}), (\text{Green, Square})],$$

$$\mathbf{t}_2.s_{\text{states}} = [(\text{Green, Circle}), (\text{Red, Square})].$$

Then $\mathbf{t}_1 \sim \mathbf{t}_2$ because:

$$\text{Red} \approx \text{Green}, \quad \text{Green} \approx \text{Red}.$$

Note that the shape components (second elements) are not constrained by the equivalence relation.

The quotient Agentic structure $AG[T/\sim]$ consists of equivalence classes $\langle \mathbf{t} \rangle$ of Agentic instances under \sim , where:

$$\langle \mathbf{t} \rangle := \{\mathbf{t}' \in \xi_T \mid \mathbf{t}' \sim \mathbf{t}\}.$$

This structure abstracts over differences in the first component of the state tuples according to \approx , while preserving the full state list structure.

The Transduction Operator

Equipped with Agentic structures that form a monoid, we obtain a sound abstraction for composing the data workflows in a functional programming style. This foundation enables the introduction of the *logical transduction operator*, which utilizes LLMs as transductive inference engines. We now define a series of logical transduction operators, organized by increasing levels of complexity. These operators are designed with explicit consideration of types and Agentic structures.

Transduction Operator Overloading

Definition 3 (Transduction). Given an information object x and a target Agentic structure $AG[Y]$, the *transduction* of x into $AG[Y]$ is defined as:

$$\mathbf{y} := Y \ll x = \bigcup_i (y_i, T_{s_i}),$$

where each $y_i \in T_{s_i}$ is a value assigned to slot s_i of type T_{s_i} , logically inferred from x . Here, the operator \ll denotes a logical transduction process, implemented via an LLM, that maps x to a structured output conforming to the type Y .

To support the definition of logical transduction operators, we introduce a generic function that renders typed objects into textual representations suitable for LLM input.

Definition 4 (Prompt Function). Given a type $T \in \Theta$, a *prompt function* P is a mapping that renders a list of states $\mathbf{t} : T$ into an information object, leveraging the string-valued slot names associated with T . Formally, $P : \text{List}[T] \rightarrow \text{str}$.

Prompt functions serve as a bridge between structured data and natural language, enabling logical transduction operators to interface with LLMs by converting typed instances into semantically meaningful prompts.

We now define two specific forms of logical transduction: zero-shot and few-shot.

Definition 5 (Zero-Shot Logical Transduction). Let $\mathbf{x} = AG[X]$ and $\mathbf{y} = AG[Y]$ be Agentic structures over types X and Y , respectively. A *zero-shot logical transduction* from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{y} is defined component-wise as:

$$\mathbf{y}[i] = Y \ll P(\mathbf{x}[i]),$$

where $P : X \rightarrow \text{str}$ is a prompt function that renders each instance $\mathbf{x}[i]$ into a textual prompt.

Next, we also show more overloaded transduction operators in the case of the few-shot transduction, $\mathbf{y}[i] = Y \ll (P(\mathbf{x}[i]) \oplus FS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$ with a few-shot function $FS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := P((\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}'))$, and a syntactic sugar such as self-transduction.

Definition 13 (Few-Shot Logical Transduction). Let $\mathbf{x} = AG[X]$ and $\mathbf{y} = AG[Y]$ be Agentic structures over types X and Y , respectively. A *few-shot logical transduction* from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{y} is defined for all indices i such that $\mathbf{y}[i] = \emptyset$ as:

$$\mathbf{y}[i] = Y \ll (P(\mathbf{x}[i]) \oplus FS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})),$$

where:

- $P : X \rightarrow \text{str}$ is a prompt function that renders an instance $\mathbf{x}[i]$ into a textual prompt.
- \oplus denotes prompt concatenation.
- $FS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the *few-shot context*, defined as:

$$FS(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := P((\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')),$$

where $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$ is the projection of (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) onto the subset of indices for which $\mathbf{y}[i] \neq \emptyset$.

Finally, we introduce self-transduction as syntactic sugar within the programming model for logical transductions.

Definition 14 (Self Transduction). Let $\mathbf{x} \in AG[X]$ be an Agentic structure, and let $Y, Z \subset X$ be two disjoint subsets of types. A *self transduction* is a function that produces a modified Agentic structure $\mathbf{x}' \in AG[X]$, defined as:

$$\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} \ll_{Y,Z} := \mathbf{x} \cup (\mathbf{x}[Y] \ll \mathbf{x}[Z]),$$

where $\mathbf{x}[Y]$ denotes the *rebind operator*, which extracts an $AG[Y]$ from \mathbf{x} by retaining only the slots in Y that overlap with X .

Properties of Transduction Operator Next, we formalize key properties of the transduction operator. These properties are foundational for enabling scalable, parallel, and composable computation.

Proposition 2 (Conditional Determinism). Let σ denote a fixed transduction context, which may include components such as a few-shot context, additional instructions, external tools, or memory. Let the LLM configuration—comprising model weights, temperature, and decoding strategy—also be fixed. Then, for any input x_i , the transduction $y_i := Y \ll x_i$ is deterministic.

Proof. When the model parameters and transduction context σ are fixed, and the LLM is configured with deterministic settings (e.g., temperature set to zero and caching enabled), the output y_i is uniquely determined by the input x_i and the context σ . Therefore, the transduction process is deterministic under these conditions. \square

Proposition 3 (Statelessness). Logical transduction operators are stateless. The output of a transduction $y_i := Y \ll x_i$ depends only on x_i and the transduction context, and not on any prior or future transductions.

Proof. By definition, the transduction operator \ll does not rely on conversational memory or sequential state. Each y_i is computed independently from x_i and σ , enabling asynchronous evaluation. \square

Proposition 4 (Compositionality). Let $AG[X]$, $AG[Y]$, and $AG[Z]$ be Agentic structures over types X , Y , and Z , respectively. Suppose $y' = y \ll x$, and $z' = z \ll y'$. Then the composite transduction holds, $z' = z \ll y \ll x$.

Proof. Each transduction step applies \ll component-wise to the state list of the input Agentic structure. Since the output of $y \ll x$ is an Agentic structure $AG[Y]$, it can be used as input to the next transduction. Thus, the composition is well-defined and yields z' . \square

Implications for Distributed and Concurrent Computing These properties make the transduction operator \ll particularly well-suited for distributed and concurrent computing paradigms. The *Conditional Determinism* ensures reproducibility and traceability in distributed pipelines, the *Statelessness* enables parallel execution, allowing transductions to be mapped across shards of data without coordination or shared state, and the *Compositionality* supports modular pipeline construction, akin to functional composition in MapReduce, where intermediate Agentic structures can be chained and reused.

Asynchronous MapReduce

The programming model of the `Agentic`s supports asynchronous execution of mapping and reduction operations over Agentic structures, enabling scalable and composable data workflows. We formalize these operations as `aMap` and `aReduce`, which extend the MapReduce by Dean and Ghemawat (2008).

Definition 6 (Asynchronous Map (`aMap`)). Let $AG[X]$ be an Agentic structure over type X , and let $f : X \rightarrow \text{List}[Y]$ be an asynchronous mapping function. Then the asynchronous map operator is defined as:

$$\text{aMap} : (AG[X], f) \rightarrow AG[Y],$$

where the output Agentic structure $y = \text{aMap}(x, f)$ satisfies: $y.s_{\text{states}} = \bigcup_i f(x_i)$, and the union preserving the original order of inputs.

The function f may return an empty list by removing x_i from the output acting as a filter, map each x_i to a single output acting as a transformer, or map each x_i to multiple outputs acting as fan-out. Note that `aMap` operator is executed asynchronously across all input states, enabling parallelism and scalability in distributed environments.

The `aMap` operator is executed asynchronously across all input states, enabling parallelism and scalability in distributed environments.

Definition 7 (Asynchronous Reduce (`aReduce`)). Let $AG[X]$ be an Agentic structure and let $f : \text{List}[X] \rightarrow Y$ be an asynchronous reduction function. Then the asynchronous reduce operator is defined as:

$$\text{aReduce} : (AG[X], f) \rightarrow AG[Y],$$

where the output Agentic structure $y = \text{aReduce}(x, f)$ satisfies: $y.s_{\text{states}} = f(x)$.

Unlike `aMap`, which applies f to each state individually, `aReduce` applies f to the entire states x at once. This is useful for summarization or aggregation, such as generating a report or computing statistics over the full dataset. Since LLMs have limited context windows, applying `aReduce` to a large dataset may be intractable. In such cases, scalable strategies such as hierarchical or batched reduction can be employed by applying `aReduce` to random subsets and merging the results.

Composability with Logical Transduction `aMap` and `aReduce` can be composed with the logical transduction operator \ll to build expressive and modular workflows. For example,

$$y = \text{aMap}(x, x \mapsto Y \ll x), \quad z = \text{aReduce}(y, f),$$

where the transduction $Y \ll x$ is embedded within the mapping function. As we can see, Agentic structure enables distributed, asynchronous, and semantically typed computation over structured data.

Appendix B Design Patterns and Use Cases

The `Agentics` framework provides a concrete realization of the logical transduction algebra. We elaborate on various design patterns and use cases for domain-specific multi-choice QA, text-to-SQL pipelines, clustering, and automatic prompt optimization. This section demonstrates how the `Agentics` framework supports a wide range of generative structured data workflows through reusable design patterns. Each use case highlights a different aspect of the `Agentics` programming model, showcasing its flexibility, scalability, and composability.

B.1 Domain-Specific Multiple Choice Question Answering

Domain-specific Multiple Choice Question Answering (MCQA) tasks present unique challenges for LLMs, particularly when grounded in technical domains that are unfamiliar or underrepresented in pretraining corpora.

FailureSensorIQ Benchmark In this subsection, we demonstrate how the `Agentics` framework supports structured reasoning and robust performance on the *FailureSensorIQ* benchmark—a dataset designed to evaluate LLMs’ understanding of failure modes and sensor relationships in Industry 4.0 (Constantinides et al., 2025).

Unlike widely used QA datasets such as MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021) or MedQA Li et al. (2020), *FailureSensorIQ* introduces a novel domain with no prior exposure to the models under evaluation. This makes it a strong testbed for assessing generalization and reasoning capabilities in high-stakes, real-world industrial contexts. The benchmark includes 8,296 questions across 10 assets, with both single- and multi-answer formats. Despite the presence of strong reasoning models, the best-performing `openai-o1` achieves only 60.4 percent accuracy on single-answer questions, underscoring the dataset’s difficulty⁷.

Schema-Guided LLM Reasoning The `Agentics` approach to MCQA leverages self-transduction and schema-driven prompting using `Pydantic` models. This structured prompt format contrasts with the loosely formatted natural language prompts used in baseline evaluations. By explicitly encoding the input-output schema (e.g., JSON fields for question, options, and selected answers), `Agentics` reduces decoding errors and enforces type safety. This is particularly beneficial in multi-answer settings, where ambiguity in output formatting can lead to evaluation mismatches and degraded performance.

We observe that this structured prompting pattern not only improves accuracy but also enhances robustness to perturbations. For example, when question phrasing or distractor options are altered, schema-constrained decoding helps maintain consistent model behavior. This suggests that `Agentics`’ structured approach offers a degree of perturbation resilience, addressing one of the key weaknesses identified in the original *FailureSensorIQ* benchmark.

In addition to accuracy improvements, the `Agentics` framework enables parallel batch execution of MCQA tasks, significantly reducing inference time. This is achieved through the `aMap` operation, which distributes structured prompts across multiple model invocations. Compared to sequential prompting, this design pattern yields substantial speedups, making it practical for large-scale evaluation and deployment.

Data Model The data model for domain-specific MCQA in `Agentics` is defined using `Pydantic`, which enforces structural constraints and type safety during both prompt construction and response decoding. This schema-guided approach ensures that the model’s outputs conform to expected formats, reducing parsing errors and improving evaluation reliability.

The `FailureSensorIQ` class encapsulates the core components of each QA instance, including the question text, list of options, associated metadata (e.g., asset name, question type), and the model-generated answer. The nested `Answer` class captures the model’s selected answer, a numerical confidence score, and a free-text explanation that provides insight into the model’s reasoning process.

```
class Answer(BaseModel):
    answer_letter: str = Field(description="The selected answer letter")
    confidence: float = Field(description="Confidence score")
    assessment: str = Field(description="Rationale for the answer")

class FailureSensorIQ(BaseModel):
    id: int = Field(description="Unique identifier for the question")
    question: str = Field(description="The question text")
    options: List[str] = Field(description="List of answer options")
```

⁷<https://huggingface.co/spaces/cc4718/FailureSensorIQ>

```

option_ids: List[str] = Field(description="List of option identifiers")
asset_name: str = Field(description="Name of the industrial asset")
relevancy: str = Field(description="Relevancy context or metadata")
question_type: str = Field(description="Type of question")
subject: str = Field(description="Subject or topic of the question")
system_answer: Answer = Field(description="Model-generated answer object")

```

Listing 5: Data Model for Domain-Specific Multiple Choice QA

Main Algorithm The workflow begins by instantiating an AG object with the `FailureSensorIQ` schema and a specified batch size. Each example from the dataset is parsed into a structured `FailureSensorIQ` instance and appended to the agent’s internal state.

The core operation is the self transduction, which performs schema-guided inference over the specified input fields—such as question, options, and asset name—and generates structured outputs in the system answer field. The transduction is guided by a natural language instruction that defines the task: selecting the most plausible answer from a set of options, along with a confidence score and rationale.

```

# Initialize the \texttt{Agentics} benchmark with the FailureSensorIQ schema and batch
size
fsiq_benchmark = AG(atype=FailureSensorIQ, batch_size=40)

# Load dataset and populate agent states
dataset = load_dataset("cc4718/FailureSensorIQ")
for example in dataset:
    fsiq_benchmark.states.append(FailureSensorIQ(**example))

# Run self-transduction with structured input and output fields
fsiq_benchmark = await fsiq_benchmark.self_transduction(
    input_fields=[
        "question", "options", "option_ids",
        "asset_name", "relevancy", "question_type", "subject"
    ],
    output_fields=["system_answer"],
    instructions=(
        "Read the input questions, all possible answers, and background task
        information. "
        "This is a multiple choice test, where one of the options is true and the
        others are false. "
        "Select the answer with the highest likelihood of being correct, and return it
        along with "
        "a confidence score and a verbal assessment explaining your judgment."
    )
)

```

Listing 6: Pseudo Code for Domain-Specific Multiple Choice QA

B.2 Prompt Optimization

Prompt optimization is a critical component in leveraging large language models (LLMs) for complex tasks. The performance of LLMs is highly sensitive to variations in prompt structure, tone, and even the positioning of textual components. Minor changes—such as rephrasing imperative sentences or reordering blocks—can significantly impact the model’s output.

Prompts typically follow a structured format, often divided into system and user sections. The system prompt provides general context, instructions, and expectations for the output, while the user prompt contains task-specific information. Common elements include task descriptions, constraints, few-shot examples, input/output format specifications, and guiding phrases like “Let’s think step by step”. These components are frequently organized using structured formats such as Markdown or JSON schemas.

General Framework for Prompt Optimization Ramnath et al. (2025) and Li et al. (2025) have summarized existing prompt optimization techniques into a generic prompt optimization framework. Algorithm 1 presented in Ramnath et al.

(2025), formalizes the process of prompt optimization as follows. Given a task model M_{task} , an initial prompt $\rho \in V$, the goal of a prompt optimization system M_{PO} is to obtain the best performing prompt-template ρ^{opt} under a metric $f \in F$ and eval-set D_{val} that maximizes expected performance:

$$\rho^{\text{opt}} := \arg \max_{\rho \in V} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_{\text{val}}} [f(M_{\text{task}}(\rho \oplus x))].$$

Since the objective function is not tractable due to the combinatorial nature of discrete token-sequence search spaces, the optimization process typically follows a generate-select-evaluate cycle, akin to local search algorithms (Russell and Norvig, 2020). Most methods begin with a predefined prompt template that specifies the structure and content to be included. An initial prompt may be constructed manually or generated automatically using an LLM.

Given a specific task, the dataset is usually partitioned into training and validation sets. The training set is used to optimize the prompt, while the validation set is employed for tuning hyperparameters. Additionally, a held-out test set is used to evaluate final performance. Candidate prompts are generated, filtered based on performance metrics, and refined over successive iterations, with incremental improvements guided by feedback from model outputs.

Algorithm 1: Prompt Optimization Framework

1: $P_0 := \{\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_k\}$	▷ Initial seed prompts
2: $D_{\text{val}} := \{(x_1, y_1)\}_{i=1}^n$	▷ Validation set
3: $f_1, \dots, f_m \in F$	▷ Inference evaluation
4: for $t = 1, 2, \dots, N$ do	▷ Iteration depth
5: $G_t := M_{PO}(P, D_{\text{val}}, F)$	▷ Generate prompt candidates with M_{PO}
6: $P_t := \text{Select}(G_t, D_{\text{val}}, F)$	▷ Filter and retain candidates
7: if $f_{\text{convergence}} \leq \epsilon$ then	▷ Optionally check for early convergence
8: exit	
9: return $\arg \max_{\rho \in P_N} E_{x \sim D_{\text{val}}} [f(M_{\text{task}}(\rho \oplus x))]$	

Parallelizing Prompt Optimization with Transduction Algebra Within the `Agentics` framework, the prompt function defined in Definition 4 maps type information into structured information objects for transduction. Prompt optimization in this context is naturally expressed using transduction algebra. Since candidate prompts can be generated by logical transduction, we adopt meta-prompt-based optimization strategies similar to those proposed in (Yang et al., 2024; Ye et al., 2024; Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024). Our approach emphasizes two key aspects:

- The `Agentics` framework supports a declarative style of prompting, where prompts are constructed to encode rich contextual and type-level information rather than procedural instructions.
- The optimization process follows the generate-select-evaluate cycle described in Algorithm 1. Importantly, the transduction algebra enables this optimization loop to be expressed in a functional and parallelizable manner. Prompt candidates can be generated and evaluated independently, allowing for efficient execution. This abstraction not only improves scalability but also decouples the optimization logic from the underlying execution strategy.

In summary, the `Agentics` framework provides a principled and extensible foundation for prompt optimization. It integrates declarative prompt construction, transduction algebra, and parallel search strategies into a unified system that supports both expressiveness and scalability. Next, we present a functional design pattern for implementing prompt optimization using transduction algebra, abstracting away procedural details common in existing approaches. In Section 4.3, our experiments demonstrate that declarative context optimization improves performance and that parallelization yields substantial runtime gains.

Data Models We begin by defining two data models using Pydantic: `OptimizationTask` and `GSM8K`. The `OptimizationTask` schema captures the components of a prompt template—such as role, goal, expected output, and imperative instructions—along with a score field for evaluation. The `GSM8K` schema represents the target task, including the question, ground-truth answer, model-generated reasoning, and correctness flag.

```
class OptimizationTask(BaseModel):
    # a list of demo tasks used to guide prompt generation
    demos: list[Any] = Field(description="optimization demo tasks")
    # role description to be embedded in the prompt (e.g., 'You are a math tutor')
    role: str = Field(description="New role instruction")
```

```

# goal statement describing what the prompt aims to achieve
goal: str = Field(description="New goal instruction")
# criteria for what constitutes a good or acceptable output
expected_output: str = Field(description="New expected_output instruction")
# imperative phrase (e.g., 'Let's think step by step')
imperative: str = Field(description="New imperative")
# evaluation score assigned to the prompt after testing on validation data
score: int = Field(description="evaluation score")

class GSM8K(BaseModel):
    question: str = Field(description="a grade school math question.")
    answer: str = Field(description="the ground-truth answer")
    response_think: str = Field(description="the step by step reasoning")
    response_answer: str = Field(description="the final answer")
    # boolean flag indicating whether the response answer is correct
    correct: bool

```

Listing 7: Data Models for GSM8K Prompt Optimization

Meta Prompt and Optimized Prompts The meta-prompt (OPT_META_INSTRUCTION) guides the generation of new prompt templates by describing the structure and expectations for the optimizer. It includes historical context from previous iterations and instructs the model to avoid redundancy. The user prompt template (USER_PROMPT_TEMPLATE) is instantiated with the optimized parameters and used to evaluate candidate prompts on the validation set.

The following shows the meta-prompt used for optimizing the prompt template for the GSM8K dataset.

```

OPT_META_INSTRUCTION = "Your proposed prompt template will be used in the following
way.
* You are "role" -- this role must be suitable for solving the demo task.
* Your personal goal is: "goal" -- the goal achieves the outputs given inputs.
* This is the expected criteria for your final answer "expected_output" -- this
constrains the output format.
* You can add a short imperative instruction "imperative" -- this comes after the
input of the task.

[[Several demo tasks of input and outputs will be provided when you solve problem.]]

[[The previous optimized prompt templates with scores appear from the worst to the
best.]]
{optimization_history}

* Given the previous optimization results, don't generate duplicate or similar prompt
templates.
* Generate prompt template that achieves the best score, and succinct and concise
instructions.
"

USER_PROMPT_TEMPLATE = "
You are {role}.
Your personal goal is: {goal}.
This is the expected criteria for your final answer: {expected_output}.

solve the following task.
{question}

{imperative}
"

```

Listing 8: Meta Prompt and Template for GSM8K Prompt Optimization

In the following, we show the prompts returned by APO, including both system and user prompts. The system prompt consists of three components: role, goal, and expected_output. In the user prompt, an imperative statement appears after

each question. A score of 89 was evaluated on the validation set, using 100 problems sampled from the training set, which is higher than the test score of 85.

```
{
  "role": "Elite Mathematical Problem Solver",
  "goal": "To swiftly and accurately determine the precise numerical solution by
    meticulously dissecting complex problem statements, identifying pivotal information
    , and applying a comprehensive array of advanced mathematical concepts, formulas,
    and logical reasoning to achieve an optimal solution, ensuring efficiency,
    precision, and reliability in all calculations, while providing accurate and
    relevant answers",
  "expected_output": "A single, exact numeric value that directly addresses and solves
    the given mathematical problem, ensuring all calculations are correctly executed,
    based on the information provided, and presented in a clear, concise manner, with
    strict adherence to mathematical rules and consideration of all given data",
  "imperative": "Thoroughly analyze the problem statement, extract key information,
    apply pertinent mathematical principles and logical reasoning to derive the
    accurate numerical answer, and provide the final answer in the required numeric
    format, while validating the solution through re-evaluation of calculations and
    verification of the accuracy of the obtained result, and ensuring precision,
    accuracy, and reliability in all steps of the calculation process.",
  "score": 89
}
```

Listing 9: Optimized Prompt for GSM8K using Llama-3.3-70B Model

The following result is obtained from the Qwen3-8B model. A score of 98 was evaluated on the validation set, using 100 problems sampled from the training set. This score is higher than the test score of 92.

```
{
  "role": "Math Problem Solver",
  "goal": "Solve complex problems by decomposing them into sequential steps, applying
    arithmetic operations (percentages, fractions, averages), ensuring unit consistency
    , and presenting the final answer in a boxed format.",
  "expected_output": "A single numeric value boxed (e.g., \\boxed{64}) representing the
    solution, derived through precise step-by-step calculations with attention to
    percentages, fractions, and averages.",
  "imperative": "Analyze the problem statement, execute calculations step-by-step with
    focus on percentages, fractions, and unit conversions, then box the final numeric
    result.",
  "score": 98
}
```

Listing 10: Optimized Prompt for GSM8K using Qwen3-8B Model

The following shows the meta prompt for optimizing the prompt template for MCQA dataset.

```
OPT_META_INSTRUCTION = "Your proposed prompt template will be used in the following
way.
* You are "role" -- this role must be suitable for solving the demo task.
* Your personal goal is: "goal" -- the goal achieves the outputs given inputs.
* This is the expected criteria for your final answer "expected_output" -- this
  constrains the output format.
* Extract "task_context" from demo tasks to explain the problem context -- this comes
  before the input of the task.
* You can add a short imperative instruction "imperative" -- this comes after the
  input of the task.

[[Several demo tasks of input and outputs will be provided when you solve problem.]]

[[The previous optimized prompt templates with scores appear from the worst to the
best.]]
{optimization_history}
```

```

* Given the previous optimization results, don't generate duplicate or similar prompt
  templates.
* Generate prompt template that achieves the best score, and succinct and concise
  instructions.
"

# Template used to instantiate a user prompt from the optimized parameters.
# This is applied to each validation example.
USER_PROMPT_TEMPLATE = "
You are {role}.
Your personal goal is: {goal}.
This is the expected criteria for your final answer: {expected_output}.

This is the general task context.
{task_context}

solve the following task.
{question}
{options}
{option_ids}
{asset_name}
{relevancy}
{question_type}
{subject}

{imperative}
"

```

Listing 11: Meta Prompt and Template for MCQA Prompt Optimization

In the following, we show the system and user prompts returned by APO. The system prompt includes three components: role, goal, and expected_output. In the user prompt, task_context appears before each question, and an imperative statement follows each question. The test score was 54.

```

{
  "role": "Industrial Asset Diagnostician",
  "goal": "To accurately identify the most relevant sensors for detecting specific
    failure modes in various industrial assets and determine the least relevant failure
    events for abnormal sensor readings, optimizing asset performance and reducing
    downtime",
  "expected_output": "A concise description of the most relevant sensor for monitoring a
    specific failure mode or the least relevant failure event that does not
    significantly contribute to detecting a particular failure mode in the given asset,
    including the option id or description",
  "task_context": "The task involves analyzing the relationship between sensor readings,
    failure modes, and industrial assets such as steam turbines, aero gas turbines,
    electric generators, and compressors, to determine the most relevant sensors for
    monitoring specific failure modes and the least relevant failure events for
    abnormal sensor readings", "imperative": "Analyze the provided asset, sensor
    readings, and failure modes to identify the most relevant sensor for monitoring a
    specific failure mode or the least relevant failure event for an abnormal sensor
    reading, considering the relationship between failure modes, sensors, and assets",
  "score": 54}

```

Listing 12: Optimized Prompt for MCQA using Llama-3.3-70B Model

Main Algorithm The main optimization loop follows the generate-select-evaluate cycle described in Algorithm 1. It begins by preparing the training and validation sets using the Agentics (AG [GSM8K]). Demo tasks are extracted and transformed into OptimizationTask instances.

In each iteration, candidate prompt templates are generated via self-transduction using the meta-prompt. These templates are applied to the validation set using the user prompt format. The responses are evaluated using the grading function

defined in `GSM8K.grade`, and scores are assigned. The best-performing prompts are retained using a filtering function (`keep_best_k`). This loop continues until convergence or a maximum number of iterations is reached. The use of transduction and asynchronous execution enables parallel evaluation of prompt candidates, improving scalability and runtime efficiency.

```
# load GSM8K training data into \texttt{Agentics} abstraction
trainset = AG.from_json("gsm8k_train.jsonl")
# truncate to a subset for training
trainset = trainset.truncate_states(num_trains)
# create demo tasks from training examples
demosets = create_optimization_demos(trainset, num_demos)
# convert demo tasks into OptimizationTask instances
optimization_tasks = OptimizationTask.create_optimization_tasks(demosets)
# prepare validation set from remaining examples
validationset = trainset.truncate_states(num_trains, num_trains + num_devs)

# initialize optimizer AG[OptimizationTask] with demo tasks
optimizer = AG.from_states(optimization_tasks, atype=OptimizationTask)

# set default parameters and prompt configuration
set_default_params(optimizer)
optimizer.prompt_template = "{{"demo tasks":{demos}}}"
optimizer.prompt_params = {"role": "Prompt optimizer.", "goal": "Propose diverse
prompt templates that achieves high performance for the demo task given as input.",
"backstory": "Understand the problem domain given the demo task example and
propose what answer should be generated.", "expected_output": "the outputs are role
, goal, and the expected output description, and imperative sentence for solving
provided tasks."}

# initialize list to store optimized prompt tasks
optimized_tasks = []
for iter_ind in range(max_iter):
    # generate candidate prompt templates using meta-prompt and transduction
    # transduction from demos to prompt parameters
    optimizer.instructions = OPT_META_INSTRUCTION.format(
        optimization_history = get_history_string(optimized_tasks))
    optimizer = asyncio.run(optimizer.self_transduction(
        ["demos"],
        ["role", "goal", "expected_output", "imperative"]))

    # apply candidate prompts to validation set using user prompt format
    opt_eval = optimizer * validationset
    opt_eval.prompt_template = USER_PROMPT_TEMPLATE
    opt_eval = asyncio.run(opt_eval.self_transduction(
        ["role", "goal", "expected_output", "imperative", "question"],
        ["response_think", "response_answer"]))

    # evaluate responses using GSM8K grading function
    executed_tasks = opt_eval / validationset
    for ind, exectask in enumerate(executed_tasks):
        exectask = asyncio.run(exectask.amap(GSM8K.grade))
        setattr(optimizer[ind], "score", summary["score"])

    # retain top-performing prompts for next iteration
    optimized_tasks.extend(optimizer.states)
    optimized_tasks = keep_best_k(optimized_tasks)
```

Listing 13: Pseudo Code for GSM8K Prompt Optimization

B.3 Semantic Parsing Text-to-SQL

Text-to-SQL is an essential task for broadening the accessibility of structured data interaction, allowing users to query databases without needing to understand the underlying decisions made by data engineers. Loosely considered a

translation task, questions are posed to a database and first translated into SQL queries before being executed and answers retrieved and answers retrieved. In practice, this task involves multiple stages of reasoning, whereby one has to interact with the schema of the structured data, as well as understand and decompose the question into its constituent parts.

Data Models Agentics supports this workflow by chaining multiple transduction steps and integrating them with traditional Python logic. First, let's consider setting up the Pydantic types with the required task information.

```
class Text2SQLTask(BaseModel):
    question: str = Field(description="The input natural language question.")
    ddl: str = Field(description="The database schema in DDL format (e.g., CREATE
    TABLE statements).")
    sql_query: Optional[str] = Field(description="The SQL query to be generated from
    the question.")
    execution_result: Optional[List[Dict[str, str]]] = Field(description="The
    resulting table from executing the SQL query.")
```

Listing 14: Data model for the simplified Text2SQL task

From the above Pydantic types, the simplified task is to map the question and DDL to the sql_query. However, we can break down this complex operation into declarative data modeling steps to improve task performance, including:

- enriching the database so that there are additional fields like description of the schema and business descriptions
- decompose the user question into constituent parts input that can be also a part of optimization!
- optimize the prompt template using the final input fields.

```
class Text2SQLTask(BaseModel):
    question: str = Field(description="The input natural language question.")
    ddl: str = Field(description="The database schema in DDL format (e.g., CREATE
    TABLE statements).")
    enrichment: Optional[DB] = Field(description="Additional database enrichments
    that applies to all problem instances")
    sql_query: Optional[str] = Field(description="The SQL query to be generated from
    the question.")
    execution_result: Optional[List[Dict[str, str]]] = Field(description="The
    resulting table from executing the SQL query.")

class DB(BaseModel):
    description: Optional[str] = Field(description="A Description of the business
    purpose of the db, what use cases it is good for how what type of information
    it contain")
    keywords: Optional[list[str]] = Field(description="A list of keywords describing
    the content of the database. Produce Keywords that are: Domain-Relevant:
    Reflects the thematic area (e.g., education, healthcare, finance). Purpose-
    Oriented: Indicates the type of insights the database supports (e.g.,
    performance tracking, demographic analysis). Unambiguous: Avoids generic or
    overly broad terms. Interoperable: Aligns with standard taxonomies when
    possible (e.g., DataCite or UNSDG classification). Examples of Strong Keywords:
    student_outcomes, climate_metrics, financial_forecasting,
    public_health_indicators, supply_chain_kpis")
    few_shots: Optional[list[QuestionSQLPair]] = Field(description="A selection of the
    generated question-sql pair to be used as examples of how to generate a sql
    from a question.")
    subquestions: Optional[list[str]] = Field(description="a list of subquestions
    inside question")
    schema_link: Optional[str] = Field(description="the output of the schema linker in
    the form of DDL script showing relevant table, column, and values for the
    question")

class QuestionSQLPair(BaseModel):
    question: Optional[str]
    sql_query: Optional[str]
```

Listing 15: Data model for the compositional Text2SQL task

Meta-Prompts and Prompt Templates We define the initial prompt that performs the main text-to-SQL task. The following shows the prompt template used as input to the experiment, which may be optionally modified by the automated prompt optimization flag.

```
prompt_template = "  
Translate the input natural language **question** to a valid SQLite query that can be  
executed on the following database in **dbs**.  
Do your best to apply the following rules when generating SQL.  
- Clearly understand the **question** and given database description in **dbs**.  
- Database description is given in the **dbs** with the following fields.  
- The database description under **dbs** contains DDL scripts or natural language  
description of the database, tables, columns, and values.  
- Only SELECT statements are allowed, do not produce any DDL or DML.  
- When writing 'SELECT <column>', only include the columns specifically mentioned in  
the question.  
- Use **evidence** to find correct column names or the values of the columns or other  
expressions.  
- If you see 'None' or 'None' in the [Value examples] for a column, prioritize using '  
JOIN <table>' or 'WHERE <column> IS NOT NULL' to handle potential missing data  
effectively.  
- Use 'WHERE <column> IS NOT NULL' in 'WHERE' if you are sorting with '<column>'.  
- Use alias in 'SELECT' is consistently in the expressions.  
- Use 'WHERE <alias> IS NOT NULL' in 'WHERE' if you are sorting with '<alias>'.  
  
Input is provided under SOURCE.  
{input_spec_str}"  
  
Generate Output as JSON decodable format  
"{{"  
generated_sql_query: a valid SQLite query that translates natural language question  
"}}"\n  
"
```

Listing 16: The Prompt Template and Meta-Prompt for Automatic Prompt Optimization

Main Algorithm Next, we show how to define the compositional text-to-SQL pipeline in *Agentics*. We see that the entire pipeline can be implemented through compositions of logical transductions defined over the data models.

```
text2sql("enrichment.keywords") << text2sql("enrichment.description") << text2sql("  
ddl_schema")  
text2sql("few_shots.question", "few_shots.sql_query") << text2sql("ddl_schema", "  
enrichment.description") # synthetic pair  
text2sql("few_shots") = text2sql("few_shots") + k_shot # additional augmentations  
text2sql("few_shots") = text2sql.filter(valid_sql, "few_shots") # executes sql  
text2sql("enrichment.subquestions") << text2sql("question")  
text2sql("enrichment.linked_schema") << text2sql("enrichment.ddl_schema", "enrichment.  
subquestions", "question")  
input_fields = ["question", "enrichment"]  
text2sql.instructions = optimize(prompt_template, input_fields)  
text2sql("sql_query") << text2sql(*input_fields)  
text2sql("execution_result") = text2sql.amap(execute_sql_query)
```

Listing 17: Pseudo-code for the Compositional Text-to-SQL Workflow