

Long-Range Tasks Using Short-Context LLMs: Incremental Reasoning With Structured Memories

Dulhan Jayalath*
University of Oxford
dulhan@robots.ox.ac.uk

**James B. Wendt, Nicholas Monath,
Sandeep Tata & Beliz Gunel**
Google DeepMind
bgunel@google.com

Abstract

Long-range tasks require reasoning over long inputs. Existing solutions either need large compute budgets, training data, access to model weights, or use complex, task-specific approaches. We present **PRISM**, which alleviates these concerns by processing information as a stream of chunks, maintaining a structured in-context memory specified by a typed hierarchy schema. This approach demonstrates superior performance to baselines on diverse tasks while using at least **4x smaller contexts** than long-context models. Moreover, PRISM is token-efficient. By producing short outputs and efficiently leveraging key-value (KV) caches, it achieves up to **54% cost reduction** when compared to alternative short-context approaches. The method also scales down to tiny information chunks (e.g., 500 tokens) without increasing the number of tokens encoded or sacrificing quality. Furthermore, we show that it is possible to generate schemas to generalize our approach to new tasks with minimal effort.

1 Introduction

Problems requiring long information contexts are prevalent in natural language processing. The prototypical example is long document summarization, where a lengthy piece of text must be summarized into a short form. To solve this task with a large language model (LLM), the model is typically prompted with the text and outputs a summary of the content. However, this requires a model with a context long enough to fit the document. Many practitioners, as well as those in the research community, rely on models with short context lengths because they are limited by the inference cost of long-context models, open source or on-premises requirements, local compute constraints, or other barriers. In response, we design an approach that is task-agnostic, requires no training data, uses a




Figure 1: **PRISM** incrementally processes a stream of chunked data, proposing a revision to its structured in-context memory after each chunk. Enabled by the structured representation, at \mathcal{P} , PRISM programmatically revises the prior memory using this proposal and the new memory is given to the model in the next step. After processing all chunks, the final memory state is used to produce an answer.

small compute budget, and does not need access to model weights. Existing approaches do not satisfy these constraints together.

Our proposal uses a typical incremental processing strategy, treating information as a sequential stream of chunks, processed in the order of their appearance alongside an in-context memory of prior chunks. For example, in incremental summarization, the document may be split into consecutive segments, each fitting within context and shown to the LLM in sequence. Here, the memory is a running summary of the content seen so far.

While incremental methods are not new (Chang et al., 2024; Hwang et al., 2024b), existing approaches are task-specific and are not economic in terms of tokens processed. To address this in our strategy, rather than seeing a natural language memory, the LLM sees a structured memory of relevant prior information and outputs a proposed revision to the memory based on the current chunk (Figure 1). The memory is specified by a user-defined typed hierarchy schema, supporting any kind of long-range task. We call our approach *Processing Incrementally with Structured Memory (PRISM)*. PRISM uses the structured memory to track salient

*Work done while author was at Google DeepMind.

Table 1: **Comparison of approaches for long-range tasks.** While existing methods each have limitations, PRISM satisfies all constraints: it requires no training data, needs no access to model weights, operates within a low compute budget, and remains task-agnostic, making it suitable for a wide range of applications.

Method	No training	No weights	Low compute	Task-agnostic
Long-context models	✓	✓		✓
Retrieval-aug. generation (Par.-efficient) fine-tuning	✓	✓	✓	
PRISM (Ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓

prior information more succinctly than with natural language. Instead of the output of the LLM overwriting the memory, it proposes a structured revision which is used to programmatically revise the memory. These properties produce less verbose outputs and reduce the cognitive burden on the LLM, improving reasoning. Additionally, we design the memory to efficiently leverage prefix key-value caching (Kwon et al., 2023; Pope et al., 2023) by intelligently reusing key-value activations previously computed for parts of the memory that have been unchanged from prior steps. Taken together, our approach leads to both higher quality final answers and fewer tokens processed.

Our main contributions are:

- **PRISM**: an approach for **solving long-range tasks** that alleviates the constraints of alternatives (Table 1) and achieves better task performance (Section 4.1) and token-efficiency (Section 4.2) than comparable solutions;
- An empirical study of encoding and decoding cost that shows that PRISM is **more token-efficient** than unstructured methods and **scales down to shorter chunk sizes** without increasing token cost (Section 4.2); and
- Experimental evidence that PRISM can be applied easily to new tasks with **LLM-generated memory schemas** (Section 4.3).

2 Related Work

There are a range of existing approaches for long-range reasoning with limited contexts that utilize memories. For book summarization, Chang et al.

(2024) propose a hierarchical processing approach that leverages contextual information from previous summaries. Among other domain-specific methods, Hwang et al. (2024a) and Hwang et al. (2024b) use natural language and JSON-encoded knowledge representations respectively for updating memories online as new information arrives, while Fei et al. (2024) specifically target retrieval-based question-answering. Focusing on conversational agents, Packer et al. (2023) perform stateful reasoning in LLMs using function calls to read and write data to storage.

Another line of research embeds memories into the architecture or representation. He et al. (2024) provide a method that augments LLMs with memory embeddings to transform them into recurrent models. Similarly, Munkhdalai et al. (2024) utilize a latent-space memory as part of the network. Wang et al. (2023) go even further, designing a new model architecture with a retrieval side-network to cache and update a memory. Finally, Ivgi et al. (2023) propose using a language model encoder to encode overlapping chunks and fuse information with a pre-trained decoder.

3 Method

We seek to solve long-range tasks token-efficiently without long-context models using an incremental processing strategy because of the many benefits it provides (Table 1). In this incremental view, instead of seeing the entire context at once, the LLM sees contiguous segments (which we refer to as *chunks*) in sequence. Since, in each step, the LLM can only see the current chunk and not previous chunks, it must receive prior information through the previous LLM output. This output must encode any information relevant to the task that was previously seen. In the current call, this output is revised based on the information in the current chunk. The use of the previous output as a memory in this way is characteristic of solving incremental tasks using LLMs. In this section, we provide a way to structure this memory using a typed hierarchy schema and show how to efficiently process these tokens across multiple LLM calls.

3.1 Incremental Processing Formulation

In a typical incremental processing strategy, data arrives in increments, forming an ordered sequence of chunks (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n) . An LLM is prompted, incrementally from $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, with task in-

structions \mathcal{T} , the next chunk d_i , and the output of the model from the previous step o_{i-1} . Accordingly, the prompt is formed by a tuple $(\mathcal{T}, d_i, o_{i-1})$. The output of the previous step acts as a natural language memory that assists in solving the task. This implies a definition for an in-context memory:

Definition 3.1. *An in-context memory is the tokens input to the model in an incremental step that encode the prior information seen by the model.*

In this problem formulation, the memory is revised by being overwritten as the tokens decoded by the LLM in the next incremental step form the next state of the memory. The output of the final step o_n is taken as the answer or otherwise post-processed.

3.2 Using Structured Memories

Natural language (or *unstructured*) memories do not necessarily encode the most salient information for a specific task because the output format is unconstrained. This can impair task performance. We improve the typical incremental processing formulation by introducing a structured memory and structured output to increase information relevance and reduce the cognitive burden on the LLM. In PRISM, we prompt the language model at step i with a modified tuple $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S}, m_i, d_i)$ where we replace the natural language memory o_{i-1} with a user-defined structured memory m_i specified by a typed hierarchy schema.

Definition 3.2. *A typed hierarchy is a structure of primitive types and simple data structures (e.g., integers, floating points, strings, and lists) in a hierarchy laid out by nested key-value maps.*

Definition 3.3. *A structured memory m has a schema \mathcal{S} specified with a typed hierarchy.*

For example, a simple schema for narrative summarization could be `str: list<str>` i.e., a key-value mapping of character names to strings describing events involving that character. After seeing a new story chunk, we can revise information about a character by adding to the entries for that character. We choose to use typed hierarchies because they are easily addressable (using a path specified by keys and indices) and updatable. We specify a new schema for each task as this structure determines the information that will be encoded in the memory. To revise the memory, instead of generating a structured memory to overwrite the prior memory with, the output of the model is a proposed memory revision r_i , which provides a path to programmatically revise m_i with a new value.

Definition 3.4. *A structured memory revision r is a tuple (p, o, v) where p specifies an addressable path in the memory, o is a binary operation that is either add or update and v is the value to revise the memory with.*

If o is add, p specifies a new path to which v is added; if update, p specifies an existing path in the memory whose current value should be replaced with v . After validating the proposed revision by programmatically ensuring it conforms to the expected structure, the memory m_i is revised with r_i to the next memory state m_{i+1} . Figure 2 provides an overview of our approach and Figure 3 gives a concrete example. In practice, r_i may consist of more than one proposed revision. After all chunks are processed, the final state of the memory (alongside the query and a specification of the memory structure) are provided to the LLM with an instruction asking the model to give a final answer. Algorithm 1 shows all steps.

Algorithm 1 PRISM

Require: $\mathcal{T}, q, \mathcal{S}, (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ ▷
 Task instruction, query, memory schema, and chunks of information

- 1: $m_1 \leftarrow \{\}$
- 2: **for** $i = 1$ **to** n **do**
- 3: $r_i \leftarrow \text{LLM}(\mathcal{T}, q, \mathcal{S}, m_i, d_i)$
- 4: $m_{i+1} \leftarrow \text{ReviseMemory}(m_i, r_i)$ ▷ Add to or update the memory with the proposed value
- 5: **end for**
- 6: $\text{answer} \leftarrow \text{LLM}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{final}}, q, \mathcal{S}, m_{n+1})$ ▷
 Generate the answer using the final memory
- 7: **return** answer

Our approach brings several quality benefits. First, a structured memory constrains the output to the query domain. This gives the model focus by forcing it to generate only the information we have deemed relevant for the query (via the schema \mathcal{S}) to revise the memory. Having a structured memory also assists the LLM in understanding and updating relevant information for the task. By using a structured memory, we provide flexibility in deciding how to construct the memory structure for a particular type of task or to even automate the generation of the schema. Furthermore, we output a *revision* (i.e., the difference between the current and next memory state) rather than the memory itself, reducing the number of tokens to decode.




Figure 2: **PRISM with typed examples.** The model receives as input the tuple $(\mathcal{T}, q, \mathcal{S}, m_i, d_i)$ describing the task, query, schema, the current state of the memory, and the current chunk. The model outputs a proposed revision r_i to programmatically revise the memory state to m_{i+1} . The purple arrows annotate example memory and revision states. Here, v_2 in m_i is replaced with v_4 in m_{i+1} using the path, operation, and value in the revision. If the operation were add instead, then the path would be created and v_4 added to the memory.




Figure 3: **PRISM code composition example.** The LLM proposes adding the `cat` function from the chunk d_i (and a description) to the existing memory because it best fits the query. The memory now has `cap` and `cat`.

3.3 Token-Efficient Memory Encoding

A significant issue with using memories is that they extend the size of the prompt (compared to having no memory) and therefore increase the number of tokens that need to be encoded. This can become a significant bottleneck when there are many chunks of information in an incremental task or if the size of the memory dominates the rest of the prompt. One way to improve encoding efficiency is to utilize prefix KV caching (Zheng et al., 2023). With this method, if there is a prefix of the prompt that matches a prior encoded prompt, the model can reuse the KV activations previously computed for this prefix. Thus, maximizing the length of this prefix is essential for cache efficiency. For simplicity, our experiments implement prefix KV caching such that the KV activations are reused for only the longest prefix matching the *last* encoded prompt.

To leverage the cache utilization improvements

we introduce next, we first ensure that our prompt is KV cache-friendly. The prompt is the tuple $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S}, m_i, d_i)$. Since only m and d will change between incremental steps, there is no need to re-encode the tokens for the prefix $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S})$. We arrange it so that the memory m appears *before* the chunk d rather than after. As our method produces memory revisions, which do not necessarily always overwrite the entire memory, key-value activations can be reused when encoding memory m_i up until the point of the first change to the memory when compared to m_{i-1} in the previous prompt. Reusing a substantial number of token activations would be unlikely in the usual problem formulation with natural language memories.

We now introduce a way to maximize cache utilization of the structured memory. If, instead of updating the path p in the memory with the new value v , we add a new memory (which we call an *amendment*) containing the new value and its path directly after the existing one, then the key-value activations for everything up to the newest change can always be reused. This requires the LLM to reason more about the memory it sees by understanding that subsequent amendments with existing paths overwrite what has been seen previously. This approach of adding *amendments* is an alternative to maintaining a consistent *in-place* memory (Figure 4). It leads to a significant gain in encoding efficiency if additions to the memory are common. However, the number of tokens in the prompt increases if update operations rather than add operations are most frequent.

3.4 Generating Memory Schemas

The memory schema can be automatically generated by prompting an LLM. To do so, we hand-craft three schemas from a variety of domains, using these as few-shot examples, and prompt the LLM (Appendix C) to generate a schema for a *different* domain given a simple description of the query domain and an example query. For example, if the task is code retrieval, the prompt should describe the query domain (the task of retrieving a function given a code repository) and provide an example query which describes the procedure of a function as well as its inputs and outputs. The output of the LLM is then a schema that defines the structure of a memory that encodes information relevant to this task from the chunks seen by the LLM. This could be something like a map from the names of functions seen to a brief description of what the




Figure 4: **PRISM’s amendments improve KV cache utilization.** Using a single-level key-value map as the memory m_i , we show an update proposed to the value at k_1 . After applying it, we get memory state m_{i+1} which can be represented in one of two ways: an *in-place memory* where the value is updated directly or as *amendments* where the change is amended to the end of the memory state as a new memory structure. Green shows the longest matching prefix compared to the previous memory m_i and red shows the information that must be (re-)encoded. Using amendments reduces the number of tokens that need to be encoded at the cost of increasing the size of the memory.

function does. Other than this procedure of automatically generating schemas reducing the human effort required to use our approach, we hypothesize that an LLM can produce a more relevant schema for a task than what a non-expert may construct. This is useful since researchers may not be experts in each domain of interest.

4 Experiments

Datasets. We evaluate our approach with three state-of-the-art long-range datasets. The first, *BooookScore* (Chang et al., 2024), is both a long-context book summarization dataset and benchmark. The dataset contains very large books (each over 100k tokens) which the authors were careful to ensure did not exist in the pre-training datasets of public large language models at the time of publication. Chang et al. (2024) additionally introduce a reference-free summarization metric that they also call BooookScore which we use to measure the coherency of the final summaries generated. This is an LLM-assisted measure that computes the percentage of sentences in the summary that do *not* contain one of a number of identified error types. The second dataset is a long-range code understanding and retrieval benchmark called *RepoQA* (Liu et al., 2024). Here, inputs are large code repositories made up of multiple code files totalling above 100k tokens. The task is to retrieve a function, which is described in natural language without being named, from the repository. A memory is useful to reason about this task because the

function descriptions can describe function behavior through relationships with functions in other chunks. We measure accuracy, marking an output as correct if it names the described function exactly, and incorrect otherwise. Our final task is a version of the Spider dataset (Yu et al., 2018) adapted by Lee et al. (2024) to be a long-range question answering task. This task, which we refer to as *LOFT-Spider*, requires answering a set of questions directly (rather than via SQL commands) from a large SQL database. Response accuracy on this task is measured using exact matching. These datasets evaluate opposite boundaries in LLM reasoning. BooookScore is a highly unstructured natural language reasoning task, while RepoQA and LOFT-Spider are well-structured retrieval and reasoning tasks.

Models. To establish a quality ceiling, we compare our baselines to a state-of-the-art long context model (Gemini 1.5 Pro (Reid et al., 2024)) with a context of 1M tokens. This is large enough to fit the longest samples from each of the datasets we study *within* context. For all other baselines, we use the same model with 32k context. This allows us to compare similarly capable models with different context sizes. We use top k sampling ($k = 40$) with temperature 0.8. For LLM-assisted schema generation, we use the same model.

Baselines. We use *incremental merging* and *hierarchical merging* as our short-context baselines for BooookScore. These were proposed by Chang et al. (2024) alongside the dataset. Incremental merging follows the characteristic incremental task formulation of revising a running summary in natural language as new chunks are seen; hierarchical merging summarizes all chunks, then summarizes consecutive pairs of summaries hierarchically in layers until a single summary remains at the last layer. As the RepoQA paper does not use any short-context baselines, we propose our own baseline based on Chang et al. (2024)’s incremental merging approach. We modify the prompt to be suitable for the RepoQA task rather than summarization. We also construct a similar baseline for LOFT-Spider. A hierarchical baseline is not naturally amenable to these latter tasks as it is unclear how to merge summaries of independent functions or tables nor why it would be beneficial.

Ablations. Our experiments evaluate several variations of our method. First, we compare in-place memories to amendments (Figure 4). Second, we evaluate when the proposed revision (Definition

3.4) supports both add and update as well as when it supports only the add operation. We encode our typed hierarchy in *JavaScript Object Notation (JSON)* and specify the schema for the memory using Python 3 dataclasses. Appendix B provides some examples of this implementation.

Setup. Unless specified otherwise, we use the schemas defined in Appendix A.1. We evaluate on 50 examples per dataset due to compute restrictions, and report the mean of the dataset-specific metric over all samples. We quote uncertainty as the standard error of the mean over five samples from the LLM. For BoookScore, we use consecutive book chunks of 2k tokens, for RepoQA, we split code files into chunks of 8k tokens from the Python subset of repositories, and for LOFT-Spider, we split tables into 8k token chunks. We choose larger chunks for RepoQA and LOFT-Spider to reduce instances where functions or tables are split across chunk boundaries.

4.1 Structured Memories Improve Task Performance

In Table 2, our method beats both existing baselines (incremental and hierarchical merging) on BoookScore to a statistically significant degree (at worst $p = 0.02$) and almost matches the performance of the long context model. All variants of our approach perform similarly well on BoookScore, except for using *amendments* with adds and updates. This case slightly outperforms the other approaches. It is encouraging to see that the *amendments* method performs equally well if not better than an in-place memory. This is a promising signal that cache-optimized memories can be just as effective at producing strong final answers.

We see a similar picture with RepoQA and LOFT-Spider. Our method outperforms the baselines and approaches the long-context ceiling. These tasks are particularly difficult because they necessitate reasoning and aggregating over multiple code files and tables. It is not trivial to define a schema that optimally supports the reasoning involved in these tasks. We also believe that critical information is clustered in these tasks. Failing to add relevant information to the memory during the processing of an important chunk is likely to be substantially more costly than in summarization.

4.2 Amended Memories Are Scalably Token-Efficient

Incremental processing requires many more LLM calls than long context models and storing a memory in-context has a cost. We investigate whether our programmatic memory revisions and key-value caching optimizations bring about compute efficiency advantages. In this section, we measure cache hit rate as the proportion of tokens whose key-value activations could be reused (i.e., the number of tokens in the longest matching prefix to the last input prompt divided by the total number of tokens encoded). We also compute a cost index to compare the relative compute cost of each method. The weighting of the index was determined by examining the per-token pricing of popular public APIs, where decoding is approximately triple the cost of encoding (e.g., OpenAI GPT-4o¹ and Claude 3.5 Sonnet²).

In Table 3, we see that variants of our method achieve the best results for all metrics across both datasets. Notably, using amendments with updates leads to the highest cache hit rates, and in the case of BoookScore, also the lowest estimated cost. Similarly, for RepoQA, using amendments (but this time without updates) leads to the lowest cost.

As compute constraints can significantly reduce viable context lengths, we also analyze how the characteristics of our method change as we reduce the context size. In Figure 5, we use different chunk sizes on the RepoQA dataset using our cache-efficient amended memory approach without updates. For smaller chunk sizes, accuracy slightly decreases. The net encoded tokens stays relatively constant since cache hit rate improves. This is because a larger proportion of the context is taken by the memory, for which the majority of the tokens are pre-computed because of our cache-efficient approach. Meanwhile, tokens decoded increases as more incremental steps are required. However, tokens encoded dominates tokens decoded. Thanks to this property, remarkably, the weighted cost remains similar regardless of the chunk size. The near-constant cost of our approach allows it to scale down easily.

¹<https://openai.com/api/pricing/>

²<https://www.anthropic.com/pricing#anthropic-api>

Table 2: **PRISM closes half the gap between baselines and long-context models using 4-50x smaller context windows.** Using just 2-8k token chunks (vs. 30-121k for long context LLMs), PRISM significantly outperforms baselines across all tasks. On BoookScore, PRISM’s amendments achieve 97% of long-context performance ($p < .02$) with 50x smaller context. On RepoQA, PRISM without updates reaches 58% of ceiling accuracy while using 15x less context.

Method	BoookScore		RepoQA		LOFT-Spider	
	Score	Ch. Tokens	Acc.	Ch. Tokens	Acc.	Ch. Tokens
Long context	.67±.004	100k	.92	121k	.44±.01	30k
Baselines [†]						
Incremental	.63±.010	–	.24±.03	–	.12±.02	–
Hierarchical	.51±.006	–	n/a	–	n/a	–
PRISM						
In-place	.63±.008	2k	.42±.02	8k	.22±.03	8k
+ w/o updates	.63±.006		.50±.03		.26±.02	
Amendments	.65±.004	2k	.48±.03	8k	.14±.01	8k
+ w/o updates	.63±.005		.53±.02		.22±.02	

[†]Baselines adapted from Chang et al. (2024)’s methods.




Figure 5: **PRISM maintains near-equivalent costs with shorter chunk sizes due to effective key-value caching.** This allows PRISM to scale down without sacrificing performance. Net tokens encoded are calculated after subtracting tokens reused through the key-value cache. Weighted cost reflects the cost index based on typical API pricing (encoding + 3x decoding).

4.3 LLM Generations Compete With Hand-Crafted Schemas

While our method is domain-agnostic, it requires expertise to develop the schema. This schema should be defined such that the memory encodes all of the information required to complete the task without being verbose. In narrative summarization, this may be the most important events in the book; for code retrieval this may be a brief summary of each function or a direct measure of how closely it matches the description. Thus, it requires knowledge of the task. We determine whether this can be avoided by generating schemas with an LLM.

In Table 4, we use LLM-generated schemas (Appendix A.2) constructed by providing a brief de-

scription of the task and an example query (alongside some examples for other tasks) to the LLM. The output is a schema that we use to specify the memory. We compare this to the best result using our hand-crafted schemas from Table 2. The results reveal that our approach is competitive with hand-crafted expert schemas. Our method can be applied to tasks with little human input or domain expertise.

5 Conclusion

We proposed a method to solve long-range problems with short-context models using an incrementally revised in-context structured memory specified with a typed hierarchy schema. With this ap-

Table 3: **PRISM with amendments achieves 69% cache reuse and 54% cost reduction.** On BoookScore, PRISM’s amendment strategy maximizes cache hits (69% vs. 0-1% for incremental and hierarchical baselines) while minimizing net tokens (171k vs. 248k) and cost (0.31 vs. 0.67). Without updates further reduces output tokens by 70% but increases net encoding. Similar patterns hold for RepoQA, where amendments achieve 75% cache reuse. We do not provide a cost index for long context as the cost is different and would not be comparable. Results are similar for LOFT-Spider and shown in Appendix D for brevity.

Method	Cache	Tokens ($\times 10^3$)		Output	Cost
	Hit (%)	Total	Net	($\times 10^3$)	Index
<i>BoookScore</i>					
Long context	–	100	100	1	–
Baselines					
Incremental [†]	0	249	248	141	0.67
Hierarchical [†]	1	227	225	70	0.43
PRISM					
In-place	49	495	250	131	0.64
+ w/o updates	34	619	409	14	0.45
Amendments	69	559	171	47	0.31
+ w/o updates	37	676	424	15	0.47
<i>RepoQA</i>					
Long context	–	121	121	0	–
Incremental	1	180	178	28	0.26
PRISM					
In-place	71	491	142	9	0.17
+ w/o updates	68	437	139	6	0.16
Amendments	75	581	144	11	0.18
+ w/o updates	68	435	138	6	0.15

[†]Methods from Chang et al. (2024).

Cost Index = (Net Tokens + 3 × Output) ÷ 10⁶, reflecting typical API pricing ratios.

Table 4: **LLM-generated schemas match or approach expert performance.** Generated schemas achieve identical performance on RepoQA, near-parity on BoookScore (93% of expert), with some limitations on Spider (58% of expert). Both maintain similar efficiency (Manual: 760 tokens, Generated: 790 tokens). [†]Generated schema matched manual version; alternative: $.24 \pm .01$.

Schema	BoookScore	RepoQA	LOFT-Spider
Manual	$.65 \pm .004$	$.53 \pm .02$	$.26 \pm .02$
Generated	$.61 \pm .010$	$.53^{\dagger} \pm .02$	$.15 \pm .03$

proach, we achieved better long-range task performance than baselines with unstructured memories. This held true for highly unstructured tasks, such as narrative summarization, as well as well-structured reasoning problems for code and databases. In the former, our method was even competitive with a

long-context model. We also demonstrated that our method is task-agnostic, requiring only specifying an appropriate schema for our memory. This too, we showed, can be automated by generating the schema with an LLM. These LLM-assisted schemas achieved similar performance to hand-crafted schemas. Furthermore, with a slight modification to the memory representation, we improved key-value cache efficiency to reduce inference cost substantially below baselines without sacrificing task performance. Finally, we noticed that our method scales down without significantly increasing the inference cost and while remaining practical for long-range reasoning. Taken collectively, our method provides a solution for long-range reasoning given short-context models that succeeds without the constraints of alternative solutions.

6 Limitations

While we have shown that structured memories can be task-agnostic, improve quality, and improve token-efficiency, there remain some limitations to our work. First, we explore only two hand-crafted schemas for the book summarization and code retrieval tasks. There is likely to be a large space of effective and useful schemas for various types of tasks. Understanding how schemas should be designed for different tasks would help use structured memories more effectively. Second, the analysis of chunk size and token efficiency is an interesting preliminary study that demonstrates the cost-efficiency of our approach even in increasingly context-constrained environments. However, we were only able to examine a single dataset with just five different chunk sizes. Evaluating on more datasets and more chunk sizes would not only allow us to be more confident in our approach, but also would help investigate the presence of a scaling law for token-efficiency. Perhaps the most significant limitation is that, although we outperform other short context approaches, the ultimate goal is to achieve on-par performance with long-context models. Although we achieved this for the summarization task, there remains a gap to bridge for the more well-structured reasoning tasks.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Michael Boratko and Zachary Fisher for comments and suggestions on this work. DJ was a Student Researcher at Google DeepMind during this project and is also supported by an AWS Studentship from the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Autonomous Intelligent Machines and Systems (AIMS) (EP/S024050/1).

References

- Yapei Chang, Kyle Lo, Tanya Goyal, and Mohit Iyyer. 2024. [BooookScore: A systematic exploration of book-length summarization in the era of LLMs](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Weizhi Fei, Xueyan Niu, Guoqing Xie, Yanhua Zhang, Bo Bai, Lei Deng, and Wei Han. 2024. [Retrieval meets reasoning: Dynamic in-context editing for long-text understanding](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.12331.
- Zifan He, Zongyue Qin, Neha Prakriya, Yizhou Sun, and Jason Cong. 2024. [HMT: hierarchical memory transformer for long context language processing](#). *CoRR*, abs/2405.06067.
- Eunjeong Hwang, Yichao Zhou, Beliz Gunel, James Bradley Wendt, and Sandeep Tata. 2024a. [SUMIE: A synthetic benchmark for incremental entity summarization](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.05079.
- EunJeong Hwang, Yichao Zhou, James Bradley Wendt, Beliz Gunel, Nguyen Vo, Jing Xie, and Sandeep Tata. 2024b. [Enhancing incremental summarization with structured representations](#). *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*, abs/2407.15021.
- Maor Ivgi, Uri Shaham, and Jonathan Berant. 2023. [Efficient long-text understanding with short-text models](#). *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 11:284–299.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP 2023, Koblenz, Germany, October 23-26, 2023*, pages 611–626. ACM.
- Jinhyuk Lee, Anthony Chen, Zhuyun Dai, Dheeru Dua, Devendra Singh Sachan, Michael Boratko, Yi Luan, Sébastien M. R. Arnold, Vincent Perot, Siddharth Dalmia, Hexiang Hu, Xudong Lin, Panupong Pasupat, Aida Amini, Jeremy R. Cole, Sebastian Riedel, Iftexhar Naim, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kelvin Guu. 2024. [Can long-context language models subsume retrieval, rag, sql, and more?](#) *CoRR*, abs/2406.13121.
- Jiawei Liu, Jia Le Tian, Vijay Daita, Yuxiang Wei, Yifeng Ding, Yuhan Katherine Wang, Jun Yang, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. [RepoQA: Evaluating long context code understanding](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.06025.
- Tsendsuren Munkhdalai, Manaal Faruqui, and Siddharth Gopal. 2024. [Leave no context behind: Efficient infinite context transformers with infinite attention](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.07143.
- Charles Packer, Vivian Fang, Shishir G. Patil, Kevin Lin, Sarah Wooders, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2023. [MemGPT: Towards LLMs as operating systems](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.08560.
- Reiner Pope, Sholto Douglas, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Jacob Devlin, James Bradbury, Jonathan Heek, Kefan Xiao, Shivani Agrawal, and Jeff Dean. 2023. [Efficiently scaling transformer inference](#). In *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference on Machine Learning and Systems, MLSys 2023, Miami, FL, USA, June 4-8, 2023*. mlsys.org.
- Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andrew M. Dai, Katie Millican, Ethan Dyer, Mia Glaese, Thibault Sottiaux, Benjamin Lee, Fabio Viola, Malcolm Reynolds, Yuanzhong Xu, James Molloy, Jilin Chen, Michael

Isard, Paul Barham, Tom Hennigan, Ross McIlroy, Melvin Johnson, Johan Schalkwyk, Eli Collins, Eliza Rutherford, Erica Moreira, Kareem Ayoub, Megha Goel, Clemens Meyer, Gregory Thornton, Zhen Yang, Henryk Michalewski, Zaheer Abbas, Nathan Schucher, Ankesh Anand, Richard Ives, James Keeling, Karel Lenc, Salem Haykal, Siamak Shakeri, Pranav Shyam, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Roman Ring, Stephen Spencer, Eren Sezener, and others. 2024. [Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context](#). *CoRR*, abs/2403.05530.

Weizhi Wang, Li Dong, Hao Cheng, Xiaodong Liu, Xifeng Yan, Jianfeng Gao, and Furu Wei. 2023. [Augmenting language models with long-term memory](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.

Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, Zilin Zhang, and Dragomir R. Radev. 2018. [Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-sql task](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, pages 3911–3921. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Lianmin Zheng, Liangsheng Yin, Zhiqiang Xie, Jeff Huang, Chuyue Sun, Cody Hao Yu, Shiyi Cao, Christos Kozyrakis, Ion Stoica, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Clark W. Barrett, and Ying Sheng. 2023. [Efficiently programming large language models using sglang](#). *CoRR*, abs/2312.07104.

A Schemas

In this section, we provide LLM-generated and hand-crafted schemas used for our experiments on all datasets.

A.1 Hand-crafted schemas

For BoookScore, the attributes map should be keyed by some identifier and the values should be a list of sentences that summarize the main plot of the book including events, background, themes, and characters. For RepoQA, each key is a function name and the value is a type that contains a natural language description of the function’s purpose, input, output, and procedure. For LOFT-Spider, the schema maps table names to descriptions of the columns and relevant fields.

```
1 @dataclasses.dataclass
2 class BookSummary:
3     """Keys may be whatever you want them
4     to be. Values should summarize in
5     sentences only the most important
6     attributes of the book which should
7     include absolutely essential details
8     such as the main characters and their
9     motivations, the main plot, the main
10    events, background information, and
11    the main theme."""
12    attributes: dict[str, list[str]]
```

Listing 1: Schema for BoookScore.

```
1 @dataclasses.dataclass
2 class FunctionNaturalDescriptor:
3     """candidate_functions is keyed by the exact name of the
4     function and stores FunctionDescription objects. Each entry
5     should represent a unique function, class method, property,
6     getter, or setter (or anything defined with a def keyword)
7     present in [TEXT] that potentially matches the description
8     given in [QUESTION]. Never add the same function more than once
9     and only add functions that appear similar to the description
10    given in [QUESTION]. If two functions are very similar to each
11    other, you should make sure to distinguish them in their
12    FunctionDescription objects."""
13
14 @dataclasses.dataclass
15 class FunctionDescription:
16     """purpose describes the purpose of the function i.e. what it
17     does. input describes what the parameters of the function are.
18     output describes what the function returns. procedure describes
19     how the function is implemented (i.e. how it does what it does
20     ). Do not repeat the description given in [QUESTION]. You must
21     describe the function based on what you see in [TEXT]."""
22     purpose: str
23     input: str
24     output: str
25     procedure: str
26
27 candidate_functions: dict[str, FunctionDescription]
```

Listing 2: Schema for RepoQA.

```

1 @dataclasses.dataclass
2 class RelevantTableInfo(pg.Object):
3     """table_descriptions is a list of TableDescription objects. One
4     for each table."""
5
6 @dataclasses.dataclass
7 class TableDescription(pg.Object):
8     """Each element in columns_observed should provide the precise
9     name and data type of a column in the table. In
10    relevant_statistics you should calculate and provide statistics
11    relevant to answering the query. relationships should provide
12    the names of other tables that are related to this table and
13    relevant to answering the query."""
14    table_name: str
15    table_description: str
16    columns_observed: list[str]
17    relevant_statistics: list[str]
18    relationships: list[str]
19
20 table_descriptions: list[TableDescription]

```

Listing 3: Schema for LOFT-Spider.

A.2 LLM-generated schemas

```

1 @dataclasses.dataclass
2 class NarrativeSummary:
3     @dataclasses.dataclass
4     class SummaryEvent:
5         events: str
6         characters: str
7         places: str
8         elements: str
9     summary_events: dict[str, SummaryEvent]

```

Listing 4: LLM-Generated Schema for BoookScore.

```

1 @dataclasses.dataclass
2 class FunctionMatch:
3     matches: dict[str, float]

```

Listing 5: LLM-Generated Schema for RepoQA.

```

1 @dataclasses.dataclass
2 class QueryPartialSolution(pg.Object):
3     attributes: dict[str, list[str]]

```

Listing 6: LLM-Generated Schema for LOFT-Spider.

B Using Typed Hierarchies in JSON

We present the use of Typed Hierarchies in JSON in figure 6. In this section, we refer to revisions as updates. The problem formulation is the same otherwise.

C Prompts

In this section, we provide prompts for PRISM and LLM-assisted schema generation. Prompts for baselines may be found in [Chang et al. \(2024\)](#).

Example Prompt For PRISM

```

1 {% raw %}I will provide a class definition [CLASS], which defines some fields
2 that need to be generated, an instantiation of that class under [
3 PARTIAL_SUMMARY] that is a response to the question in [QUESTION], and

```




Figure 6: **Using a JSON-encoded memory.** Using the example of a code retrieval task, we fill the context of the LLM with the task instruction, query, a schema defining our memory structure, the existing memory, and a chunk of code context. When this context is used to prompt the LLM, it should propose a memory revision based on the chunk that it has seen. The revision is used to programmatically revise the underlying JSON memory structure, which is then used in the prompt for the next step.

```

  some text in a section called [TEXT]. Your task is to propose updates to [
  PARTIAL_SUMMARY] gathered from the information in [TEXT].
2
3 Here are the sections that you will complete, in the same order:
4
5 [OBJECTS FOR UPDATE]
6 In this section you will produce a set of dictionaries (one per line) in JSON
  format where the keys correspond to the JSONPaths whose objects should be
  updated and the values are a dictionary with the following fields:
7 * 'update': The object to overwrite the existing value at the JSONPath.
8
9 The 'update' object must adhere to the [CLASS] definition at the given
  JSONPath. If information is missing for some fields, then you can use the
  placeholder string '???' or `None` to represent that missing information.
  Updates must only ever increase the amount of information in [
  PARTIAL_SUMMARY], they can be made by either replacing a `None` object or
  the placeholder string '???' with relevant content from [TEXT] or by
  modifying an existing value using content from [TEXT]. To separate
  multiple values within a string, use '; '. For example, a value about the
  'location' of a hotel may say '5 minute walk from the subway station;
  views of the Eiffel tower'.
10
11 [OBJECTS FOR ADD]
12 In this section you will produce a dictionary in JSON format where the keys
  correspond to the JSONPaths that do not exist in [PARTIAL_SUMMARY] yet
  that will be added, and the values are a dictionary with the following
  fields:
13 * 'add': The object to add at that JSONPath.
14
15 The 'add' object must adhere to the [CLASS] definition at the given JSONPath.
  If information is missing for some fields, then you can use the
  placeholder string '???' or `None` to represent that missing information.
16
17 Additional guidelines:
18
19 1. Field names in JSONPaths must be quoted. For example, "$. 'places'. '
  flexibility of material '".
20 2. Proposed JSON objects must have sufficient context: the values of the [
  PARTIAL_SUMMARY] should have enough context so a reader can understand
  what it means.
```




Figure 7: Using amendments with a JSON memory. An update to the candidate function “foo” is proposed, changing the existing “percent_match” field from 0.2 to 0.7 and replacing the “purpose” field. The function ReviseMemory takes the existing memory and applies the proposed update to it. We show two possible resulting memory states. *Single memory* shows the memory if the object at the specified path is updated with the new object directly. *Amendments* shows the state if the change is simply amended to the end as a new JSON object. Text in green shows the longest matching prefix compared to the previous memory and text in red shows the information that must be (re-)encoded. Using amendments reduces the number of tokens that need to be encoded at the cost of increasing the size of the memory.

```

21 3. Ignore irrelevant text: If the content in [TEXT] does not have any
    information that is relevant to [QUESTION] and [PARTIAL_SUMMARY] it is OK
    to make no update to that object.
22 4. No redundant fields: If information from [TEXT] can be incorporated by
    updating an existing field in [PARTIAL_SUMMARY], then do not introduce a
    new redundant field. For example, if there's already a field for '
    activities' do not introduce a new field for 'other activities' or 'water
    activities', 'hiking'. Update the existing field for 'activities'.
23 5. A field should not contain redundant values. If one value encompasses most
    of the details in another value, merge them together. For instance, "
    beautiful views of the Eiffel tower" and "view of the Eiffel tower" should
    be merged into a single value like "beautiful views of the Eiffel tower".
24
25 Here is an example of an entity comparison:
26 [QUESTION]
27 ESR HaloLock wireless car charger vs. MagSafe Wireless Car Charger
28
29 [CLASS]
30 Comparison
31
32 ```python
33 class Comparison:
34     product_names: tuple[str, str]
35     Facet = str
36     values: dict[Facet, tuple[str, str]]
37 ```
38
39 [PARTIAL_SUMMARY]
40 {
41     "product_names": ("ESR HaloLock wireless car charger", "MagSafe Wireless Car
    Charger"),
42     "values": {
43         "size": ("4.2 inches", "???"),
44         "flexibility": ("???", "very flexible"),
45     }
46 }

```

```

47
48 [TEXT]
49 When using ESR HaloLock wireless car charger, the orientation of the iPhone is
    absolutely free, as they are free too inclination and height that you
    want to give to the smartphone, as long as you pay attention to the center
    of gravity: despite the aluminum structure it is very resistant and the
    joints are very solid, if you position the smartphone too far forward, the
    base of the stand would not be able to support the weight and would risk
    tilting forward.
50
51 [OBJECTS FOR UPDATE]
52 {"$. 'values'. 'flexibility'": {"update": ("allows iPhone to orientate freely",
    "very flexible")}}
53
54 [OBJECTS FOR ADD]
55 {"$. 'values'. 'material'": {"add": ("aluminum structure", "???" )}}
56 {"$. 'values'. 'durability'": {"add": ("very resistant", "???" )}}
57 {"$. 'values'. 'design'": {"add": ("can not support the weight of a phone if it
    is too far forward", "???" )}}
58
59 ===
60
61 Here is an example of an entity summarization:
62 [QUESTION]
63 Describe attributes and values of HOTEL0.
64
65 [CLASS]
66 class Summary(TypedDict):
67     attributes: dict[str, list[str]] # Keyed by attribute, with a list of
        sufficient details about the attribute.
68
69 [PARTIAL_SUMMARY]
70 {
71     "attributes": {
72         "Amenities": ["There are two pools", "pub opens till midnight"],
73         "Food & Beverage": ["limited breakfast options"],
74         "Room Quality": ["Spacious and comfortable rooms"],
75     }
76 }
77
78 [TEXT]
79 HOTEL0 offers exceptional dining and the beds were very cozy, but there was a
    lot of street noise. HOTEL1 offers great Eiffel tower view from window.
80
81 [OBJECTS FOR UPDATE]
82 {"$. 'attributes'. 'Food & Beverage'": {"update": [ "limited breakfast options",
    "HOTEL0 offers exceptional dining" ]}}
83 {"$. 'attributes'. 'Room Quality'": {"update": [ "Spacious and comfortable rooms
    ", "beds were very cozy" ]}}
84
85 [OBJECTS FOR ADD]
86 {"$. 'attributes'. 'Noise Level'": {"add": [ "Notable street noise at night" ]}}
87
88 ===
89
90 Here is an example of query answering from SQL tables:
91 [QUESTION]
92 What is the total number of singers?
93
94 [CLASS]
95 class TableMemory(pg.Object):
96     """table_descriptions is keyed by the name of the table and the value is a
        TableDescription object. One for each table."""
97
98     class TableDescription(pg.Object):
99         """table_description is a short summary of the table. thoughts is a list
            of relevant information from the table that will be helpful in answering
            the query. When referring to fields and columns, use their exact names."""

```

```

100     table_description: str
101     thoughts: list[str]
102
103     table_descriptions: dict[str, TableDescription]
104
105 [PARTIAL_SUMMARY]
106 {
107     "table_descriptions": {
108         "Stadiums": {
109             "table_description": "The table lists the stadiums including Wembley
110 Stadium, Stark's Park, and others.",
111             "thoughts": [
112                 "There are 8 stadiums in the table.",
113                 "It does not say which singers perform.",
114             ],
115         },
116     }
117
118 [TEXT]
119 Table: Concert
120 concert_ID,concert_Name,Theme,Stadium_ID,Year
121 1,Auditions,Free choice,1,2014
122 2,Super bootcamp,Free choice 2,2,2014
123 3,Home Visits,Bleeding Love,2,2015
124 4,Week 1,Wide Awake,10,2014
125 5,Week 1,Happy Tonight,9,2015
126 6,Week 2,Party All Night,7,2015
127
128 Table: Singer
129 Singer_ID,Name,Country,Song_Name,Song_release_year,Age,Is_male
130 1,Joe Sharp,Netherlands,You,1992,52,F
131 2,Timbaland,United States,Dangerous,2008,32,T
132 3,Justin Brown,France,Hey Oh,2013,29,T
133 4,Rose White,France,Sun,2003,41,F
134 5,John Niznik,France,Gentleman,2014,43,T
135 6,Tribal King,France,Love,2016,25,T
136
137 Table: Singer_in_Concert
138 concert_ID,Singer_ID
139 1,2
140 1,3
141 1,5
142 2,3
143 2,6
144 3,5
145 4,4
146 5,6
147 5,3
148 6,2
149
150 Table: Stadium
151 Stadium_ID,Location,Name,Capacity,Highest,Lowest,Average
152 1,Raith Rovers,Stark's Park,10104,4812,1294,2106
153 2,Ayr United,Somerset Park,11998,2363,1057,1477
154 3,East Fife,Bayview Stadium,2000,1980,533,864
155 4,Queen's Park,Hampden Park,52500,1763,466,730
156 5,Stirling Albion,Forthbank Stadium,3808,1125,404,642
157 6,Arbroath,Gayfield Park,4125,921,411,638
158 7,Alloa Athletic,Recreation Park,3100,1057,331,637
159 9,Peterhead,Balmoor,4000,837,400,615
160 10,Brechin City,Glebe Park,3960,780,315,552
161
162 [OBJECTS FOR UPDATE]
163 {}
164
165 [OBJECTS FOR ADD]

```



```

166 {"$.table_descriptions.'Singers': {"add": {"table_description": "This table
    lists the singers.", "thoughts": [ "The Singer table has the singers Joe
    Sharp, Timbaland, Justin Brown, Rose White, John Niznik, and Tribal King
    .", "There are 6 singers in the table." ]}}
167
168 ===
169
170 Here is an example of code retrieval:
171 [QUESTION]
172 Find the exact name of the function described by the following function
    description: 1. Purpose: The function generates a string used to
    format text with new lines and optionally a form feed character, typically
    used to control spacing in formatted output.
173 2. Input: The function takes three parameters: an integer representing the
    number of new lines, a boolean indicating whether a form feed character
    should be included, and an optional string representing the line break
    character (defaulting to a newline).
174 3. Output: It returns a string composed of the specified number of newline
    characters, and if requested, includes a form feed character followed by
    an additional newline.
175 4. Procedure: The function first checks if the form feed should be
    included. If true, it concatenates the specified number of newline
    characters minus one with a form feed character and another newline. If
    false, it simply returns a string of newline characters multiplied by the
    specified integer.
176
177 [CLASS]
178 class FunctionNaturalDescriptor(pg.Object):
179     """candidate_functions is keyed by the exact name of the function and stores
    FunctionDescription objects. Each entry should represent a unique
    function, class method, property, getter, or setter (or anything defined
    with a def keyword) present in [TEXT] that potentially matches the
    description given in [QUESTION]. Never add the same function more than
    once and only add functions that appear similar to the description given
    in [QUESTION]. If two functions are very similar to each other, you should
    make sure to distinguish them in their FunctionDescription objects.""" #
    pylint: disable=line-too-long
180
181     class FunctionDescription(pg.Object):
182         """purpose describes the purpose of the function i.e. what it does. input
    describes what the parameters of the function are. output describes what
    the function returns. procedure describes how the function is implemented
    (i.e. how it does what it does). Do not repeat the description given in [
    QUESTION]. You must describe the function based on what you see in [TEXT
    ].""" # pylint: disable=line-too-long
183         purpose: str
184         input: str
185         output: str
186         procedure: str
187
188         candidate_functions: dict[str, FunctionDescription]
189
190 [PARTIAL_SUMMARY]
191 {
192     "candidate_functions": {
193         "_merge_entities":{
194             "purpose": "The function merges a list of entities into a single entity.
    Optionally, the merge can be done quickly, which may result in some
    information being lost. The function also formats and prints the merged
    entity.",
195             "input": "The function takes two parameters: a list of entities to merge
    and a boolean indicating whether to do a quick merge (defaulting to False
    ).",
196             "output": "The function returns a single entity created from merging all
    entities in the input list.",
197             "procedure": "The function first checks if the quick merge flag is set.
    If true, it uses a simple merge algorithm that simply concatenates all the
    entities in the list without any additional processing. If false, it uses

```

```

    a more complex merge algorithm that attempts to merge the entities in a
    way that preserves as much information as possible. The function then
    formats and prints the merged entity.",
198     },
199     "reduce_sum_list": {
200         "purpose": "The function reduces a list of integers to a single integer
    by summing all the values in the list.",
201         "input": "The function takes a single parameter: a list of integers.",
202         "output": "The function returns a single integer representing the sum of
    all the values in the list.",
203         "procedure": "The function iterates through the list of integers and
    adds each value to a running sum. It then returns the running sum.",
204     }
205 }
206 }
207
208 [TEXT]
209 File path: /src/test_file.py
210 Content:
211     elif t in {token.NAME, token.NUMBER, token.STRING}:
212         return NO
213
214     elif p.type == syms.import_from:
215         if t == token.DOT:
216             if prev and prev.type == token.DOT:
217                 return NO
218
219             elif t == token.NAME:
220                 if v == "import":
221                     return SPACE
222
223                 if prev and prev.type == token.DOT:
224                     return NO
225
226     elif p.type == syms.sliceop:
227         return NO
228
229     elif p.type == syms.except_clause:
230         if t == token.STAR:
231             return NO
232
233     return SPACE
234
235
236 def make_simple_prefix(nl_count: int, form_feed: bool, empty_line: str = "\n")
    -> str:
237     """Generate a normalized prefix string."""
238     if form_feed:
239         return (empty_line * (nl_count - 1)) + "\f" + empty_line
240     return empty_line * nl_count
241
242
243 def preceding_leaf(node: Optional[LN]) -> Optional[Leaf]:
244     """Return the first leaf that precedes `node`, if any."""
245     while node:
246         res = node.prev_sibling
247         if res:
248             if isinstance(res, Leaf):
249                 return res
250
251             try:
252                 return list(res.leaves())[-1]
253
254             except IndexError:
255                 return None
256
257     node = node.parent
258     return None

```

```

259
260
261 def prev_siblings_are(node: Optional[LN], tokens: List[Optional[NodeType]]) ->
    bool:
262     """Return if the `node` and its previous siblings match types against the
    provided
263     list of tokens; the provided `node` has its type matched against the last
    element in
264     the list. `None` can be used as the first element to declare that the
    start of the
265     list is anchored at the start of its parent's children."""
266
267 [OBJECTS FOR UPDATE]
268 {}
269
270 [OBJECTS FOR ADD]
271 {"$. 'candidate_functions'. 'make_simple_prefix'": {"add": {"purpose": "The
    function generates a prefix string by repeating a number of empty lines
    which can be formatted with a form feed character if supplied.", "input":
    "The function takes three parameters: an integer which denotes the number
    of new lines, a boolean determining if a form feed character should be
    used, and an optional argument: a string representing a character to be
    used for line breaks. This optional argument is defaulted to a newline
    character.", "output": "The function returns a string which is a prefix of
    the desired format.", "procedure": "The function first checks if the form
    feed character should be used. If it should, the function generates a
    string which is a concatenation of the specified number of newline
    characters minus one, a form feed character, and another newline character
    . If it should not, the function generates a string which is a
    concatenation of the specified number of newline characters. The function
    then returns the generated string." }}}
272 {"$. 'candidate_functions'. 'preceding_leaf'": {"add": {"purpose": "The function
    returns the first leaf that precedes a given node, if any.", "input": "
    The function takes a single parameter: a node to find the preceding leaf
    for.", "output": "The function returns a leaf if one exists, otherwise it
    returns None.", "procedure": "The function first checks if the node has a
    previous sibling. If it does, it checks if the previous sibling is a leaf.
    If it is, it returns the previous sibling. If it has a list of leaves,
    then it returns the last (or None if there is an IndexError). If it is not
    a leaf nor has a list of leaves, it sets the node to the parent and
    repeats the process in a while loop." }}}
273 {"$. 'candidate_functions'. 'prev_siblings_are'": {"add": {"purpose": "The
    function checks if the node and its previous siblings match types against
    the provided list of tokens.", "input": "The function takes two parameters
    : a node to check and a list of tokens to match against.", "output": "The
    function returns a boolean indicating whether the node and its previous
    siblings match types against the provided list of tokens.", "procedure": "
    Unknown" }}}
274
275 ===
276
277 {% endraw %}[QUESTION]
278 {{ question }}
279
280 [CLASS]
281 {{ structure }}
282
283 [PARTIAL_SUMMARY]
284 {{ partial_summary }}
285
286 [TEXT]
287 {{ text }}
288
289 {{ parse_response(store("raw_response", llm(temperature=0.8))) }}

```

Example Prompt For Schema Generation (And Example Generations)

```
1 I have a system in which a user enters a query in a particular domain and the
  system must answer the query. In order to answer the query, the system
  views a large number of documents one at a time and only once. Thus, when
  the system sees a document it stores information related to answering the
  query by updating a JSON format memory. Once the system has viewed all
  documents, the system will read its JSON memory and use this information
  to decide the output for the query. Consequently, the JSON memory should
  store all information relevant to answering the query. Hence, the schema
  for the JSON memory must ensure that the memory contains the right
  information to assist the system in producing the final answer. It should
  make sure not to keep too little information nor too much-but generally
  should prefer to store more information if unsure. The schema for the
  memory is defined by a python dataclass and is specific to the domain of
  the query. The schema may include a python comment describing how it
  should be used. Your task is to construct a schema given a query domain
  and a query example.
2
3 The schema will always store some information from every document, so it
  should support data structures that can be appended or updated such as
  lists or dicts. Information that should be structured together should be
  kept together with subclasses.
4
5 ===
6
7 [Query domain]
8 Comparing two entities found in various documents based on their respective
  shared attributes.
9
10 [Example query]
11 ESR HaloLock wireless car charger vs. MagSafe Wireless Car Charger
12
13 [Schema]
14 ```python
15 class Comparison:
16     """attributes should be keyed by attributes that both entities share e.g.
17     connectivity and the values should be AttributeValues instances."""
18     class AttributeValues:
19         """entity_one and entity_two are lists of descriptions relating to the two
20         respective entities, found in documents, that correspond to the specific
21         attribute the instance is keyed under."""
22         entity_one: list[str]
23         entity_two: list[str]
24
25     attributes: dict[str, AttributeValues]
26 ```
27
28 ===
29 [Query domain]
30 Summarizing details about entities (such as people, things, and institutions)
  found in online documents.
31
32 [Example query]
33 Describe attributes and values of HOTEL0.
34
35 [Schema]
36 ```python
37 class Summary(TypedDict):
38     """Keyed by attribute, with a list of sufficient details about the attribute
39     """
40     attributes: dict[str, list[str]]
41 ```
42
43 ===
```

```

43
44 [Query domain]
45 Finding the top individuals in terms of a particular metric defined by the
    query. Documents are the content of websites on the internet.
46
47 [Example query]
48 Who are the top 10 highest earning CEOs in the bay area?
49
50 [Schema]
51 ```python
52 class TopKList:
53     """top_persons is a list of PersonMetric instances giving the person name
    and the value of the metric asked by the query."""
54     class PersonMetric:
55         """person is the name of the individual and metric is the value of the
    metric required by the query."""
56         person: str
57         metric: float
58
59
60     top_persons: list[PersonMetric]
61 ```
62
63 ===
64
65 [Query domain]
66 Retrieving the exact name of a function given a query that describes the
    purpose, input, output, and procedure of the function. Documents are files
    of code. Here, the memory should provide some way of knowing to what
    extent a function matches the description given in a query.
67
68 [Example query]
69 Find the exact name of the function described by the following function
    description: 1. Purpose: The function generates a string used to
    format text with new lines and optionally a form feed character, typically
    used to control spacing in formatted output.
70 2. Input: The function takes three parameters: an integer representing the
    number of new lines, a boolean indicating whether a form feed character
    should be included, and an optional string representing the line break
    character (defaulting to a newline).
71 3. Output: It returns a string composed of the specified number of newline
    characters, and if requested, includes a form feed character followed by
    an additional newline.
72 4. Procedure: The function first checks if the form feed should be
    included. If true, it concatenates the specified number of newline
    characters minus one with a form feed character and another newline. If
    false, it simply returns a string of newline characters multiplied by the
    specified integer.
73
74
75 [Schema]
76
77 Generated Schema (for RepoQA):
78 class FunctionMatch:
79     """Stores information about functions found in code."""
80     class FunctionInfo:
81         """name is the exact name of the function and matches is a list of strings
    describing which parts of the function description in the query were
    matched to the function."""
82         name: str
83         matches: list[str]
84
85
86     functions: list[FunctionInfo]
87
88 ===
89
90 [Query domain]

```

```

91 You are summarizing very long narrative books. Each document is a segment of
    the book. Here, the story may feature non-linear narratives, flashbacks,
    switches between alternate worlds or viewpoints, etc. Therefore, the
    memory needs to represent a consistent and chronological narrative.
    Critical information may relate to key events, backgrounds, settings,
    characters, their objectives, and motivations.
92
93 [Example query]
94 Summarize this book excerpt. Briefly introduce characters, places, and other
    major elements if they are being mentioned for the first time.
95
96 [Schema]
97
98 Generated Schema (for BoookScore):
99
100 class BookSummary:
101     """Summarizes a book with potentially non-linear narratives by storing
        information chronologically."""
102     class Event:
103         """Represents a single event in the story. Events are stored in
            chronological order."""
104         description: str
105         """Description of the event."""
106         time: str
107         """Explicit time information provided in the text for this event, if any
            ."""
108         location: str
109         """Location of the event, if specified."""
110         characters: list[str]
111         """Characters involved in the event."""
112
113     class Character:
114         """Represents a character in the story."""
115         name: str
116         """Name of the character."""
117         description: str
118         """Description or background information about the character."""
119         motivations: list[str]
120         """Known or speculated motivations of the character."""
121
122     class Location:
123         """Represents a location in the story."""
124         name: str
125         """Name of the location."""
126         description: str
127         """Description of the location."""
128
129     events: list[Event]
130     """List of events in the story, ordered chronologically."""
131     characters: dict[str, Character]
132     """Dictionary of characters encountered in the story, keyed by character
        name."""
133     locations: dict[str, Location]
134     """Dictionary of locations encountered in the story, keyed by location name
        ."""
135
136 ===
137
138 [Query domain]
139 Given a bunch of SQL tables formatted in text, answer queries that may require
    reasoning over multiple tables to find the answer.
140
141 [Example query]
142 What is the total number of singers?
143
144 [Schema]
145
146 LOFT-Spider generated schema:

```

Table 5: Cache-efficiency results for LOFT-Spider.

Method	Cache hit (%)	Enc. ($\times 10^3$)	Net Enc. ($\times 10^3$)	Dec. ($\times 10^3$)	Cost Index
	LOFT-Spider				
Long context	0	30	30	0.4	
Incremental	0	31	31	1.5	0.035
Ours In-place	41	56	33	0.7	0.035
w/out updates	39	54	33	0.4	0.030
Ours Amendments	39	54	33	0.6	0.035
w/out updates	40	54	33	0.4	0.034

```

147
148 class SQLQueryInformation:
149     """This schema stores information relevant to a SQL query.
150     It focuses on the entities and attributes mentioned in the query,
151     rather than storing entire tables.
152     """
153
154     class EntityInformation:
155         """Represents information about a specific entity mentioned in the
156         query.
157         For instance, if the query asks about 'singers', this would store
158         information related to singers.
159         """
160         name: str # Entity name (e.g., "singers")
161         relevant_columns: list[str] # Columns relevant to the query for this
162         entity
163         relevant_rows: list[dict[str, str]] # Rows containing information
164         related to the query, as dictionaries
165
166         entities: list[EntityInformation]
167
168         # Additional fields for aggregate queries (COUNT, SUM, AVG, etc.):
169         aggregate_results: dict[str, float] # e.g., {"count": 123}

```

D Additional Results

We present additional results, extending Table 3 for the LOFT-Spider dataset in Table 5.