
Unlocking Large Language Model’s Planning Capabilities with Maximum Diversity Fine-tuning

Wenjun Li

Singapore Management University
wjli.2020@phdcs.smu.edu.sg

Changyu Chen

Singapore Management University
cychen.2020@phdcs.smu.edu.sg

Pradeep Varakantham

Singapore Management University
pradeepv@smu.edu.sg

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive task-solving capabilities, achieved through either prompting techniques or system designs. However, concerns have arisen regarding their proficiency in planning tasks, as they often struggle to generate valid plans. This paper investigates the impact of fine-tuning on LLMs’ planning capabilities. Our findings indicate that LLMs can achieve good performance in planning through substantial (thousands of specific examples) fine-tuning. However, fine-tuning is associated with significant economic and computational costs. To address this challenge, we propose the Maximum Diversity Fine-Tuning (MDFT) strategy to improve the sample efficiency of fine-tuning in the planning domain. Specifically, our algorithm, referred to as MDFT-g, encodes the planning task instances with their graph representations and selects a subset of samples in the vector space that maximizes data diversity. We empirically demonstrate that MDFT-g consistently outperforms existing baselines at various scales across multiple benchmark domains.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive capabilities in a variety of applications beyond traditional natural language processing (NLP) tasks. For instance, they can accomplish complex tasks involving planning in environments like Minecraft [21, 25] and household settings [10, 23], and solve math problems using reasoning [22, 24]. Despite these impressive capabilities, concerns have been raised about their proficiency in planning tasks. Numerous studies [19, 14, 11, 7] have shown that LLMs, on their own, often struggle to generate valid plans. As a result, enhancing the planning abilities of LLMs has emerged as a prominent research area.

In this paper, we focus on enhancing the planning capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) within rigorous planning settings, often referred to as "automated planning". Despite extensive criticism, there has been little concrete progress in fundamentally improving the planning capabilities of LLMs within the field of automated planning. In this paper, we demonstrate that fine-tuning remains the most effective approach to tackle this challenge, achieving good planning capabilities with solved rates exceeding 95%.

Many works [5, 17, 4] have demonstrated that fine-tuning can significantly enhance LLM’s task-specific performance. However, comprehensive research on fine-tuning in the planning domain remains limited. To address this gap, we provide an in-depth analysis of how fine-tuning affects LLMs’ planning capabilities. Specifically, we investigate the impact of data scaling and diversity on

the fine-tuning outcomes, focusing on both planning capabilities and generalization performance of LLMs. Surprisingly, we found that substantial fine-tuning significantly improves LLM’s planning capabilities to a satisfactory level, which contradicts the existing prejudice that LLMs are weak at planning. In summary, our research addresses two main questions: (1) How does fine-tuning impact the planning capabilities of LLMs? (2) Can we identify the most effective samples to enhance sample efficiency in fine-tuning?

Fine-tuning both closed-source models like OpenAI’s GPT-x [2] and open-source models such as Meta’s Llama-x [18] entails substantial economic and computational costs. For example, fine-tuning GPT-3.5 once with just 5000 planning task examples in the Blocksworld domain costs approximately 100 USD. Additionally, fine-tuning Llama-3-8b requires high-end and expensive GPUs (e.g., A100, H100) and a significant amount of time. Given these constraints, our goal is to enhance the planning capabilities of LLMs while minimizing the required fine-tuning data. In this paper, we explore the impact of both the quantity and diversity of fine-tuning data on training outcomes. We propose the Maximum Diversity Fine-Tuning (MDFT) strategy to improve sample efficiency in the planning domain. Our algorithm, referred to as MDFT-g, encodes planning instances in vector space using their graph representations and selects the most diverse and representative examples. In our experiments, we empirically demonstrate that MDFT-g consistently outperforms existing baseline methods at the same scale.




Figure 1: Algorithm overview. (a) Training samples in natural language. (2) Samples encoded in vector space. (3) A subset of samples selected by MDFT-g. The red stars are the selected ones. (d) Fine-tune LLMs with the subset of samples.

Overall, our work makes two key contributions. First, we conducted a comprehensive investigation into how data scaling and diversity affect the fine-tuning outcomes of LLMs, particularly in the planning domain. Second, we introduced MDFT-g, a novel approach that leverages graph representations to encode planning instances and selects the most diverse and representative samples. Our empirical results demonstrate that MDFT-g significantly improves sample efficiency and outperforms existing baseline methods.

2 Related Work

Enhancing LLM’s planning capabilities with prompting. Prompt controls the input to an LLM using a template or a cue to elicit the desired output. Approaches like Chain of Thoughts (CoT, [22]) and Tree of Thoughts (ToT, [24]) enable complex reasoning and planning capabilities through intermediate reasoning steps. However, these prompting techniques have shown limited effectiveness in improving performance in automated planning domains. For example, [19] showed that CoT prompting resulted in only a 1% improvement in the Blocksworld domain, with GPT-4 [1] achieving a 34.6% solved rate without CoT prompting and 35.6% with it.

LLMs with access to external tools. Due to LLMs’ tendency to generate responses with hallucinations and their lack of strict adherence to actions and predicates, some approaches integrate external tools to provide feedback. For example, [11] and [7] utilize the Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL) executor to verify the validity of generated plans and provide feedback (such as explanations for why plans are not executable) to aid LLMs in reflection and plan refinement. However, these approaches do not fundamentally enhance the inherent planning capabilities of LLMs and require complex integration engineering work. Additionally, the effectiveness of the

traditional planner relies heavily on the quality of the translation from natural language to PDDL. Any inaccuracies or omissions in this translation can result in incorrect plans or failed validations.

Enhancing LLM’s task-specific capabilities with fine-tuning. Fine-tuning refers to the process of updating the parameters of a pre-trained model using task-specific data. Initial studies, such as Less Is More for Alignment (LIMA, [27]), have investigated the effects of training data quantity and quality on fine-tuning outcomes in typical natural language processing tasks like Q&A and creative writing. However, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no comprehensive study on how fine-tuning data (considering aspects like quantity, diversity, composition, etc.) affects the planning capabilities of LLMs. This paper pioneers the exploration of these research questions.

3 Approach: Maximum Diversity Fine-tuning

We choose supervised fine-tuning (SFT) as our fine-tuning approach in this paper. SFT data consists of two components: queries and the associated responses. Previous studies [27, 26] have shown that higher quality responses and more diverse queries lead to better LLM performance after fine-tuning. In automated planning domains, we can employ traditional planning solvers (e.g., Fast Downward [8]) to find the optimal plans and achieve the highest quality in responses. As a result, how to capture the diversity of the fine-tuning data becomes the main challenge.

Unlike [27, 26] that utilized human resources to capture the diversity in queries, we aim to automatically identify the diverse and effective samples. Moreover, given the high economic and computational costs associated with fine-tuning, achieving higher sample efficiency is crucial. To address these, we propose utilizing the Maximum Diversity Fine-Tuning (MDFT) strategy to enhance the planning capabilities of LLMs using minimal data. Maximizing diversity within a subset of samples is known as the Maximum Diversity Problem (MDP, [6, 13]) in the literature, which has been studied for decades. MDP is NP-hard, meaning that finding the exact optimal solution is computationally challenging for large datasets. However, several heuristic and approximation algorithms exist to find good solutions. In this paper, we employ clustering-based approaches to identify representative points, thereby ensuring diversity within the dataset.

3.1 Representing Planning Tasks as Graphs

MDP algorithms operate in numeric and vector spaces, so the first step is to convert planning tasks from natural language into vector space.

Natural language can be easily and efficiently encoded into vector representations using language embedding tools such as the Universal Sentence Encoder [3] and Self-BLEU [28]. However, due to the narrative nature of planning tasks, planning tasks with distinct solutions can only differ in a few words in the natural language descriptions and result in highly similar language embeddings. For example, in Figure 2(a), switching the positions of the orange and green blocks in the initial configuration while keeping other conditions constant changes the task descriptions slightly. The original task description is, "As initial conditions, I have that the orange block is clear, the orange block is on top of the green block, ...", whereas the altered task description is, "As initial conditions, I have that the green block is clear, the green block is on top of the orange block, ...". Despite having different solutions, these two tasks produce very similar language embeddings that are close in vector space. This issue makes subsequent diversity maximization difficult and inaccurate. Additional results and analyses on the limitations of language embeddings can be found in the appendix.

Therefore, a more representative embedding approach specifically tailored for planning tasks is necessary to capture the nuances between tasks. Inspired by [15, 16], we use graph representations to encode planning tasks. Each planning task consists of an initial configuration of objects and a goal configuration of objects. To solve the task, the LLM needs to perform sequential actions to transform the initial configuration into the goal configuration. In graph representation, each object is a node, and each predicate is a (directed) edge between two nodes. An example task from the Blocksworld domain and its graph representation are shown in Figure 2. Once the planning tasks are converted into graphs, we can efficiently encode these graphs into vector embeddings. To fully capture the information of a task, we concatenate the vectors of the initial configuration and the goal configuration into a single graph representation. Additional details are provided in the appendix.




Figure 2: (a) An example task from Blocksworld. Left: initial configuration. Right: goal configuration. (b) A graph representation of the example task, where nodes are objects and edges are predicates.

3.2 Selecting Maximum Diversity Data

Instead of solely maximizing diversity among the subset of samples, we also want the selected samples to be representative to enhance the effectiveness of downstream fine-tuning. To achieve this, we adopt a straightforward heuristic using the clustering-based method to select the maximum diversity fine-tuning data in vector space.

Assume we have a total number of N tasks and we want to find a subset of k tasks that maximize the overall diversity. The diversity is defined as the sum of all pair-wise distances between the k samples. To make the clustering more effective, we first perform dimension reduction (e.g., t-SNE [20]) on the embedding space. Subsequently, we perform k-means clustering on the entire set of data points, with k used as the number of clusters. For each cluster, we find the point closest to the cluster centroid, select it to represent the cluster, and include it in the final subset.

The clustering-based method is compatible with any embedding approaches that can convert planning tasks from natural language to vector representations. Note that the clustering requires a suitable distance metric. For instance, we employed L2 norm distance for language embeddings and edit distance for graph embeddings in our experiments. We denote the maximum diversity fine-tuning data selection with language embeddings as MDFT-l and graph embeddings as MDFT-g, respectively. The complete procedures of MDFT-l and MDFT-g are presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Selecting Maximum Diversity Fine-tuning Data

Input: N tasks, subset size k , embedding method $f(\cdot)$, distance metric $c(\cdot, \cdot)$

- 1 Initialize empty subset \mathcal{D} , embeddings set \mathbb{E}
- 2 **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
- 3 Encode task t_i as vector embedding, $e_i = f(t_i)$
- 4 Insert e_i into \mathbb{E}
- 5 **end**
- 6 Perform dimension reduction on the embedding space
- 7 Perform k-means clustering with distance metric $c(\cdot, \cdot)$ over the embeddings with k clusters
- 8 Obtain k centroids of the clusters
- 9 **for** $i = 1$ to k **do**
- 10 In each cluster, find the e_i closest to the cluster centroid
- 11 Retrieve the task instance associated with e_i and add it to \mathcal{D}
- 12 **end**

Output: A subset of tasks, \mathcal{D}

4 Experiment Setup

Benchmark Domains: We utilize two widely adopted benchmark domains for automated planning from the International Planning Competition (IPC, [12]). Detailed information about domain properties, actions, predicates, dataset generation, prompts, and other specifics can be found in the appendix.

Blocksworld: This domain comprises a set of blocks, a table, and a robot hand. Blocks can be placed on other blocks or on the table. A block with nothing on top of it is considered clear, and the robot hand can hold one block or be empty. The robot hand can perform four actions: pick-up, put-down,

stack, and unstack. The goal is to find a plan to transition from the initial configuration of blocks to the goal configuration. Blocks are uniquely identified by their colors. The complexity of Blocksworld tasks varies mainly with the number of blocks. We randomly created thousands of instances with different numbers of blocks and used a planning solver [8] to find the optimal plans. Note that the testing tasks are separated from the training tasks to ensure that the LLMs never see the testing tasks during fine-tuning. Detailed experimental settings are provided with each table and figure. More details about the Blocksworld dataset can be found in the appendix.

Logistics: The objective in this domain is to transport packages to specified goal locations. Locations are grouped by cities. Trucks move packages within a city, and airplanes move packages between cities. Each city has one truck and an airport. There can be multiple airplanes and packages located in different cities and locations. The Logistics domain is much more complex than Blocksworld and typically requires longer plans. We generated six thousand instances with varying numbers of cities, locations, packages, and airplanes.

Base Models: We selected GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 and Llama-3-8b as the base models for addressing Research Question 1 because they are the latest and most powerful closed-source and open-source LLMs, respectively. GPT-4 [1] was omitted from our experiments due to its limited experimental access and lack of public availability for fine-tuning. Additionally, we also conducted experiments on Llama-2-7b [18] for Research Question 2.

Baselines: We compare the proposed MDFT-g algorithm with two baselines: Random and MDFT-l. The Random baseline uniformly samples k instances from the entire training dataset. MDFT-l differs from MDFT-g only in the embedding method and distance metric, as described in the Approach section and Algorithm 1.

Evaluation: In our experiments, LLMs respond in natural language, and the generated plans are translated to PDDL and then verified using VAL [9]. A plan is considered correct as long as it successfully transitions from the initial configuration to the goal configuration. An analysis of the optimality rate of the generated plans is provided in the appendix.

Prompt: Our experiments use two types of prompts: one-shot and zero-shot prompts. The one-shot prompt includes three components: domain instructions, an example task with its solution, and a query task. The zero-shot prompt contains only the domain instructions and the query task. Further details about the prompt settings are available in the appendix. In our experiments, we found that fine-tuned models perform better with zero-shot prompts, while un-fine-tuned models perform better with one-shot prompts. This is because the fine-tuned models have seen many example responses during fine-tuning, allowing them to follow the desired format and provide more concise responses. Consequently, we evaluate un-fine-tuned models with one-shot prompts and fine-tuned models with zero-shot prompts.

5 Experiment Results

5.1 Research Question 1. How does fine-tuning impact the planning capabilities of LLMs?

To evaluate the planning capabilities and transferability of LLMs precisely, we prepared multiple testing tasks with varying numbers of blocks in the Blocksworld domain. Specifically, there are 100, 1000, 500, and 500 testing tasks for 3-block, 4-block, 5-block, and 6-block settings, respectively. In contrast, the Logistics domain has too many variables (e.g., the number of cities, locations, trucks, airplanes, etc.) that affect task complexity, making it challenging to identify which variable impacts task difficulty the most. Therefore, we randomly selected 300 instances with varying numbers of variables as the testing data for the Logistics domain.

5.1.1 Significant Improvement Brought by Fine-tuning

First, we measured the planning capabilities of LLMs before fine-tuning, with the results presented in Table 1. Notably, LLMs without fine-tuning exhibit weak planning abilities when provided with only one example in the prompt. These results align with existing criticisms of LLMs' planning capabilities in the literature.

Next, we evaluated the planning capabilities of LLMs after fine-tuning them on planning tasks using two sample sizes: large (1000 samples) and small (100 samples). Table 2 presents the test

Table 1: Task solved rate of un-finetuned LLMs.

Domain		GPT-3.5-turbo	Llama-3-8b
Blocksworld	3-block	8.0% (8/100)	0.0% (0/100)
	4-block	3.7% (37/1000)	0.0% (0/1000)
	5-block	1.2% (6/500)	0.0% (0/500)
	6-block	0.4% (2/500)	0.0% (0/500)
Logistics		0.7% (2/300)	0.0% (0/300)

performance of LLMs after fine-tuning. Remarkably, the planning capabilities of LLMs were significantly enhanced after fine-tuning, even with a small number of samples. Additionally, we tested the fine-tuned models on the dataset from [19], where GPT-3.5-turbo and Llama-3-8b achieved solved rates of 90.6% and 84.3%, respectively. Humans are reported in [19] to have a solved rate of 78%. These findings challenge the prevailing notion that LLMs are inherently weak at planning.

Table 2: Task solved rate of fine-tuned LLMs. GPT-3.5-turbo and Llama-3-8b fine-tuned with 100 and 1000 samples are denoted as GPT-3.5-100/Llama-3-100 and GPT-3.5-1k/Llama-3-1k, respectively. We use 4-block samples for Blocksworld and samples with varying numbers of variables for Logistics.

Domain		GPT-3.5-100	GPT-3.5-1k	Llama-3-100	Llama-3-1k
Blocksworld	3-block	65.0%	98.0%	57.0%	85.0%
	4-block	61.8%	91.9%	43.9%	91.3%
	5-block	36.4%	65.8%	19.6%	46.4%
	6-block	15.4%	34.0%	3.6%	15.0%
Logistics		7.5%	73.0%	2.8%	72.7%

5.1.2 Data Scaling Effect

We then examined the effect of data scaling on LLMs’ planning capabilities. Figure 3 shows LLM’s planning capabilities improve as the amount of fine-tuning data increases. However, this improvement follows an asymptotic pattern – while initial increases in sample size lead to substantial performance gains, the rate of improvement (slope) diminishes as more samples are added. When provided with 4000 examples, LLMs achieve excellent performance levels. In Blocksworld, GPT-3.5-turbo and Llama-3-8b achieved 96.5% and 99.3% solved rates, respectively, with 4000 fine-tuning samples. In the Logistics domain, Llama-3-8b reached a 94.7% solved rate with 4000 fine-tuning samples.




Figure 3: Model performance versus the number of fine-tuning samples. GPT-3.5-turbo finetuned with 4000 Logistics samples is omitted in this experiment due to high economic costs.

From the above results, we can conclude that GPT-3.5-turbo demonstrates superior planning capabilities compared to the Llama models both before and after fine-tuning. However, GPT-3.5-turbo is outperformed by Llama-3-8b when both are fine-tuned with 4000 samples in our experiment. This discrepancy is because we restricted the number of fine-tuning epochs for GPT-3.5-turbo due to high economic costs, whereas the Llama models were fine-tuned for significantly more epochs.

5.1.3 Transferability

Furthermore, we explored the transfer performance of LLMs to different tasks and domains after fine-tuning.

In-domain Transferability: We assessed LLM’s transfer performance to different tasks within the same domain after fine-tuning. The base models, GPT-3.5-turbo and Llama-3-8b, were fine-tuned with 1000 samples of 4-block, 5-block, and 6-block tasks, respectively. The fine-tuned models were then evaluated on tasks with different block numbers than those used in fine-tuning. Note that we did not fine-tune the base models with 1000 3-block samples because the 3-block setting does not have enough distinct samples. The in-domain transferability results are provided in Table 3.

Our results indicate that LLMs exhibit good in-domain transferability and can apply their acquired planning capabilities to new challenges. For example, GPT-3.5 fine-tuned with 5-block tasks transfers well (68.0%) to 6-block tasks, even when the tasks involve unseen block colors. Notably, LLMs transfer better to less complex tasks within the same domain. GPT and Llama fine-tuned with 6-block tasks did not achieve the best performance and transferability because 1000 samples are insufficient for LLMs to achieve a good performance on 6-block tasks.

Table 3: LLM’s transferability within the same domain after fine-tuning. GPT-3.5 and Llama-3 finetuned with x-block tasks are denoted as GPT-3.5-xblock and Llama-3-xblock respectively.

Finetuned Model	Testing Tasks			
	3-block	4-block	5-block	6-block
GPT-3.5-4block	98.0%	91.9%	65.8%	34.0%
GPT-3.5-5block	81.0%	88.0%	84.8%	68.0%
GPT-3.5-6block	74.0%	75.4%	77.0%	70.6%
Llama-3-4block	85.0%	91.3%	46.4%	15.0%
Llama-3-5block	73.0%	82.3%	71.6%	39.2%
Llama-3-6block	63.0%	65.6%	69.2%	58.6%

Cross-domain Transferability: To assess cross-domain transferability, we fine-tuned the base models in one domain and then evaluated them in another. Specifically, we fine-tuned the base models with 200 tasks from the Blocksworld domain and evaluated their performance in the Logistics domain. Similarly, we fine-tuned the base models with 400 tasks from the Logistics domain and then evaluated them in the Blocksworld domain. We used relatively small sample sizes in this experiment to prevent the LLMs from overfitting to the response patterns and dynamics of a single domain. The cross-domain transferability results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: LLM’s transferability across domains.

Test Domain	Model	un-finetuned	Fine-tuning Tasks	
			Blocksworld	Logistics
Blocksworld	GPT-3.5	3.7%	72.4%	3.1%
	Llama-3	0%	54.2%	0.3%
Logistics	GPT-3.5	0.7%	0.3%	45.8%
	Llama-3	0%	0%	44.4%

Notably, LLMs exhibit poor transferability across different planning domains after fine-tuning, even worse than un-fine-tuned models. This is due to the significant differences between automated planning domains in terms of actions, predicates, objects, etc., making it difficult for LLMs to generalize across them. Consequently, to enable LLMs to acquire multi-task capabilities, it is necessary to fine-tune them on tasks from multiple domains collectively. A detailed analysis of how data composition affects fine-tuning outcomes is provided in the extended experiment section in the appendix. In summary, while fine-tuning on mixed data enables LLMs to effectively acquire multi-task planning capabilities, it also introduces a slightly higher variance in outcomes.

5.2 Research Question 2: Can we identify the most effective samples to enhance sample efficiency in fine-tuning?

In this section, we demonstrate that MDFT-g identifies the most representative and effective samples, thereby improving the sample efficiency in fine-tuning. Additionally, we found that MDFT-l also outperforms Random, highlighting the value of the maximum diversity fine-tuning (MDFT) strategy. We simplified testing data composition for Blocksworld, as detailed performance on different types of tasks was unnecessary for analysis in this section. We uniformly sampled from the four types of testing settings (i.e., 3-block, 4-block, 5-block, 6-block) to collectively create a testing dataset with 1000 instances. Testing data for Logistics remains consistent with the previous sections.

First, we illustrate the effectiveness of the clustering-based method in solving the maximum diversity problem. Figure 4 shows the subsets of samples identified by MDFT-g and MDFT-l. In both plots, the selected samples (red stars) are located nearest to the centroids of each cluster, ensuring a diverse and broad coverage of the entire vector space. However, the data points in each cluster for MDFT-l (b) are very dense and close together due to the limitations of language embeddings in capturing the complexity of planning tasks. This results in clusters being far apart, influenced more by narrative differences than by task structure. In contrast, MDFT-g (a), which uses graph embeddings, represents tasks with greater expressiveness. This method captures the structural nuances of planning tasks more effectively, resulting in more representative clustering and diverse sample selection.




Figure 4: Illustration of subset samples selected by (a) MDFT-g and (b) MDFT-l. Each point represents a planning task in Blocksworld, encoded in vector space. The sample point closest to each cluster centroid is selected for the subset.

Table 5: Task solved rate in the Blocksworld domain. Results are presented as mean \pm standard deviation. GPT and Llama results are collected across three and five random seeds respectively.

Base Model	Algorithm	Subset Size			
		$k = 100$	$k = 200$	$k = 400$	$k = 1000$
GPT-3.5-turbo	Random	61.8 \pm 1.9%	72.4 \pm 1.8%	81.9 \pm 1.5%	91.9 \pm 1.2%
	MDFT-l	60.4 \pm 1.6%	73.2 \pm 1.4%	82.8 \pm 1.3%	92.5 \pm 1.0%
	MDFT-g	71.7\pm1.7%	77.6\pm2.0%	85.8\pm1.3%	94.9\pm0.8%
Llama-2-7b	Random	28.8 \pm 3.6%	30.3 \pm 8.6%	50.0 \pm 1.0%	74.6 \pm 3.7%
	MDFT-l	24.8 \pm 4.4%	32.6 \pm 3.8%	51.5 \pm 1.4%	74.2 \pm 2.9%
	MDFT-g	32.5\pm2.1%	37.2\pm4.5%	52.9\pm1.3%	75.7\pm0.7%
Llama-3-8b	Random	43.9 \pm 2.9%	54.2 \pm 6.8%	67.6 \pm 3.3%	86.3 \pm 0.8%
	MDFT-l	42.0 \pm 3.9%	53.6 \pm 5.4%	69.2 \pm 4.5%	87.1 \pm 0.7%
	MDFT-g	51.2\pm5.3%	59.5\pm3.7%	71.6\pm2.4%	88.5\pm0.7%

Next, we empirically demonstrate MDFT-g’s effectiveness at different scales. In Blocksworld, we created five thousand instances with varying numbers of blocks as the training dataset. Using Random, MDFT-l, and MDFT-g, we selected task subsets of varying sizes ($k = 100, 200, 400,$ and 1000) and fine-tuned the base models, then evaluated them on testing data. Complete results for Blocksworld and Logistics are shown in Tables 5 and 6. MDFT-g consistently outperforms Random and MDFT-l

at various scales in both domains. MDFT-g significantly improves sample efficiency in fine-tuning, particularly at smaller scales. For instance, MDFT-g with $k = 100$ achieves a 71.7% solved rate, a performance that requires Random and MDFT-l to have around 200 samples. MDFT-g shows smaller performance margins as sample size increases because the improvement brought by a new sample diminishes as sample size increases. Thus, MDFT-g is particularly effective and beneficial in scenarios where fine-tuning incurs high economic or computational costs, making it ideal for applications with limited resources or stringent efficiency requirements.

Table 6: Task solved rate in Logistics. GPT and Llama results are collected across three and five random seeds respectively. GPT fine-tuned with 1000 samples is omitted due to high economic costs.

Base Model	Algorithm	Subset Size			
		$k = 100$	$k = 200$	$k = 400$	$k = 1000$
GPT-3.5-turbo	Random	7.5±2.5%	20.6±2.1%	45.8±3.8%	–
	MDFT-l	8.3±1.5%	19.3±2.7%	42.2±2.1%	–
	MDFT-g	11.1±1.6%	25.0±1.2%	51.8±1.2%	–
Llama-2-7b	Random	0.4±0.1%	1.9±0.3%	11.9±1.3%	53.0±2.1%
	MDFT-l	0.8±0.3%	2.0±0.4%	12.4±3.0%	54.1±2.4%
	MDFT-g	0.4±0.2%	4.7±0.9%	15.5±1.5%	56.1±1.8%
Llama-3-8b	Random	2.8±1.1%	10.3±0.7%	44.4±1.5%	72.7±3.1%
	MDFT-l	3.9±1.0%	8.8±1.5%	46.8±3.8%	73.2±1.8%
	MDFT-g	5.3±1.0%	12.9±1.6%	49.8±2.6%	75.3±0.8%

Finally, we compare the performance between MDFT-l and Random in detail. Figure 5 presents the win-tie-loss comparison between MDFT-l and Random. MDFT-g is omitted from this comparison as it is consistently superior. In Figure 5, MDFT-l wins most comparisons in both Blocksworld and Logistics, further confirming the effectiveness of the maximum diversity fine-tuning strategy.




Figure 5: Performance comparison between MDFT-l and Random.

6 Limitations

While the proposed algorithm enhances LLMs’ performance in automated planning with higher sample efficiency, the planning capabilities acquired in one domain are not transferable to new domains. Although the mixed-data fine-tuning approach proves effective, it also introduces higher variance in outcomes, indicating the need for further refinement and stability enhancements. Addressing these limitations will be the focus of our future work. Cross-domain transferability in planning remains an underexplored area, highlighting a significant opportunity for further investigation.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we demonstrated that fine-tuning significantly enhances the planning capabilities of LLMs, even with limited data. To improve sample efficiency in fine-tuning, we introduced the Maximum Diversity Fine-Tuning (MDFT) strategy. Our clustering-based method can effectively solve the maximum diversity problem, ensuring a broad and representative sample set. Our proposed methods, MDFT-g, which uses graph embeddings, and MDFT-l, which uses language embeddings, were shown to outperform random sampling. These findings underscore the value of strategic sample selection in maximizing the performance and efficiency of LLM fine-tuning for automated planning.

References

- [1] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [3] D. Cer, Y. Yang, S.-y. Kong, N. Hua, N. Limtiaco, R. S. John, N. Constant, M. Guajardo-Cespedes, S. Yuan, C. Tar, et al. Universal sentence encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.11175*, 2018.
- [4] B. Chen, C. Shu, E. Shareghi, N. Collier, K. Narasimhan, and S. Yao. Fireact: Toward language agent fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05915*, 2023.
- [5] N. Ding, Y. Qin, G. Yang, F. Wei, Z. Yang, Y. Su, S. Hu, Y. Chen, C.-M. Chan, W. Chen, et al. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large-scale pre-trained language models. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(3):220–235, 2023.
- [6] J. B. Ghosh. Computational aspects of the maximum diversity problem. *Operations research letters*, 19(4):175–181, 1996.
- [7] L. Guan, K. Valmeekam, S. Sreedharan, and S. Kambhampati. Leveraging pre-trained large language models to construct and utilize world models for model-based task planning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:79081–79094, 2023.
- [8] M. Helmert. The fast downward planning system. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 26:191–246, 2006.
- [9] R. Howey, D. Long, and M. Fox. Val: Automatic plan validation, continuous effects and mixed initiative planning using pddl. In *16th IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence*, pages 294–301. IEEE, 2004.
- [10] W. Huang, P. Abbeel, D. Pathak, and I. Mordatch. Language models as zero-shot planners: Extracting actionable knowledge for embodied agents. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9118–9147. PMLR, 2022.
- [11] B. Liu, Y. Jiang, X. Zhang, Q. Liu, S. Zhang, J. Biswas, and P. Stone. Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*, 2023.
- [12] D. Long and M. Fox. The 3rd international planning competition: Results and analysis. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 20:1–59, 2003.
- [13] R. Martí, M. Gallego, A. Duarte, and E. G. Pardo. Heuristics and metaheuristics for the maximum diversity problem. *Journal of Heuristics*, 19:591–615, 2013.
- [14] V. Pallagani, B. Muppasani, K. Murugesan, F. Rossi, B. Srivastava, L. Horesh, F. Fabiano, and A. Loreggia. Understanding the capabilities of large language models for automated planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16151*, 2023.
- [15] O. Rivlin, T. Hazan, and E. Karpas. Generalized planning with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.02305*, 2020.
- [16] T. Silver, R. Chitnis, A. Curtis, J. B. Tenenbaum, T. Lozano-Pérez, and L. P. Kaelbling. Planning with learned object importance in large problem instances using graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pages 11962–11971, 2021.
- [17] R. Tinn, H. Cheng, Y. Gu, N. Usuyama, X. Liu, T. Naumann, J. Gao, and H. Poon. Fine-tuning large neural language models for biomedical natural language processing. *Patterns*, 4(4), 2023.

- [18] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [19] K. Valmeekam, M. Marquez, S. Sreedharan, and S. Kambhampati. On the planning abilities of large language models—a critical investigation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [20] L. Van der Maaten and G. Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11), 2008.
- [21] Z. Wang, S. Cai, G. Chen, A. Liu, X. S. Ma, and Y. Liang. Describe, explain, plan and select: interactive planning with llms enables open-world multi-task agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [22] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, F. Xia, E. Chi, Q. V. Le, D. Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [23] S. Yao, J. Zhao, D. Yu, N. Du, I. Shafran, K. Narasimhan, and Y. Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022.
- [24] S. Yao, D. Yu, J. Zhao, I. Shafran, T. Griffiths, Y. Cao, and K. Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [25] H. Yuan, C. Zhang, H. Wang, F. Xie, P. Cai, H. Dong, and Z. Lu. Skill reinforcement learning and planning for open-world long-horizon tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16563*, 2023.
- [26] H. Zhao, M. Andriushchenko, F. Croce, and N. Flammarion. Long is more for alignment: A simple but tough-to-beat baseline for instruction fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04833*, 2024.
- [27] C. Zhou, P. Liu, P. Xu, S. Iyer, J. Sun, Y. Mao, X. Ma, A. Efrat, P. Yu, L. Yu, et al. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [28] Y. Zhu, S. Lu, L. Zheng, J. Guo, W. Zhang, J. Wang, and Y. Yu. Taxygen: A benchmarking platform for text generation models. In *The 41st international ACM SIGIR conference on research & development in information retrieval*, pages 1097–1100, 2018.