

Summary of the Experiment:

Versions Used:

1. One-Shot Version:

Result: GPT responds well with a single question, but the answer might lack required details or formatting.

- Strength: Simple and quick.
- Weakness: Might miss details like the team name or points.

2. Few-Shot Version:

- Result: GPT provides accurate responses when clear examples are given, such as the 2009 and 2010 winners.

- Strength: Improves answer accuracy and maintains format consistency.
- Weakness: Can lead to incorrect answers if examples do not cover all possible cases.

3. Explicit Format Request Version:

- Result: Works well when GPT is asked to answer in a specific format (e.g., "Driver", "Team", "Points").

- Strength: Ensures accurate and consistent formatting.
- Weakness: Requires precise and clear instructions.

Key Observations:

- Clarity and context matter: The more specific and detailed the instructions, the better the responses.
- Few-Shot Learning: Providing examples helps improve accuracy, but if the examples are narrow or incomplete, errors may occur.
- Explicit format requests: Asking GPT to respond in a particular format ensures more consistent and accurate answers.

What I Learned:

- Explicit instructions lead to better answers, while simple questions might lack necessary details.