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Introduzione

- Ambito dell’attività di tesi

- Obiettivi dell’attività di tesi

Stato dell’arte

- Documentare tutto ciò che esisteva prima della tesi in termini di tecnologie, metodologie e modelli

2/3 capitoli di metodologia in cui spiega cosa ha effettivamente svolto, progettato e realizzato (architettura software, addestramento di modelli, dati utilizzati e loro composizione etc..)

- 1 capitolo su i risultati

- 1 breve capitolo di conclusioni in cui ricapitola il tutto traendo le conclusioni e proponendo degli sviluppi futuri.

# Introduction

In this thesis work we want to explore the use of Large Language Models (LLMs) in hardware diagnostics. LLMs have shown good memorization and "understanding" capabilities of natural language, even in reasoning tasks. Especially in the case in which the models know the environment in which they operate.

In our case, we initially want to make the LLMs understand how a hardware architecture is structured so that the model is able to solve the diagnostics at its best. Subsequently, we want to exploit the capabilities of the LLMs to identify any problems in the hardware by analysing system logs, telemetry data and hardware functionality test results. To carry out these activities it was necessary to create a specific dataset and a simulation environment. We also implemented the Open WebUI graphical interface.

So, we have two objectives, the first is to verify that the LLMs are able to understand the hardware architecture. While the second is to verify that the LLMs are able to understand and solve hardware problems. This work was based on In-Context Learning (ICL) and Prompt Engineering. In particular, we compared the performance of different models according to various metrics.

# 1. State Of The Art

## 1.1 Natural Language Processing (NLP)

NLP is an interdisciplinary sub-branch of linguistics, computer science, and artificial intelligence (AI) that deals with the interaction between computers and natural language or human language. In particular, it uses algorithms to analyse and extract the content of documents in natural language with the aim of making a computer “understand” the content of documents, including the contextual nuances of the language, as well as classify and categorize the documents themselves.

This process is difficult and complex due to the intrinsic characteristics of ambiguity of natural language. In fact, NLP is considered a difficult problem in computer science because the “laws” that govern natural language are difficult for computers to interpret, in fact sometimes they can make mistakes and attribute incorrect meanings that lead to incorrect and difficult to understand results.

## 1.2 Large Language Models (LLMs)

LLMs are machine learning models with many parameters, designed for natural language processing (NLP) tasks, especially text generation. These models are typically built using deep neural networks, particularly transformer architectures, and are trained on massive corpora of textual data. They are trained with self-supervised learning on a vast amount of text. Their strength lies in the ability to capture complex syntactic, semantic, and contextual patterns, allowing them to perform a wide range of tasks such as translation, summarization, question answering, and reasoning.

LLMs can be fine-tuned for specific tasks or guided by prompt engineering, as done in this work. These models acquire predictive power regarding syntax, semantics, and ontologies inherent in human language corpora, but they also inherit inaccuracies and biases present in the data they are trained in.

The core idea behind LLMs is to learn a statistical model of language by predicting the next word (or token) in a sentence, given a context. This is achieved using self-supervised learning, where the model learns from raw text without the need for labelled data. During training, the model builds internal representations that encode meaning, structure, and dependencies across sequences of words.

The largest and most capable LLMs are generative pre-trained transformers (GPTs).

Modern LLMs like OpenAI’s GPT and DeepSeek’s DeepSeek series or Meta’s LLaMA models are characterized by having billions or even trillions of parameters. The performance of these models tends to improve significantly as the number of parameters and the size of the training data increase, a phenomenon often referred to as “scaling laws.”

In addition to linguistic capabilities, recent LLMs demonstrate emergent properties such as reasoning, commonsense inference, and even basic code generation. However, they also exhibit limitations, including sensitivity to prompt phrasing, hallucination of facts, and the presence of biases derived from the training data. So, in the context of training LLMs, datasets are typically cleaned by removing low-quality, duplicated, or toxic data. Cleaned datasets can increase training efficiency and lead to improved downstream performance.

As all the others machine learning (ML) algorithms, LLMs process numbers rather than text, the text must be converted to numbers through the tokenization process. Tokenization is a fundamental process in LLM pipelines. Before text is processed by a model, it is converted into tokens. In the first step, a vocabulary is decided upon, then integer indices are arbitrarily but uniquely assigned to each vocabulary entry, and finally, an embedding is associated to the integer index.

Most results previously achievable only by (costly) fine-tuning, can be achieved through prompt engineering, although limited to the scope of a single conversation (more precisely, limited to the scope of a context window). Due to the high training costs and the huge amount of data needed, we did not implement a fine-tune, instead we worked in the field of ICL. Also, because it is already sufficient to achieve our goals.

In our thesis work, LLMs serve a dual role: first, as systems capable of understanding the architecture and components of hardware environments through descriptive prompts; second, as tools capable of interpreting system logs and telemetry to support fault diagnosis.

## 1.3 Self-Supervised Learning (SSL)

SSL is a paradigm in machine learning where a model is trained on a task using the data itself to generate supervisory signals, rather than relying on externally provided labels. In the context of neural networks, self-supervised learning aims to leverage inherent structures or relationships within the input data to create meaningful training signals. SSL tasks are designed so that solving them requires capturing essential features or relationships in the data.

Auto-associative self-supervised learning is a specific category of SSL where a neural network is trained to reproduce or reconstruct its own input data. In other words, the model is tasked with learning a representation of the data that captures its essential features or structure, allowing it to regenerate the original input.

## 1.4 Prompt Engineering

Prompt engineering is the process of structuring or crafting an instruction in order to produce the best possible output from a generative AI model.

In case of text-to-text language models a *prompt* is natural language text describing the task that an AI should perform. It can be a query, a command, or a longer statement including context, instructions, and conversation history. Prompt engineering may involve phrasing a query, specifying a style, choice of words and grammar, providing relevant context, or describing a character for the AI to mimic.

There are many different types of prompt engineering:

* Chain-of-Thought (CoT): it is a reasoning technique that goes through several intermediate steps before giving a definitive answer to a question.

The CoT prompting improves reasoning ability by inducing the model to answer a multi-step problem with steps of reasoning that mimic a train of thought. These techniques were developed to aid common sense reasoning and multi-step reasoning.

The prompt specifies some examples of questions and answers (Q&A); this improved the results considerably. Even just writing "let's think step by step" improved the results a lot. Allowing you to generalize and avoid writing many specific examples that consume the context.

* In-Context Learning (ICL): it is the ability of models to learn information temporarily. The information of interest is specified in the prompt, typically in the initial part. This information is then used by the model in the session to answer questions by generating text, this allows the model to be trained without necessarily having to perform fine-tuning.

The weights of the network are not updated, so the information is temporary. Starting a new instance the model does not retain this knowledge.

* Prompting to estimate model sensitivity: research consistently demonstrates that LLMs are highly sensitive to subtle variations in prompt formatting, structure, and linguistic properties. Linguistic features significantly influence prompt effectiveness—such as morphology, syntax, and lexico-semantic changes—which meaningfully enhance task performance across a variety of tasks.

To address sensitivity of models and make them more robust, several methods have been proposed. Format Spread facilitates systematic analysis by evaluating a range of plausible prompt formats, offering a more comprehensive performance interval. Similarly, Prompt Eval estimates performance distributions across different prompts, enabling robust metrics such as performance quantiles and accurate evaluations under constrained budgets.

* Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG): it is a technique that enables generative AI models to retrieve and incorporate new information. It modifies interactions with a LLM so that the model responds to user queries with reference to a specified set of documents, using this information to supplement information from its pre-existing training data. This allows LLMs to use domain-specific and/or updated information.
* Few-shot: the model is already pre-trained and fine-tuned to become instruct. Few-shot means that in inference in the prompt are put from zero to 4/5 task examples before the request for an actual task.

There are many other techniques, but they are not relevant to this work. In this work we mainly focused on ICL and CoT, building a customized few-shot technique.

## 1.5 Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT)

A GPT is a type of LLM and a prominent framework framework for generative AI. It is an artificial neural network that is used in NLP by machines. It is based on the transformer deep learning architecture, pre-trained on large datasets of unlabelled text, and able to generate novel human-like content. As of 2023, most LLMs had these characteristics and are sometimes referred to broadly as GPTs.

The first GPT was introduced in 2018 by OpenAI. OpenAI has released significant GPT foundation models (models trained on board data at scale such that they can be adapted to a wide range of downstream tasks) that have been sequentially numbered, to comprise it “GPT-n” series. Each of this was significantly more capable than the previous, due to increased size (number of trainable parameters) and training. Such models have been the basis for their more task specific GPT systems, including models fine-tuned for instruction following.

GPT is based on the transformer architecture.

## 1.6 Transformer

A transformer is a self-attention-based ML model that specializes in processing sequential data. Transformers use self-attention to process sequences of input such as sequences of words in a text. The self-attention mechanism allows the model to give more weight to certain parts of the input so that it pays more attention to relevant information and ignores less important information. The self-attention mechanism allows the model to access all previous states and evaluate them based on a learned relevance measure, providing relevant information about distant tokens. The weights are essentially computed in the later states of the architecture.

This ability to pay attention to specific parts of the text makes transformers particularly suitable for NLP where useful information may be dispersed in a sequence of words.

The transformer is highly parallelized since it does not process the input one word at a time sequentially but processes the entire input all at once in a parallel manner, which reduces training time and increases efficiency as it has greater understanding of the text.

Transformers use two main mechanisms:

* Multi-head attention allows the model to pay attention to multiple specific parts of the input at the same time.
* Transformer-based encoding allows the model to capture long-term context information.

Transformer architecture has encoder and decoder.

## 1.7 Llama

## 1.8 Diagnostics

# 2. Method

## 2.1 Preliminary activities

The purpose of these firsts activities is to evaluate the ability of LLMs in understanding the hardware structure of a sample system and its interconnections, and to determine whether representation of the system architecture is more effective in making the model understand the system architecture. This is therefore an initial proof of concept (PoC).

I have experimented three system architecture representations: textual, JSON and tabular representation of the network architecture. All these representations are always in text format since LLMs only understand text.

We have experimented with various models according to the available hardware capacity for this phase, especially meta-llama/llama3.2-3B-Instruct and microsoft/Phi-4-mini-reasoning.

For this phase I had an NVIDIA GA104GLM RTX A3000 Mobile GPU with 6GB of memory. Consequently, I had to perform the tests with small models and the use of 8-bit and 4-bit quantization.

To test the models on the understanding of the connection topology (the architecture of the System) I created a dataset of 94 questions, in which it is asked what is connected from port/interface A to B, and vice versa. From this dataset I extract a subsample of questions to ask the model to verify if it has "understood" and remembers the architecture. Since the GPU used in this phase has only 6GB of memory, it is not possible to ask all the questions together.

Since the LLMs answer open questions with generally always different and long text, I taught the model (specifying rules in the system prompt) to answer by indicating only the name of the connected component. In this way it is possible to automatically parse the answers to evaluate the accuracy.

The system prompt consists of a short description of the task that the model must perform and its role, a set of rules on the representation of the architecture and the names of the devices, a list of the devices, the representation itself in its format and finally some examples of questions and answers. This PoC is therefore based on a combination of the prompt engineering techniques shown in the previous chapter.



### 2.1.1 Questions dataset

I manually built a dataset with 94 questions and corresponding answers about the system interconnections topology. The dataset contains questions like “What is connected to A?” for all ports and interfaces of all devices. So, if A is connected to B there is the dual question (the answer is B when asking about A and vice versa). In the dataset there are also few questions about components that do not exists. The responses are of the type "The C is connected to D", "Nothing" if there is nothing connected or "The interface/port D does not exist for device G".

To calculate the accuracy, a subset of questions is randomly extracted and asked to the model. Due to GPU memory limitations, I could not ask the models all questions at once.

I calculate the accuracy in reporting the asked questions and in correctly responding to questions. All the models can report the questions (the accuracy was always 100%), so they know the request but in answering/reasoning they had more difficulties.

### 2.1.2 Prompt structure

The prompt is specific for each type of representation. At the beginning of the prompt is defined the model task.



In the successive part initially, I put the components definitions



After some experiments I removed the definitions because it was not helpful in interconnections understanding and the size of the prompt matter.

In the successive part there are the naming conventions and other rulers depending on the representation, the representation itself and finally the Q&A examples (few-shot).

### 2.1.3 Textual representation

### 2.1.4 Json representation

### 2.1.5 Tabular representation

### 2.1.6 Models results

### 2.1.7 Model dimension limit

The tests for this part have been done with meta-llama/llama3.2-3B-Instruct model and the textual representation.

I did a first experimental test with twenty questions before the tests done in section [2.1.6](#_2.1.6_Models_results). Here the results of the first test:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Device name format | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Mean |
| Colon | 85.0% (17/20) | 70.0% (14/20) | 100.0% (20/20) | 85.0% |
| Dash | 90.0% (18/20) | 87.5% (17.5/20) | 100.0% (20/20) | 92.5% |

In the first test I noticed most errors were caused by a similar nomenclature in multi-device components (e.g., Switch-1, Switch-2, Swtich-3). In questions like “What is connected to the Workstation-1-eth0?” the model answered more than one time like “The Switch-3-port-2” while the correct answer was “The Switch-2-port-2”. Then to better highlight the number that makes the devices different I tried a different representation by separating the device name and number from the port/interface with the colon symbol (‘:’). This did not change too much. So, I realized that the problem was due to the size of the model also because the model did not answer correctly to other questions (like “What is connected to ...?”) where the answer was clearly defined in the prompt where the topology is defined. Indeed, a smaller size model has less storage/reasoning capacity. To empirically demonstrate this, I did two experiments:

1. I expanded the context (more questions) resulting in a worsening of accuracy — these are the tests in the section [2.1.6](#_2.1.6_Models_results).
2. I reduced the size of the system (maintaining more questions) resulting in an improvement.

Information that is already available from scientific literature (papers) on diagnostics. However, the company wanted to experiment with it. I also feed the system architecture to larger models like GPT-4 and DeepSeek to verify it again. These models correctly understand and answer questions.

To calculate the accuracy in this case I defined a smaller dataset with 34 questions (to test all the interconnections of the smaller system). I feed to the model all the 34 questions for five runs. For simplicity I used only the “dash” representation for device names, also because as I said before it does not really matter. For this reason, I decided to test only the dash name format with the other models.

Run 1 Run 2 Run 3 Run 4 Run 5 Mean

88.2% (30/34) 94.1% (32/34) 91.2% (31/34) 97.1% (33/34) 94.1% (32/34) 92.94%

### 2.1.8 PoC conclusion

## 2.2 Dataset

Since we want to carry out a real diagnostic activity, we have created a specific dataset to carry out an ICL and few-shot (prompt engineering) activity.
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