

## GEN AI HANDS-ON 1

Name:- Mithun R

SRN:- PES2UG23CS341

Task	Model	Classification (Success / Failure)	Observation (What actually happened?)	Why did this happen? (Architectural Reason)
Generation	BERT	Failure	Model failed to generate meaningful text or returned errors when used with text-generation pipeline.	BERT is an <b>encoder-only model</b> trained for understanding tasks, not autoregressive next-token prediction.
	RoBERTa	Failure	Similar to BERT, failed or produced invalid output for text generation.	RoBERTa is also <b>encoder-only</b> and does not support causal text generation.
	BART	Success	Generated fluent and coherent text when used for generation tasks.	BART is an <b>encoder-decoder</b> model trained to generate text from corrupted inputs.
Fill-Mask	BERT	Success	Correctly predicted words like <i>“create”</i> , <i>“generate”</i> .	BERT is trained using <b>Masked Language Modeling (MLM)</b> , making it ideal for fill-mask tasks.
	RoBERTa	Success	Accurately predicted masked tokens using <mask>.	RoBERTa improves on BERT’s MLM training with more data and dynamic masking.
	BART	Partial Success	Predicted reasonable words but sometimes less precise than BERT/RoBERTa.	BART supports masking but is optimized more for <b>sequence generation</b> than single-token prediction.

Question Answering (QA)	BERT	Partial Success	Returned incomplete answers like <i>“significant risks such as”</i> .	Extractive QA predicts <b>start/end token spans</b> , often truncating list-based answers.
	RoBERTa	Partial Success	Returned multiple answer spans; some correct, some incomplete.	Better contextual representations, but still limited by <b>extractive selection</b> .
	BART	Failure (Extractive)	Output inconsistent or incorrect. It repeated the context itself.	BART is a <b>generative model</b> ; extractive QA pipelines are not its primary use case.