## Compare RNN vs LLaMA

| Model | Accuracy | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|---|
| **RNN** | 0.8594 | - Simple architecture, easy to implement and train.<br>- Low computational cost, can run on CPU.<br>- Works well for small datasets.<br>- Fast inference for short sequences. | - Lower accuracy on complex language patterns (context, sarcasm, etc.).<br>- Struggles with long-term dependencies.<br>- Limited generalization compared to pretrained LLMs.<br>- Requires feature engineering (e.g., tokenization, embeddings). |
| **LLaMA (pretrained)** | 0.8600 | - Pretrained on massive text corpora, captures semantic meaning effectively.<br>- High accuracy even on small fine-tuning datasets.<br>- Understands context, sarcasm, and nuanced language.<br>- Handles long sequences better than RNNs.<br>- Easy to use with Python SDK. | - Requires GPU for fast inference (CPU possible but slower).<br>- Larger model size increases memory.<br>- Slower training/fine-tuning.<br>- Dependent on external libraries and API support. |