
LEMO-NADE: MULTI-PARAMETER NEURAL ARCHITECTURE DISCOVERY WITH LLMs

A PREPRINT

Md Hafizur Rahman

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Maine
Orono, ME 04469
md.hafizur.rahman@maine.edu

Prabuddha Chakraborty

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Maine
Orono, ME 04469
prabuddha@maine.edu

February 29, 2024

ABSTRACT

Building efficient neural network architectures can be a time-consuming task requiring extensive expert knowledge. This task becomes particularly challenging for edge devices because one has to consider parameters such as power consumption during inferencing, model size, inferencing speed, and CO₂ emissions. In this article, we introduce a novel framework designed to automatically discover new neural network architectures based on user-defined parameters, an expert system, and an LLM trained on a large amount of open-domain knowledge. The introduced framework (LeMo-NADe) is tailored to be used by non-AI experts, does not require a predetermined neural architecture search space, and considers a large set of edge device-specific parameters. We implement and validate this proposed neural architecture discovery framework using CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and ImageNet16-120 datasets while using GPT-4 Turbo and Gemini as the LLM component. We observe that the proposed framework can rapidly (within hours) discover intricate neural network models that perform extremely well across a diverse set of application settings defined by the user.

1 Introduction

Neural networks have found extensive application across various fields such as healthcare [1, 2, 3], surveillance [4, 5], Industry 4.0 [6, 7, 8], and Internet of Things (IoT) [9, 10, 11]. A neural network can be composed of a large number of layers of different types while sporting diverse hyperparameters. Hence, for a given task: (1) finding the right set of neural layers; (2) connecting them in the right topology; and (3) selecting the most optimal hyperparameters for each layer can be a daunting task requiring a large amount of computation resources, human expert involvement, and time. Requiring a given neural network to perform under specific resource-constrained conditions (a case for many IoT/Edge devices) can add to the complexity of the neural architecture search process. For example designing a neural network to have more than $x\%$ accuracy for a given task is a hard problem to solve but it becomes harder if we further constrain the problem with additional parameters such as frames-per-second requirements during inferences and power consumption limits.

Traditional neural architecture search (NAS) frameworks are typically designed to identify the optimal architecture within a specified search space. This approach, although powerful, is limited by the said pre-defined search space failing to innovate and create wildly new architectures. Traditional NAS techniques are designed to primarily focus on improving task accuracy with very little emphasis on additional parameters such as frames-per-second (FPS), power consumption, and green house gas emission that have become more relevant in recent years.

To mitigate these concerns we propose a **Large Language Model** guided **Neural Architecture Discovery** (LeMo-NADe) framework that can allow the discovery of novel neural network architecture without relying on a pre-defined search space. This will be achieved through an iterative approach utilizing a large language model (LLM) and an expert system for driving the LLM towards the target discovery. The expert system will use a set of configurable rules and several

user-defined metrics to generate a set of instructions for the LLM leading to progressive refinement of the generated neural architecture.

To validate the LeMo-NADe framework, we perform extensive experimentation using the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and ImageNet16-120 datasets. We use the framework to generate many different neural networks for diverse application requirements and priorities. Neural networks generated using LeMo-NADe for CIFAR-10 (89.41% test accuracy) and CIFAR-100 (67.90% test accuracy) showed near state-of-the-art level performance. For ImageNet16-120 LeMo-NADe was also able to generate fairly competitive architectures (31.02% test accuracy). LeMo-NADe is also very efficient (time, energy consumption, and CO₂ Emissions) in terms of model generation/training. While using GPT-4 Turbo¹ [12] (as the backend LLM), LeMo-NADe was able to generate and train CIFAR-100 models in about 4.81 hours consuming only about 0.50 kWh-PUE energy. LeMo-NADe is also capable of prioritizing other metrics (besides accuracy) towards creating neural architecture that are optimal for different IoT/Edge requirements (e.g. high speed low accuracy inferencing) and more importantly, has created novel neural architectures from scratch creating a new opportunity for search-space agnostic neural architecture search research.

To summarize, we offer the following contributions:

1. Formalize and design a search-space agnostic neural architecture discovery framework (LeMo-NADe) leveraging Large Language Models (LLMs).
2. Propose an expert system with associated rules and relevant metrics that is capable of driving a given LLM towards discovering different neural architectures.
3. Implement LeMo-NADe as a highly configurable/efficient tool for immediate application and easy future extensions.
4. Qualitatively and quantitatively evaluate LeMo-NADe using CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and ImageNet16-120 datasets for diverse settings and application requirements.

2 Background and Motivation

In this section, we briefly describe the recent advances in the domain of neural architecture search. We also highlight the motivation behind our work stemming from different shortcomings of traditional NAS frameworks.

2.1 Neural Architecture Search

Methods of Neural Architecture Search (NAS) extensively applied across various research areas, such as image processing [13, 14, 15], signal processing [16, 17, 18], object detection [19, 20], and natural language processing [21, 22]. It involves identifying the best neural network (judged traditionally based on only accuracy) for a given task through repeated trials. The early NAS techniques worked mainly based on the evolutionary algorithms (EA) [23] and reinforcement learning (RL) [24]. Although these methods showed promising result by building quality networks they require high computing power and time. To solve this issue, weight-reusing [25] approaches were proposed that avoids the necessity of training each design from the beginning resulting in low computation cost. One-shot approaches for NAS [26] were also proposed which involves training a large network called SuperNet that incorporates every conceivable architecture within the search domain. DNAS [27] is another weight re-using approach where all the SubNet parameters are optimized by gradient decent.

NAS is hard to reproduce due to its high computational power and time. To limit this issue researchers proposed NAS benchmark dataset that contains all the possible architecture with corresponding evaluation results. One NAS dataset is NAS-Bench-101 [28] that contains 5 million distinct neural architectures and is trained on CIFAR-10 dataset. The NAS-Bench-201 [29] dataset has 15625 cell layouts and is derived from a cell-based search technique and is trained on CIFAR-10 [30], CIFAR-100 [30] and ImageNet16-120 [31] datasets. In [32], the authors proposed a NAS method named as β -DARTS to solve weak generalization ability found in DARTS method. They used the NAS-Bench-201 to evaluate their framework. In another research work [33], authors suggested Λ -DARTS as a solution for the structural flaws caused by the weight sharing approach in DARTS. In a recent work [34], authors proposed a framework named GENIUS where they used LLM to solve the NAS problem while utilizing pre-defined search spaces.

2.2 Shortcomings of NAS

Traditional NAS algorithms typically focuses on improving accuracy and give little priority to parameters such as inferencing speed, training power consumption, and CO₂ emissions. However, in recent years, it has become important

¹gpt-4-1106-preview

to consider these parameters during the neural network design process due to: (1) an increase in the number of resource-constrained edge devices; and (2) environmental concerns arising from excessive AI-related power utilization and CO₂ emissions. Most traditional NAS techniques also rely on having access to a pre-defined search space (of potential neural architectures) making it difficult to scale across different applications and use cases.

2.3 Why LLM for Neural Discovery?

We hypothesize that a Large Language Model (LLM) that is trained on a large volume of open-domain data will inevitably also have the knowledge about different neural architectures. LLMs have demonstrated success in terms of searching for neural network architectures given a search space [35, 34, 36]. However, we wanted to go one step further and find out if LLMs can generate novel neural network architecture (discovery) without being pointed to a pre-defined search space. We also wanted to analyze if: (1) the open-domain knowledge has provided these LLMs with insights into different metrics associated with a neural architecture such as estimated training power consumption, inferencing speed, and CO₂ emissions during inference; (2) these LLMs can follow automated instructions generated from an expert system for refining a neural network.




Figure 1: Overview of the LeMo-NADe framework.

3 Methodology

In this section, we will describe and discuss the LeMo-NADe framework.

3.1 Neural Discovery Process

In Figure 1 we show an overview of the LeMo-NADe framework where an Expert System (ES) takes the task specification from the user (metrics) and generates commands for the LLM using a set of rules for creating a neural architecture. The generated neural network from the LLM is then evaluated and the associated evaluation-based metrics are used by ES to generate the next LLM command.

Algorithm 1 shows the overall procedure of LeMo-NADe. It takes user-defined metrics (UDM), task specification (TS), termination condition (TC), and the initial command (*Initial_Cmd*) as input from the user. From lines 2-6, all variables are initialized and the initial command (designed based on the task specification) is stored in the cmd variable. In line 8, LLM_AGI (the GPT-4 Turbo [12] and Gemini [37] as LLM component) returns a response based on the command and subsequently, a model is created from the response. From lines 11-13, the generated model is trained and evaluated with the training and validation datasets respectively and a set of metrics such as training energy (E_1), training accuracy (A_1), validation energy (E_2) and validation accuracy (A_2) are calculated and stored in the Metrics dictionary. The Metrics dictionary is then passed to the NNGES (Algorithm 2) to generate a set of instructions for the next round of LLM-based neural network generation. Any conflicts between the generated instructions are removed using Algorithm

Algorithm 1 LeMo-NADe Neural Network Discovery

```

1: function AI_AG(UDM, TS, TC, Initial_Cmd)
2:   BCM  $\leftarrow$   $\emptyset$ 
3:   Metrics  $\leftarrow$  UDM
4:   BestModel  $\leftarrow$   $\emptyset$ 
5:   cmd  $\leftarrow$  Initial_Cmd
6:   TC = False
7:   while TC = False do
8:     Response  $\leftarrow$  LLM_AGI(cmd)
9:     Model  $\leftarrow$  Create_Model(Response)
10:    Metrics.P  $\leftarrow$  Model.params
11:    [Model, Metrics.E1]  $\leftarrow$  Model.train(TS.train_set)
12:    Metrics.A1  $\leftarrow$  Model.eval(train_set)
13:    [Metrics.E2, Metrics.A2]  $\leftarrow$  Model.eval(val)
14:    cmd  $\leftarrow$  NNGES(Metrics)
15:    cmd  $\leftarrow$  RESOLVE_CONFLICT(cmd)
16:    CM  $\leftarrow$  Model_Effectiveness(Metrics)
17:    if CM > BCM then
18:      BCM  $\leftarrow$  CM
19:      BestModel  $\leftarrow$  Model
20:    end if
21:    if Termination Condition is Met then
22:      TC = True
23:    end if
24:  end while
25:  return BestModel
26: end function

```

TABLE 1: PROPOSED USER-DEFINED AND EVALUATION BASED METRICS.

LEGENDS	DESCRIPTION	TYPE
A_1	TRAINING ACCURACY OF THE CURRENT MODEL (CM) PREDICTED BY LLM/AGI	EVALUATION BASED
PA_1	PRIORITY OF THE TRAINING ACCURACY	USER DEFINED
TA_1	THRESHOLD OF THE TRAINING ACCURACY	USER DEFINED
A_2	VALIDATION ACCURACY OF THE CURRENT MODEL (CM) PREDICTED BY LLM/AGI	EVALUATION BASED
PA_2	PRIORITY OF THE VALIDATION ACCURACY	USER DEFINED
TA_2	THRESHOLD OF THE VALIDATION ACCURACY	USER DEFINED
E_1	ENERGY REQUIRED FOR EVALUATING THE TRAINING SET	EVALUATION BASED
PE_1	PRIORITY OF THE ENERGY REQUIRED FOR EVALUATING THE TRAINING SET	USER DEFINED
TE_1	THRESHOLD OF ENERGY REQUIRED FOR EVALUATING THE TRAINING SET	USER DEFINED
E_2	ENERGY REQUIRED FOR EVALUATING THE VALIDATION SET	EVALUATION BASED
PE_2	PRIORITY OF THE ENERGY REQUIRED FOR EVALUATING THE VALIDATION SET	USER DEFINED
TE_2	THRESHOLD OF ENERGY REQUIRED FOR EVALUATING THE VALIDATION SET	USER DEFINED
F	FPS OF THE CURRENT MODEL (CM) PREDICTED BY LLM/AGI	EVALUATION BASED
PF	PRIORITY OF THE FPS FOR THE MODEL	USER DEFINED
TF	THRESHOLD OF THE FPS FOR THE MODEL	USER DEFINED
P	PARAMETERS OF THE CURRENT MODEL (CM) PREDICTED BY LLM/AGI	EVALUATION BASED
OT	THRESHOLD VALUE TO CHECK THE OVERFITTING	USER DEFINED
UT	THRESHOLD VALUE TO CHECK THE UNDERFITTING	USER DEFINED

3. To store the best network architecture, we calculate a metric called the combined model effectiveness (CM) which we define as:

$$CM = AW \cdot (T_a + V_a) + (FW \cdot NF) - EW \cdot (T_{NE} + V_{NE}) \quad (1)$$

Where, AW is weight for accuracy; T_a is training accuracy; V_a is validation accuracy; FW is weight for FPS; NF is normalized FPS; EW is weight for energy; T_{NE} is normalized training energy; V_{NE} is normalized validation energy. Table 1 describes all metrics.

Algorithm 2 LeMo-NADe Expert System

```

1: function NNGES(Metrics)
2:   cmd  $\leftarrow$  {ACL : 0, ASC : 0, ADL : 0, RCL : 0, RSC : 0, RDL : 0, AD : 0, AMK : 0, AWI : 0, AR : 0, RK : 0, RD : 0, AMN : 0, RN : 0, RR : 0}
3:   if Metrics.A1 < Metrics.TA1 then
4:     cmd[ACL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ACL] + Metrics.PA1
5:     cmd[ADL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ADL] + Metrics.PA1
6:     cmd[AMK]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AMK] + Metrics.PA1
7:     cmd[ASC]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ASC] + Metrics.PA1
8:   end if
9:   if Metrics.A2 < Metrics.TA2 then
10:    cmd[ACL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ACL] + Metrics.PA2
11:    cmd[ADL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ADL] + Metrics.PA2
12:    cmd[AMK]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AMK] + Metrics.PA2
13:    cmd[ASC]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ASC] + Metrics.PA2
14:  end if
15:  if Metrics.E1 > Metrics.TE1 then
16:    cmd[AD]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AD] + Metrics.PE1
17:    cmd[AWI]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AWI] + Metrics.PE1
18:    cmd[RCL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RCL] + Metrics.PE1
19:    cmd[RK]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RK] + Metrics.PE1
20:    cmd[RSC]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RSC] + Metrics.PE1
21:  end if
22:  if Metrics.E2 > Metrics.TE2 then
23:    cmd[AD]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AD] + Metrics.PE2
24:    cmd[RCL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RCL] + Metrics.PE2
25:    cmd[RK]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RK] + Metrics.PE2
26:    cmd[RDL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RDL] + Metrics.PE2
27:  end if
28:  if Metrics.F < Metrics.TF then
29:    cmd[AD]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AD] + Metrics.PF
30:    cmd[RK]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RK] + Metrics.PF
31:    cmd[RSC]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RSC] + Metrics.PF
32:  end if
33:  if (Metrics.A1 - Metrics.A2) > Metrics.OT then
34:    cmd[ADL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ADL] + Metrics.PA1
35:    cmd[RCL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RCL] + Metrics.PA1
36:    cmd[RK]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RK] + Metrics.PA1
37:    cmd[RN]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RN] + Metrics.PA1
38:    cmd[AR]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AR] + Metrics.PA1
39:  end if
40:  if (Metrics.A2 - Metrics.A1) > Metrics.UT then
41:    cmd[RD]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RD] + Metrics.PA2
42:    cmd[ACL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ACL] + Metrics.PA2
43:    cmd[AMK]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AMK] + Metrics.PA2
44:    cmd[ADL]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ADL] + Metrics.PA2
45:    cmd[AMN]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[AMN] + Metrics.PA2
46:    cmd[ASC]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[ASC] + Metrics.PA2
47:    cmd[RR]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[RR] + Metrics.PA2
48:  end if
49:  return cmd
50: end function

```

3.2 Expert System for Instruction set Generation

The expert system drives the LLM towards constructing an optimal neural network for a given set of user-defined parameters by generating a set of instructions based on the full set of Metrics. Algorithm 2 shows the overall process for instruction generation. Table 2 describes all instructions used by ES. In line 3, if the A_1 (training accuracy) is below the threshold value as defined by the user then we add the associated priority value (for this metric) to certain instructions inside *cmd*. This process leads to the selection and prioritization of instructions that are used by Algorithm 1 for generating the LLM command for the next iteration.

3.3 Conflict Resolution

Instructions generation might have some conflicts (see Table 2) due to the nature of the instructions themselves. Algorithm 3 shows the overall procedure of eliminating conflicts. In line 3, we organize the *cmd* in descending order according to their values. Through lines 7-9, it identifies and stores the commands that have values larger than 0 in *Refined_Cmd*. In lines 10-15, the algorithm examines the current command and the remaining commands to identify any conflicts. If a conflict is detected, the corresponding value is set to zero.

TABLE 2: RULE BOOK FOR THE LEMO-NADE EXPERT SYSTEM.

LEGEND	DESCRIPTION	CONFLICTING INSTRUCTIONS
ACL	ADD CONVOLUTIONAL LAYER	RCL
ASC	ADD SKIP CONNECTION	RSC
ADL	ADD DENSE LAYER	RDL
RCL	REDUCE CONVOLUTIONAL LAYER	ACL
RSC	REDUCE SKIP CONNECTION	ASC
RDL	REDUCE DENSE LAYER	ADL
AD	ADD DROPOUT LAYER	RD
AMK	ADD MORE KERNEL	RK
AWI	ADD WEIGHT INITIALIZER	-
AR	ADD REGULARIZATION	RR
RK	REDUCE NUMBER OF KERNEL	AMK
RD	REDUCE DROPOUT LAYER	AD
AMN	ADD MORE NEURONS	RN
RN	REDUCE NEURONS	AMN
RR	REDUCE REGULARIZATION	AR

Algorithm 3 LeMo-NADe Conflict Resolution

```

1: function RESOLVE_CONFLICT(cmd)
2:   Refined_Cmd  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3:   sort_descending(cmd)
4:   m  $\leftarrow 0$ 
5:   key  $\leftarrow$  cmd.keys()
6:   while m < Length(cmd) do
7:     if cmd[key[m]] > 0 then
8:       Refined_Cmd[key[m]]  $\leftarrow$  cmd[key[m]]
9:       n  $\leftarrow$  m + 1
10:      while n < Length(cmd) do
11:        if cmd[key[m]].conflict = cmd[key[n]] then
12:          cmd[key[n]]  $\leftarrow$  0
13:        end if
14:        n  $\leftarrow$  n + 1
15:      end while
16:    end if
17:    m  $\leftarrow$  m + 1
18:  end while
19:  return Refined_Cmd
20: end function

```

4 Experimental Analysis

In this study, we have considered three publicly available datasets CIFAR-10 [30], CIFAR-100 [30], and ImageNet16-120 [31] for validating LeMo-NADe. All experiments are run on a single NVIDIA A100 GPU (to make a fair determination of metrics such as power consumption and runtime).

4.1 Search and Final Training Strategy

Both the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets comprises 60k images, each with dimensions of 32×32 pixels where 50k and 10k samples are designated for training and testing purposes respectively. The CIFAR-10 dataset have 10 output classes where CIFAR-100 datasets have 100 output classes. We split the training data in a 9:1 ratio for generating the new training and validation set respectively. ImageNet16-120 has 151k training and 6k testing samples with a resolution of 16×16 having 120 classes. We split the training dataset again in a 9:1 ratio towards creating a new training and validation set. During neural discovery, we run LeMo-NADe for 30 iterations and then train the generated network for 20 epochs using batch size of 512 (Adam optimizer and 0.001 learning rate). The learning rate reduces by 10% of its initial value if validation loss doesn't reduce for successive 5 epochs. To reduce overfitting, we augmented the training dataset with random rotation of 20 degrees, random horizontal flip, 10% random width shift, 10% random height shift, 10% random shear, and 10% random zoom.

TABLE 3: EFFECTIVENESS OF LEMO-NADE FOR GENERATING OPTIMAL NEURAL NETWORK MODELS FOR CIFAR-10 DATASET.

LLM	SETTING	TEST ACCURACY	NUMBER OF PARAMS	GENERATING			INFERENCING		
				+ TRAINING RUNTIME (HOURS)	+ TRAINING ENERGY (KWH-PUE)	+ TRAINING CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	FRAME PER SECOND	ENERGY PER IMAGE (KWH-PUE)	CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)
GPT-4 TURBO	1	82.55 %	2442698	3.93	0.5157	0.4920	6897.22	1.11E-05	1.06E-05
	2	84.27%	357706	4.60	0.5682	0.5421	115220.68	5.34E-06	5.09E-06
	3	89.41 %	699466	4.25	0.7041	0.6717	10755.78	7.06E-06	6.74E-06
	4	69.26 %	136874	4.84	0.4751	0.4533	14636.72	5.39E-06	5.14E-06
	5	85.44 %	2400330	4.27	0.5743	0.5480	13051.73	5.89E-06	5.62E-06
GEMINI	1	81.76 %	440778	2.14	0.1605	0.1531	13435.93	3.18E-06	3.04E-06
	2	81.20 %	128842	2.79	0.2333	0.2226	21553.23	2.44E-06	2.33E-06
	3	80.79 %	3016522	2.403	0.2064	0.1969	20460.87	1.08E-06	1.03E-06
	4	71.73 %	79530	2.87	0.1811	0.1728	23029.86	7.42E-07	7.08E-07
	5	78.59 %	1276234	1.94	0.1264	0.1206	19565.53	6.42E-06	6.12E-06

TABLE 4: USER-DEFINED PARAMETERS FOR DIFFERENT EXPERIMENT SETTINGS.

SETTING	PA_1	PA_2	PE_1	PE_2	PF
1	0.4	0.6	0	0	0
2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0
3	0	1	0	0	0
4	0	0	0.5	0.5	0
5	0.3	0.4	0	0	0.3

After LeMo-NADE determines the most optimal neural network, we retrain it for 500 epochs (max) using a batch size of 1024. The Adam optimizer was utilized, starting with an initial learning rate of 0.01. This learning rate is decreased if there is no reduction in validation loss over 20 consecutive epochs. We configured the GPT-4 Turbo with temperature setting of 0.

4.2 Results

4.2.1 CIFAR-10 Dataset

Table 3 shows the experimental results for CIFAR-10 dataset (settings described in Table 4). For GPT-4 Turbo (Table 3), we obtain better test accuracy of 89.41% when the validation accuracy priority is set to 1. For this case, the total run time (searching time + model training) is 4.25 hours, the power utilization effectiveness (PUE) is 0.7041 kWh, and CO₂ emission is 0.6717 lb. Since both training and inferencing energy are prioritized in setting 4, LeMo-NADE generated a much simpler neural network while sacrificing some validation accuracy (69.26%). We calculated the PUE and CO₂ emission using the following two equations as described in [38].

$$p_t = \frac{1.58t(p_c + p_r + gp_g)}{1000} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{CO}_2e = 0.954p_t \quad (3)$$

Here, p_c , p_r , and p_g represent the power usages (in watt) of CPU, RAM and GPU respectively. Also, t is the total run time in hours and g is the number of GPUs.

For Gemini, the highest test accuracy of 81.76% was obtained for setting 1 where LeMo-NADE prioritised training accuracy and validation accuracy. This generation (and training) took 2.14 hours and consumed 0.1605 kWh-PUE of energy emitting 0.1531 lb of CO₂. The efficient model for inferencing (in terms of energy consumed) was obtained for setting 4 where LeMo-NADE gave equal priority to training and inferencing time energy consumption. For this setting, LeMo-NADE took 2.87 hours (generating and training time), consumed 0.1811 kWh-PUE, and emitted 0.1728 lb CO₂. We can see that GPT-4 Turbo perform better compared to Gemini.

TABLE 5: EFFECTIVENESS OF LEMO-NADE FOR GENERATING OPTIMAL NEURAL NETWORK MODELS FOR CIFAR-100 DATASET.

LLM	SETTING	TEST ACCURACY	NUMBER OF PARAMS	GENERATING	GENERATING	GENERATING	INFERENCING	INFERENCING	INFERENCING
				+ TRAINING RUNTIME (HOURS)	+ TRAINING ENERGY (KWH-PUE)	+ TRAINING CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	FRAME PER SECOND	ENERGY PER IMAGE (KWH-PUE)	CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)
GPT-4 TURBO	1	56.94%	948708	4.46	0.6874	0.6558	11753.98	7.95E-06	7.59E-06
	2	63.43%	1725348	4.73	0.7142	0.6813	10278.36	6.08E-06	5.80E-06
	3	58.49%	948708	4.13	0.6056	0.5778	13294.64	5.96E-06	5.68E-06
	4	67.90%	79530	4.81	0.5021	0.4790	15079.86	5.63E-06	5.37E-06
	5	64.55%	3489316	4.68	0.7351	0.7013	10026.15	7.44E-06	7.10E-06
GEMINI	1	47.78 %	721060	2.21	0.1609	0.1535	21455.82	2.91E-06	2.77E-06
	2	52.96 %	801444	2.48	0.0932	0.0889	20740.8	2.48E-06	2.36E-06
	3	50.20 %	4385540	2.65	0.2877	0.2744	18524.72	2.67E-06	2.55E-06
	4	10.24 %	12836	2.83	0.1015	0.097	20726.49	1.19E-06	2.09E-06
	5	51.33 %	2665124	2.92	0.2115	0.2018	18470.16	1.04E-06	9.90E-07

TABLE 6: EFFECTIVENESS OF LEMO-NADE FOR GENERATING OPTIMAL NEURAL NETWORK MODELS FOR IMAGENET16-120 DATASET.

LLM	SETTING	TEST ACCURACY	NUMBER OF PARAMS	GENERATING	GENERATING	GENERATING	INFERENCING	INFERENCING	INFERENCING
				+ TRAINING RUNTIME (HOURS)	+ TRAINING ENERGY (KWH-PUE)	+ TRAINING CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	FRAME PER SECOND	ENERGY PER IMAGE (KWH-PUE)	CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)
GPT-4 TURBO	1	27.43%	1476536	6.26	0.6476	0.6178	13027.34	1.09E-05	1.04E-05
	2	26.83%	1476536	7.14	0.6950	0.6630	11856.32	7.75E-06	7.39E-06
	3	27.70%	891448	7.21	0.7476	0.7132	13217.37	5.40E-06	5.16E-06
	4	17.83%	116408	9.08	0.8835	0.8428	17062.41	2.71E-06	2.59E-06
	5	25.23%	898104	9.47	1.01	0.96	15040.49	5.61E-06	5.35E-06
GEMINI	1	19.98%	1113272	8.31	0.5679	0.5417	23322.39	8.85E-07	8.44E-07
	2	31.02%	368440	6.53	0.4680	0.4468	186845.09	9.95E-07	9.49E-07
	3	24.75%	35446424	11.30	1.707	1.638	8590.73	2.66E-06	2.54E-06
	4	23.52%	21370	6.82	0.485	0.4630	22327.31	3.30E-06	3.15E-06
	5	22.49%	2338776	4.99	0.32924	0.3141	21833.88	2.59E-06	2.47E-06

4.2.2 CIFAR-100 Dataset

Table 5 presents the outcomes of experiments performed with the CIFAR-100 dataset, following the same parameters outlined in Table 4. GPT-4 Turbo shows superior results regarding testing accuracy (67.90%), lower model parameters (79530), lower generating + training energy (0.5021 kWh-PUE), and higher FPS (15079.86) for setting 4. The generated model has 64.55% test accuracy when 0.3, 0.3, and 0.4 were provided as the priorities for FPS, training accuracy and validation accuracy respectively. For this model image inferencing took 7.44×10^{-6} kWh-PUE energy.

Gemini performs better for setting 2 in terms of test accuracy, parameter, runtime and energy consumption. This generated model has an test accuracy of 52.96%, took 2.48 hours for generating/training, and consumed 0.0889 kWh-PUE which is least among all other settings. Setting 3 leads to a test accuracy of 50.20% where full priority is provided to the validation accuracy and it took 2.65 hours for generation/training.

4.2.3 ImageNet16-120 Dataset

Table 6 presents the outcomes of studies experiments carried out using the ImageNet16-120 dataset. LeMo-NADe with GPT-4 Turbo shows 27.70% test accuracy for setting 3 which is the best accuracy among all settings. It takes 7.21 hours to generate and train the final model with an energy consumption of 0.7476 kWh-PUE. For setting 1 (0.4 priority on

TABLE 7: COMPARISON BETWEEN LEMO-NADE AND OTHER NAS FRAMEWORKS.

METHOD	CIFAR-10		CIFAR-100		IMAGENET16-120	
	VALIDATION	TEST	VALIDATION	TEST	VALIDATION	TEST
DARTS [27]	39.77	54.30	38.57	15.61	18.87	16.32
DSNAS [39]	89.66	30.87	30.87	31.01	40.61	41.07
PC-DARTS [40]	89.96	93.41	67.12	67.48	40.83	41.31
iDARTS [41]	89.86	93.58	70.57	70.83	40.38	40.89
GDAS [42]	89.89	93.61	71.34	70.70	41.59	41.71
β -DARTS [32]	91.55	94.36	73.49	73.51	46.37	46.34
Λ -DARTS [33]	91.55	94.36	73.49	73.51	46.37	46.34
GENIUS [34]	91.07	93.79	70.96	70.91	45.29	44.96
LEMO-NADE (GPT4-TURBO)	90.90	89.41	68.38	67.90	27.05	27.70
LEMO-NADE (GEMINI)	82.94	81.76	52.12	52.96	30.34	31.02

training accuracy and 0.6 priority on validation accuracy) we have a test accuracy of 27.43% and a generation/training energy consumption of 0.6476 kWh-PUE.

Gemini also showed promising performance in terms of accuracy and model parameters, requiring low training/inferencing energy. As seen in Table 6, LeMo-NADe using Gemini shows 31.02% accuracy for setting 2 with comparatively lower model parameter (368440) having a training energy of 0.4680 kWh-PUE. For this dataset (ImageNet16-120) Gemini outperforms GPT-4 Turbo.

4.2.4 Comparative Analysis

Table 7 compares different leading-edge NAS techniques (where they used predefined search spaces to identify the optimal network) and LeMo-NADe (no search spaces) on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet16-120 datasets. We can see that for CIFAR-10 dataset, LeMo-NADe shows promising results and in some cases, it outperforms DARTS, DSNAS, PC-DARTS, iDARTS, and GDAS. For CIFAR-100 dataset, LeMo-NADe with GPT-4 Turbo outperforms DARTS, DSNAS, and PC-DARTS for both validation and test set results. For ImageNet16-120, LeMo-NADe with Gemini perform better than LeMo-NADe with GPT-4 Turbo and it shows 30.34% and 31.02% accuracy for validation and test set respectively which is approximately $2\times$ better than the DARTS method.

5 In-depth Micro Analysis

Fig. 2 shows the behavior of GPT-4 Turbo and Gemini based on the feedback from the Expert System.

5.1 GPT-4 Turbo

In Figure 2 we show how GPT-4 Turbo handles feedback from our expert system using the before and after neural network architecture representations. We describe individual cases below-

- **Case 1:** We can see that the initially generated model was a simple CNN model with two convolutional layers having ReLU activations and Batch Normalization (BN), Maxpooling, and a single Dense layer. After getting the feedback (ACL,ASC,ADL) GPT-4 Turbo generated a model with four blocks of convolutional layers with ReLU activation and Batch Normalization (BN), and two Dense layers. It also adds two skip connections based on the feedback.
- **Case 2:** Shows another behaviour of GPT-4 Turbo where it adds more skip connection by adding some convolutional layers.
- **Case 3:** In some situations, skip connections make the network architecture more energy intensive to train/run. In this case, GPT-4 Turbo reduces the skip connections based on the feedback from ES.
- **Case 4:** GPT-4 Turbo not always show outstanding performance. We observe that approximately in 15% of the cases it fails to follow the provided instructions. For example, in this case, it suggested a model with improper shape.

6 Conclusion

In this article, we formalized, implemented, and evaluated a multi-parameter neural discovery framework, LeMo-NADe that can generate novel neural networks for diverse requirements without having access to any pre-defined search space. The proposed framework operates with the help of a highly customizable metrics and rules driven expert system. This expert system is used to generate instructions for a backend Large Language Model (LLM) for iteratively generating different novel neural networks. LeMo-NADe was able to create highly effective (accuracy, FPS, power consumption) neural networks for different applications/requirements and for different datasets (CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and ImageNet16-120) in an efficient manner (generation time, energy, CO₂ emissions). This work paves the way towards a new paradigm of AI-guided AI designing. Future works will explore the use of a customized LLM that is specifically trained to generate AI models for a wider range of user-defined applications.

References

- [1] Michelle Chua, Doyun Kim, Jongmun Choi, Nahyoung G Lee, Vikram Deshpande, Joseph Schwab, Michael H Lev, Ramon G Gonzalez, Michael S Gee, and Synho Do. Tackling prediction uncertainty in machine learning for healthcare. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 7(6):711–718, 2023.
- [2] Rupali Bhardwaj and Ilina Tripathi. An enhanced reversible data hiding algorithm using deep neural network for e-healthcare. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, 14(8):10567–10585, 2023.
- [3] Sudarshan Nandy, Mainak Adhikari, Venki Balasubramanian, Varun G Menon, Xingwang Li, and Muhammad Zakarya. An intelligent heart disease prediction system based on swarm-artificial neural network. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 35(20):14723–14737, 2023.
- [4] Noussaiba Jaafar and Zied Lachiri. Multimodal fusion methods with deep neural networks and meta-information for aggression detection in surveillance. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 211:118523, 2023.
- [5] Rabbia Mahum, Aun Irtaza, Marriam Nawaz, Tahira Nazir, Momina Masood, Sarang Shaikh, and Emad Abouel Nasr. A robust framework to generate surveillance video summaries using combination of zernike moments and r-transform and deep neural network. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 82(9):13811–13835, 2023.
- [6] Zohaib Jan, Farhad Ahamed, Wolfgang Mayer, Niki Patel, Georg Grossmann, Markus Stumptner, and Ana Kuusk. Artificial intelligence for industry 4.0: Systematic review of applications, challenges, and opportunities. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 216:119456, 2023.
- [7] Abirami Raja Santhi and Padmakumar Muthuswamy. Industry 5.0 or industry 4.0 s? introduction to industry 4.0 and a peek into the prospective industry 5.0 technologies. *International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM)*, 17(2):947–979, 2023.
- [8] Muhammad Shafiq, Kalpana Thakre, Kalluri Rama Krishna, Noel Jeygar Robert, Ashok Kuruppath, and Devendra Kumar. Continuous quality control evaluation during manufacturing using supervised learning algorithm for industry 4.0. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, pages 1–10, 2023.
- [9] Dharmendra Singh Rajput, Gaurav Meena, Malika Acharya, and Krishna Kumar Mohbey. Fault prediction using fuzzy convolution neural network on iot environment with heterogeneous sensing data fusion. *Measurement: Sensors*, 26:100701, 2023.
- [10] Kazi Kutubuddin Sayyad Liyakat. Machine learning approach using artificial neural networks to detect malicious nodes in iot networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, IoT and Big Data*, pages 123–134. Springer, 2023.
- [11] Ankit Thakkar and Ritika Lohiya. Attack classification of imbalanced intrusion data for iot network using ensemble learning-based deep neural network. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2023.
- [12] R OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article*, 2:13, 2023.
- [13] Jianing Wang, Jinyu Hu, Yichen Liu, Zheng Hua, Shengjia Hao, and Yuqiong Yao. El-nas: Efficient lightweight attention cross-domain architecture search for hyperspectral image classification. *Remote Sensing*, 15(19):4688, 2023.
- [14] Tiejun Yang, Qing He, and Lin Huang. Om-nas: pigmented skin lesion image classification based on a neural architecture search. *Biomedical Optics Express*, 14(5):2153–2165, 2023.
- [15] Yi Yang, Jiakuan Wei, Zhixuan Yu, and Ruisheng Zhang. A trustworthy neural architecture search framework for pneumonia image classification utilizing blockchain technology. *The Journal of Supercomputing*, pages 1–34, 2023.

- [16] Peijie Dong, Xin Niu, Lujun Li, Zhiliang Tian, Xiaodong Wang, Zimian Wei, Hengyue Pan, and Dongsheng Li. Rd-nas: Enhancing one-shot supernet ranking ability via ranking distillation from zero-cost proxies. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [17] Jun Wang, Peng Yao, Feng Deng, Jianchao Tan, Chengru Song, and Xiaorui Wang. Nas-dymc: Nas-based dynamic multi-scale convolutional neural network for sound event detection. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [18] Jialin Li, Xuan Cao, Renxiang Chen, Xia Zhang, Xianzhen Huang, and Yongzhi Qu. Graph neural network architecture search for rotating machinery fault diagnosis based on reinforcement learning. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 202:110701, 2023.
- [19] Wanqi Yuan, Chenping Fu, Risheng Liu, and Xin Fan. Ssob: searching a scene-oriented architecture for underwater object detection. *The Visual Computer*, 39(11):5199–5208, 2023.
- [20] Xiang Jia, Ying Tong, Hongming Qiao, Man Li, Jiangang Tong, and Baoling Liang. Fast and accurate object detector for autonomous driving based on improved yolov5. *Scientific reports*, 13(1):1–13, 2023.
- [21] Ritik Mehta, Olha Jurečková, and Mark Stamp. A natural language processing approach to malware classification. *Journal of Computer Virology and Hacking Techniques*, pages 1–12, 2023.
- [22] Nancy Girdhar, Mickaël Coustaty, and Antoine Doucet. Benchmarking nas for article separation in historical newspapers. In *International Conference on Asian Digital Libraries*, pages 76–88. Springer, 2023.
- [23] Esteban Real, Alok Aggarwal, Yanping Huang, and Quoc V Le. Regularized evolution for image classifier architecture search. In *Proceedings of the aaai conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 4780–4789, 2019.
- [24] Chenxi Liu, Barret Zoph, Maxim Neumann, Jonathon Shlens, Wei Hua, Li-Jia Li, Li Fei-Fei, Alan Yuille, Jonathan Huang, and Kevin Murphy. Progressive neural architecture search. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 19–34, 2018.
- [25] Han Cai, Tianyao Chen, Weinan Zhang, Yong Yu, and Jun Wang. Efficient architecture search by network transformation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- [26] Hieu Pham, Melody Guan, Barret Zoph, Quoc Le, and Jeff Dean. Efficient neural architecture search via parameters sharing. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4095–4104. PMLR, 2018.
- [27] Hanxiao Liu, Karen Simonyan, and Yiming Yang. Darts: Differentiable architecture search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.09055*, 2018.
- [28] Chris Ying, Aaron Klein, Eric Christiansen, Esteban Real, Kevin Murphy, and Frank Hutter. Nas-bench-101: Towards reproducible neural architecture search. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 7105–7114. PMLR, 2019.
- [29] Xuanyi Dong and Yi Yang. Nas-bench-201: Extending the scope of reproducible neural architecture search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00326*, 2020.
- [30] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- [31] Patryk Chrabaszcz, Ilya Loshchilov, and Frank Hutter. A downsampled variant of imagenet as an alternative to the cifar datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.08819*, 2017.
- [32] Peng Ye, Baopu Li, Yikang Li, Tao Chen, Jiayuan Fan, and Wanli Ouyang. β -darts: Beta-decay regularization for differentiable architecture search. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10864–10873. IEEE, 2022.
- [33] Sajad Movahedi, Melika Adabinejad, Ayyoob Imani, Arezou Keshavarz, Mostafa Dehghani, Azadeh Shakeri, and Babak N Araabi. λ -darts: Mitigating performance collapse by harmonizing operation selection among cells. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07998*, 2022.
- [34] Mingkai Zheng, Xiu Su, Shan You, Fei Wang, Chen Qian, Chang Xu, and Samuel Albanie. Can gpt-4 perform neural architecture search? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10970*, 2023.
- [35] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [36] Haishuai Wang, Yang Gao, Xin Zheng, Peng Zhang, Hongyang Chen, and Jiajun Bu. Graph neural architecture search with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01436*, 2023.

-
- [37] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
 - [38] Emma Strubell, Ananya Ganesh, and Andrew McCallum. Energy and policy considerations for deep learning in nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02243*, 2019.
 - [39] Shoukang Hu, Sirui Xie, Hehui Zheng, Chunxiao Liu, Jianping Shi, Xunying Liu, and Dahua Lin. Dsnas: Direct neural architecture search without parameter retraining. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12084–12092, 2020.
 - [40] Yuhui Xu, Lingxi Xie, Xiaopeng Zhang, Xin Chen, Guo-Jun Qi, Qi Tian, and Hongkai Xiong. Pc-darts: Partial channel connections for memory-efficient architecture search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.05737*, 2019.
 - [41] Miao Zhang, Steven W Su, Shirui Pan, Xiaojun Chang, Ehsan M Abbasnejad, and Reza Haffari. idarts: Differentiable architecture search with stochastic implicit gradients. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12557–12566. PMLR, 2021.
 - [42] Xuanyi Dong and Yi Yang. Searching for a robust neural architecture in four gpu hours. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1761–1770, 2019.

A Appendix

TABLE 8: EFFECTIVENESS OF LeMo-NADE FOR GENERATING OPTIMAL NEURAL NETWORK MODELS FOR CIFAR-10 DATASET USING GPT-4 TURBO WITH DIFFERENT TEMPERATURE VALUES.

TEMPERATURE SETTING	TEST ACCURACY	NUMBER OF PARAMS	GENERATING			INFERENCING			
			+ TRAINING RUNTIME (HOURS)	+ TRAINING ENERGY (KWH-PUE)	+ TRAINING CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	FRAME PER SECOND	ENERGY PER IMAGE (KWH-PUE)	CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	
T = 0.2	1	84.42%	3491146	4.10	0.5545	0.5290	12009.58	7.50E-07	7.15E-06
	2	85.06%	621258	4.59	0.5794	0.5528	7461.53	5.08E-06	4.85E-06
	3	85.65%	3494730	4.41	0.8478	0.8088	10904.14	7.15E-06	6.82E-06
	4	66.25%	795330	4.75	0.4531	0.4323	15335.26	5.28E-06	5.04E-06
	5	87.32%	4605642	4.05	0.5374	0.5127	13167.46	6.09E-06	5.81E-06
T = 0.4	1	83.37%	3491146	3.99	0.6099	0.5819	11487.42	1.09E-06	1.04E-06
	2	84.03%	621258	4.08	0.5011	0.4781	13521.36	5.66E-06	5.40E-06
	3	87.59%	3597002	3.89	0.6717	0.6408	108132.38	7.24E-06	6.91E-06
	4	65.65%	795330	4.70	0.5086	0.4852	15032.04	5.93E-06	5.66E-06
	5	89.02%	3418570	4.27	0.5725	0.5461	10377.16	1.09E-05	1.04E-05
T = 0.6	1	89.70%	3428938	3.92	0.5068	0.4834	11013.01	1.03E-05	9.81E-06
	2	84.11%	620746	4.15	0.4889	0.4664	12560.41	5.02E-06	4.79E-06
	3	90.90%	5884042	4.05	0.7806	0.7447	9218.27	7.41E-06	7.07E-06
	4	65.14%	795330	4.65	0.4436	0.4232	15426.29	2.63E-06	2.51E-06
	5	88.67%	3495530	4.20	0.5266	0.5024	11622.50	9.99E-06	9.54E-06
T = 0.8	1	89.13%	4997898	4.84	2.09	2.0	4743.40	1.31E-05	1.25E-05
	2	83.28%	361930	3.57	0.4518	0.4301	12494.94	5.54E-06	5.28E-06
	3	89.53%	4778762	3.99	0.6022	0.5745	10870.27	6.61E-06	6.30E-06
	4	63.48%	231562	4.66	0.4759	0.4541	15866.69	2.78E-06	2.66E-06
	5	90.46%	9675082	3.61	0.4646	0.4432	11438.98	1.01E-05	9.60E-06
T = 1	1	82.22%	2401866	3.67	0.4656	0.4442	11855.67	9.06E-06	8.63E-06
	2	86.34%	9188298	4.24	0.5778	0.5512	12245.07	6.56E-06	6.26E-06
	3	84.55%	3510858	3.78	0.5030	0.4798	12511.31	6.82E-06	6.50E-06
	4	67.17%	795330	4.69	0.4811	0.4589	14869.92	5.89E-06	5.62E-06
	5	83.15%	161098	3.77	0.4118	0.3929	14786.20	5.85E-06	5.58E-06

Table 8, 9, 10 shows the experimental results of LeMo-NAde when using GPT-4 Turbo on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet16-120 dataset respectively. We varied the temperature within the range of 0.2 to 1 and evaluated the generated neural network architecture. After carefully investigating the results we can see in Table 8 that LeMo-NAde perform better for Temperature 0.6 in terms of accuracy, model parameter, computing energy and inference FPS. On the other hand, in Table 9 we can see that LeMo-NAde with GPT-4 Turbo shows better performance for Temperature value 0.8. It also shows better results for Temperature 0.8 for ImageNet16-120 dataset as reported in Table 10.

Figure 3 illustrates a model generated by LeMo-NAde with GPT-4 Turbo for CIFAR-10 dataset. This model is obtained for the following configuration-

Temperature = 0.6; Priorities: Training accuracy: 0, Training energy: 0, Validation accuracy: 1, Validation energy: 0, FPS: 0; Threshold: Training accuracy: 0.95, Validation accuracy: 0.92, FPS: 20000, Training energy: 10^{-3} kWh, Validation energy: 10^{-5} kWh.

Figure 4 illustrates a model generated by LeMo-NAde with GPT-4 Turbo for CIFAR-100 dataset. This model is obtained for the following configuration-

Temperature = 0.4; Priorities: Training accuracy: 0.4, Training energy: 0, Validation accuracy: 0.6, Validation energy: 0, FPS: 0; Threshold: Training accuracy: 0.90, Validation accuracy: 0.85, FPS: 20000, Training energy: 10^{-2} kWh, Validation energy: 10^{-4} kWh.

Figure 5 illustrates a model generated by LeMo-NAde with GPT-4 Turbo for ImageNet16-120 dataset. This model is obtained for the following configuration-

TABLE 9: EFFECTIVENESS OF LEMO-NADE FOR GENERATING OPTIMAL NEURAL NETWORK MODEL FOR CIFAR-100 DATASET USING GPT-4 TURBO WITH DIFFERENT TEMPERATURE VALUES.

TEMPERATURE SETTING	TEST ACCURACY	NUMBER OF PARAMS	GENERATING + TRAINING RUNTIME (HOURS)	GENERATING + TRAINING ENERGY (KWH-PUE)	GENERATING + TRAINING CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	INFERENCING FRAME PER SECOND	INFERENCING ENERGY PER IMAGE (KWH-PUE)	INFERENCING CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	
T = 0.2	1	56.43%	3489316	4.50	0.8881	0.8472	9389.76	1.07E-05	1.02E-05
	2	58.03%	948708	4.18	0.5707	0.5444	12694.01	5.11E-06	4.88E-06
	3	58.85%	948708	4.19	0.8080	0.7709	12374.44	5.72E-06	5.46E-06
	4	45.19%	635172	4.77	0.4730	0.4512	15020.50	5.35E-06	5.11E-06
	5	57.67%	948708	4.57	0.7865	0.7503	13518.15	5.32E-06	5.07E-06
T = 0.4	1	57.74%	948708	4.21	0.7334	0.6997	11285.20	5.38E-06	5.13E-06
	2	62.42%	463380	4.25	0.6635	0.6330	11060.66	6.19E-06	5.90E-06
	3	53.45%	4630308	4.26	0.7017	0.6694	10563.94	5.64E-06	5.38E-06
	4	45.28%	635172	4.71	0.4597	0.4385	14895.69	7.96E-06	7.59E-06
	5	61.90%	34166180	4.62	0.8843	0.8436	11405.19	1.08E-05	1.03E-05
T = 0.6	1	56.22%	1543844	3.95	0.6204	0.5919	9703.77	7.62E-06	7.27E-06
	2	59.34%	948708	4.05	0.6515	0.6215	13147.95	5.96E-06	5.69E-06
	3	44.92%	6108708	4.38	0.7732	0.7377	11135.41	6.73E-06	6.42E-06
	4	46.52%	635172	4.74	0.4518	0.4310	14760.20	5.12E-06	4.89E-06
	5	60.44%	3441700	3.99	0.6337	0.6046	12014.46	7.04E-06	6.71E-06
T = 0.8	1	54.60%	4624932	3.99	0.5776	0.5510	11605.52	5.69E-06	5.43E-06
	2	63.69%	2674852	4.42	0.6246	0.5958	12606.06	5.73E-06	5.46E-06
	3	50.70%	3557284	3.88	0.6374	0.6080	12400.02	1.04E-05	9.92E-06
	4	40.80%	325956	4.72	0.4644	0.4431	14583.39	2.61E-06	2.49E-06
	5	67.52%	6009124	4.36	0.6583	0.6280	10632.62	1.10E-05	1.05E-05
T = 1	1	51.60%	6166756	3.89	0.5683	0.5421	11330.60	6.53E-06	6.23E-06
	2	56.28%	948708	3.76	0.4831	0.4609	13364.18	5.26E-06	5.02E-06
	3	56.27%	3489316	4.17	0.6477	0.6179	9965.78	1.05E-05	1.00E-06
	4	40.05%	325956	4.72	0.4527	0.4318	14878.67	5.14E-06	4.91E-06
	5	60.75%	92465646	4.18	0.5933	0.5660	12972.91	6.11E-06	5.82E-06

Temperature = 0.4; Priorities: Training accuracy: 0.4, Training energy: 0, Validation accuracy: 0.6, Validation energy: 0, FPS: 0; Threshold: Training accuracy: 0.70, Validation accuracy: 0.65, FPS: 22000, Training energy: 10^{-3} kWh, Validation energy: 10^{-5} kWh.

TABLE 10: EFFECTIVENESS OF LEMO-NADE FOR GENERATING OPTIMAL NEURAL NETWORK MODELS FOR IMAGENET16-120 DATASET USING GPT-4 TURBO WITH DIFFERENT TEMPERATURE VALUES.

TEMPERATURE SETTING	TEST ACCURACY	NUMBER OF PARAMS	GENERATING	GENERATING	GENERATING	INFERENCING	INFERENCING	INFERENCING	
			+ TRAINING RUNTIME (HOURS)	+ TRAINING ENERGY (KWH-PUE)	+ TRAINING CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	PER SECOND	PER IMAGE (KWH-PUE)	CO ₂ EMISSION (LBS)	
T = 0.2	1	30.25%	2467128	6.40	0.708	0.6755	11737.36	8.0E-06	7.64E-06
	2	24.22%	429656	6.20	0.6340	0.6049	13649.14	5.51E-06	5.25E-06
	3	26.50%	3296760	7.44	0.8343	0.7960	15027.43	8.78E-06	8.37E-06
	4	18.40%	116408	9.35	0.8622	0.8225	15690.88	5.12E-06	4.88E-06
	5	25.57%	881592	8.65	0.8700	0.8300	15686.66	5.35E-06	5.10E-06
T = 0.4	1	25.97%	2686968	7.03	0.7098	0.6772	15062.65	8.02E-06	7.65E-06
	2	26.07%	1473208	7.74	0.7508	0.7175	14646.19	5.14E-06	4.90E-06
	3	29.08%	901688	6.85	0.6782	0.6470	12419.29	5.13E-06	4.89E-06
	4	14.73%	68952	8.99	0.8518	0.8126	18408.92	2.64E-06	2.52E-06
	5	26.50%	1488184	8.49	0.9066	0.8649	14915	5.70E-06	5.44E-06
T = 0.6	1	2.635%	1492792	6.98	0.7321	0.6984	12709.54	5.37E-06	5.12E-06
	2	27.73%	899640	7.34	0.7384	0.7044	13815.50	5.26E-06	5.02E-06
	3	25.37%	883128	5.94	0.5869	0.5599	15487.06	5.18E-06	4.94E-06
	4	19.40%	212536	8.49	0.8620	0.8223	18041.92	5.65E-06	5.39E-06
	5	23.72%	898104	8.05	0.8143	0.7768	14988.14	5.41E-06	5.17E-06
T = 0.8	1	35.03%	1442744	8.05	0.9968	0.9510	12202.11	6.55E-06	6.25E-06
	2	26.02%	2064056	7.85	0.8090	0.7718	12326.82	5.42E-06	5.17E-06
	3	27.42%	1843192	6.75	0.7034	0.6710	11216.21	5.38E-06	5.13E-06
	4	17.73%	116024	8.77	0.8727	0.8325	19443.04	5.51E-06	5.26E-06
	5	26.73%	832312	6.16	0.5988	0.5712	15291.25	5.07E-06	4.84E-06
T = 1	1	26.17%	4625464	6.74	0.6879	0.6562	16176.14	5.31E-06	5.06E-06
	2	28.12%	418456	6.25	0.6454	0.6157	12878.29	5.47E-06	5.23E-06
	3	27.93%	111160	7.17	0.7335	0.6997	14035.10	5.23E-06	4.99E-06
	4	10.13%	38024	8.92	0.8566	0.8173	17140.02	5.38E-06	5.13E-06
	5	31.65%	3294584	7.16	0.7576	0.7227	15842.34	5.38E-06	5.14E-06




Figure 3: Model generated by GPT-4 Turbo for CIFAR-10 dataset with temperature 0.6 and setting 3, and it gives 90.90% test accuracy.




Figure 4: Model generated by GPT-4 Turbo for CIFAR-100 dataset with temperature 0.4 and setting 1, and it gives 57.74% test accuracy.




Figure 5: Model generated by GPT-4 Turbo for ImageNet16-120 dataset with temperature 0.4 and setting 1, and it gives 25.97% test accuracy.