

Large Language Models for Explainable Decisions in Dynamic Digital Twins

Nan Zhang¹, Christian Vergara-Marcillo^{1,2}, Georgios Diamantopoulos^{1,2},
Jingran Shen¹, Nikos Tziritas³, Rami Bahsoon², and Georgios
Theodoropoulos^{*4,1}

¹ Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, China

² University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

³ University of Thessaly, Lamia, Greece

⁴ Research Institute of Trustworthy Autonomous Systems (RITAS), Shenzhen, China

Abstract. Dynamic data-driven Digital Twins (DDTs) can enable informed decision-making and provide an optimisation platform for the underlying system. By leveraging principles of Dynamic Data-Driven Applications Systems (DDDAS), DDTs can formulate computational modalities for feedback loops, model updates and decision-making, including autonomous ones. However, understanding autonomous decision-making often requires technical and domain-specific knowledge. This paper explores using large language models (LLMs) to provide an explainability platform for DDTs, generating natural language explanations of the system's decision-making by leveraging domain-specific knowledge bases. A case study from smart agriculture is presented.

Keywords: DDDAS · Explainability · Dynamic Digital Twins · LLM · Retrieval Augmented Generation · Smart Agriculture.

1 Introduction

Dynamic data-driven Digital Twins (DDTs) utilise a DDDAS-based info-symbiotic feedback loop between a physical system and its virtual counterpart, whereby real-time data from the physical system are utilised to improve the system model, reconfigure the instrumentation pipeline, and optimise the underlying system. Due to the complexity and interdisciplinary nature of DDDAS, understanding the reasoning behind decisions requires vast technical and domain-specific knowledge. Furthermore, decisions are often represented by formats containing sensor readings and measurements that are hard for humans to parse. These challenges are exacerbated in the context of intelligent DDTs for intelligent systems, where DDTs can utilise their cognitive capabilities to make decisions autonomously [20]. In this context, explainability becomes a critical property, allowing end-users to understand and, thus, trust the autonomous decisions of the DDT.

* Corresponding author

In [21], we examined the concept and challenges of explainability in DDDAS/DDT systems, identifying areas and stages in the analytics cycle that lend themselves to explainability. The aim of this paper is to extend that work by examining the role and utilisation of generative pre-trained large language models (LLMs) as a mechanism to support explainability. LLMs now possess the ability to mimic human-generated text with impressive accuracy, while through Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [11], LLMs can utilise knowledge bases (technical documents, scientific papers, computer code, etc.) when generating text. In the context of DDT explainability, RAG is the key feature, allowing LLMs to possess the required domain-specific knowledge to parse and sufficiently explain the decisions of the DDT. The contributions of the paper are the following: (a) An elaboration of different roles of LLM in supporting explainability in DDTs; (b) A novel reference architecture for LLM-enabled explainability for decisions in DDTs; (c) A proof-of-concept demonstration in a smart agriculture drone surveillance example for using LLM for explaining what-if simulation-based decisions.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the related work in the explainable DDDAS/DDTs literature. Section 3 introduces the proposed explainable DDT architecture. Section 4 presents an illustrative example of the proposed architecture in smart agriculture, including current limitations and possible future work. Finally, section 5 concludes this paper.

2 Related Work

Preliminary research has discussed explainability in DDTs. Intuitively, a system is interpretable if it uses a white box model based on physical or mechanical principles [15]. When black box models are needed, Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) techniques are preferred [21]. Some XAI-empowered Digital Twins (DTs) focus on explaining the predictions, such as time-series forecast [13], reliability of prediction and model retraining [2]. Some others relate to explaining the autonomous behaviours of DDT, such as dynamically selecting a model from a model library to estimate structural health [10]. Architectural efforts to enhance DT explainability include a three-tiered pipeline from [13] for explaining DT predictions and a self-explainability framework in [12] where the explanation model is derived from formal system specifications. Explanation during design also enhances understanding among modellers and stakeholders [16]. Despite the work in enriching DTs with explainability, the focus on explainable *decisions* autonomously made by the DDT is still at the preliminary stage [21,10,12].

LLMs are increasingly augmenting scientific simulations, offering potential in elucidating model structures, summarising simulation outputs, enhancing platform accessibility, and interpreting errors [8]. An individual LLM agent can understand and act on human natural language-based instructions to perform remote simulations [4]. Extending this, multiple LLM agents are being explored for advanced tasks, including simulating human behaviours [18] and participating in complex processes like perception, planning, and decision-making [14]. Despite general explorations into LLM explainability [22], the specific roles of LLMs in




Fig. 1: LLM enabled explainability in a DDT system.

explaining DDDAS/DDTs require further clarification. Rather than using LLM for decision-making, this paper adopts LLMs as an intermediate layer between the DDT and humans for organic integration between trustworthy simulation analysis techniques and LLM explanations.

3 A Reference Architecture

In [21] we presented a reference architecture that illustrated the explainability requirements in DDTs. Based on that architecture, Fig. 1 illustrates the potential role of LLM in supporting explainable decisions in DDT. The architecture considers LLM’s role in supporting explainability in different dimensions: who makes decisions, how the decisions are explained, and how humans are involved. In [21] three types of explainable decisions were identified, leveraging the classical DDDAS architecture [3]: the explanation for *measurement adaptation*, *model adaptation*, and *system behaviour adaptation*. It can be argued that LLM can further support these three types by enhancing the understandability and the ease of human-system interaction and value alignment.

3.1 Roles of LLM for Explainability

LLM acts as a bridge between offline design and real-time data, employing specialised domain-related knowledge. It offers customisable explanations for diverse stakeholders through fine-tuning, ensuring reliable performance. For DDT in particular, the role of LLM varies depending on who the decision maker is. This paper considers the following four scenarios:

DDDAS/DDT makes decisions: LLM should serve as an external interpreter outside of the DDT to interact with the users by elucidating the decision-making process, inputs, and decisions, without intruding on the DDT’s operations. It achieves this by analysing the DDT system’s design documentation, inputs, and operational logs.

Human makes decisions: Human stakeholders require comprehensive information to make informed decisions, yet their understanding of DDT can vary significantly. They need to understand the state space, control space, objective space, and the mapping between them, enabled by techniques such as what-if analysis. LLMs, in this case, must not only interpret the DDT’s behaviour but

also facilitate a two-way dialogue between humans and the DDT. The LLM should: 1) clarify the current system state to humans, 2) translate human natural language-based instructions into machine-readable commands for the DDT to perform simulation analyses, 3) communicate and explain the results of these simulations, 4) convey human decisions back to the DDT, potentially suggesting alternative decisions.

LLM makes decisions: A planner LLM operates as a black box, requiring transparent explanations of its decision-making. It monitors the system, creates prompts for itself, and devises plans. To enhance transparency and decision accuracy, Chain-of-Thought prompting can be employed to articulate the decision rationale step-by-step [17]. Yet, the LLM’s generative and probabilistic nature can make trusting its explanations difficult, referred to as hallucination [9].

Collaborative decision-making: Integrating the three aforementioned scenarios, a collaborative framework can be established, involving DDDAS, LLMs, and humans. Each entity can take on different decision-making responsibilities and provide feedback to enhance collective decision quality. While DDDAS may face constraints leading to sub-optimal decisions, LLMs can offer reassessments and recommend human interventions. Similarly, LLMs can critique and refine human decisions, offering insights into potential enhancements.

The rest of the paper specifically investigates one specific scenario above where the DDT is the decision-maker, with the LLM explaining the DDT’s decisions on *system behaviour adaptation* to optimise task-related goals.

4 An Illustrative Example: Drone Fleet in Smart Farming




Fig. 2: The DDDAS loop of the DDT in the smart farming application scenario.

Smart farming applications can be assisted by aerial monitoring using drones and remote sensing to detect problems assessing crop health through vegetation indices such as NDVI [19]. Nevertheless, these drone-based systems are often time-intensive, leading to challenges in sensing and model updates for achieving efficient sensing and prompt updates to models, further constrained by factors such as energy consumption and weather. Given that the system’s status changes in real-time, continuous model updates are necessary. A DDT-based approach

can dynamically adjust drones’ sensing behaviour enabling time and cost-efficient updates. Previous papers have considered DDT-based approaches for smart agriculture [5,6,7,1]. This paper adopts a DDT-enabled smart farming application to showcase the benefits of integrating LLMs and DDDAS in a multi-resolution application made of a drone fleet or *alliance*. In this case, two types are proposed: Survey and Inspection drones. The former facilitates a quick scan at high altitudes but with low resolution, mainly used to identify Regions Of Interest (ROIs). The latter performs a focused exploration of these ROIs. DDT, in this scenario, enables dynamic drone planning designed to enhance efficiency in the overall system’s operations. The full workflow is shown in Fig. 2.

4.1 Modelling

Algorithm 1: The planning workflow

```

A new image is received from the survey drone;
Calculate its confidence;
if confidence <  $T_\alpha$  then
   $R \leftarrow []$ ;
  /* Assign an inspection drone to examine it */
  for  $d$  in all inspection drones do
     $\Delta t, battery \leftarrow Simulate(d)$ ;
    if battery >  $T_b$  then
       $R.append(\Delta t)$ ;
    end
  end
   $d_o \leftarrow$  rank all options in  $R$  and get the drone with the minimum time  $\Delta t$ ;
  Send instructions to  $d_o$ ;
end

```

Farm model: The farm can be envisioned as a grid of *tiles* of the same size. The model of the farm provides the healthiness of each tile, built by images with NDVI taken by the drone alliance in real-time. Farmers or automated equipment will use this information to apply the *exact* amount of nutrients or water.

Due to the information loss in the lower-resolution images taken by the survey drone, a confidence indicator α_i of a tile i is introduced to decide whether there is a need to let inspection drones examine carefully. An intuitive idea is to measure the confidence that the crops in the tile are healthy or unhealthy. The confidence is low if it is difficult to tell whether the tile is definitely *Good* or *Bad*.

$$\alpha_i = |\mu_{Good}(\bar{V}_i) - \mu_{Bad}(\bar{V}_i)| \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{V}_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j^N V_{NDVI,j} \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{V}_i \in [-1, 1]$ is the average NDVI of all pixels of the tile i ; μ is a fuzzy membership function shown below to define the degree that the health condition of the crop is *Good* or *Bad* ($a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 \in [-1, 1]$ are parameters to define the boundary of the membership).

$$\mu_{Good}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < a_1 \\ \frac{a_1 - x}{a_1 - b_1} & a_1 \leq x \leq b_1 \\ 1 & x > b_1 \end{cases}, \quad \mu_{Bad}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x < a_2 \\ \frac{a_2 - x}{a_2 - b_2} & a_2 \leq x \leq b_2 \\ 0 & x > b_2 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Drone model: The drone model considers the flying time and energy consumption. If a drone is busy inspecting a tile and receives an instruction to inspect another at s unit distance away, the drone will finish the current task first (which will take t_{rem} time unit), fly to the new tile with speed v ($t_{disp} = s/v$), and inspect it (t_{insp}). Therefore, the total time for inspecting a new tile is: $\Delta t = t_{rem} + t_{disp} + t_{insp}$.

Planning model: The re-planning of drones is based on the status of all drones and tiles. A tile requires further inspection if its confidence α_i is less than a threshold T_α . What-if analysis is conducted to simulate the options to send which inspection drone. Only drones with enough predicted battery life (larger than T_b) to finish the task are considered candidate options. All candidate options are then sorted by the total time, and the option with the minimum time Δt is selected. The detailed workflow is shown in Algorithm 1.

4.2 LLM-Enabled Explainability




Fig. 3: DDDAS/DDT decision-making and LLM's explanation with RAG.

The complexity of the drone system's dynamic planning, as outlined in Algorithm 1, can lead to seemingly counter-intuitive actions, necessitating clear explanations for farm operators. LLMs, with their vast public data training, are ideal for this but lack access to specific or local knowledge. Therefore, Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) is used to integrate a custom knowledge base, ensuring LLMs provide coherent and contextually relevant information [11]. This study integrates RAG with existing LLM APIs and domain expertise through tools like LangChain to optimise response quality.

To demonstrate the LLM's explainability capabilities, we conducted experiments¹ using LangChain, OpenAI `gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09` model and embedding model `text-embedding-ada-002`, providing the LLM with contextual

¹ Code available at: <https://github.com/explainable-digital-twins/RAG-DDDAS>

information and decisions made by the DDDAS loop of the DDT. Relevant runtime information includes drones status, and structured DDDAS/DDT simulation results (in JSON) regarding time and battery to complete an emergent task. The RAG knowledge base includes the content of this paper before this section (as a `.tex` text file) and an additional description of the JSON results. Two scenarios are considered in Fig 3. In **Scenario 1** the DDT instructs a drone (Drone 1) whose total predicted time Δt is not the minimum among all drones, because the minimum one (Drone 2) does not meet the battery requirement of T_b . In **Scenario 2**, the DDT instructs a “busy” drone to finish its current task first and then inspect a new tile because dispatching a new “ready” drone (awaiting instructions) takes more time. Users can be confused why no drone was immediately dispatched for this task. However, the LLM explains the reason.

This demonstration showcases a promising vision for LLM to enhance the explainability of the system. However, the hallucination problem can be challenging as LLMs can generate irrelevant or wrong information [9]. For instance, “Other drones have higher Δt or are busy” appears in LLM Answer 2 of Fig. 3: Scenario 2, but whether the drone is busy is not considered in the planning algorithm, which requires further tuning of the prompt and retrieval process.

5 Conclusion

This paper investigates the role of LLMs in enhancing explainability for *Dynamic data-driven Digital Twins* (DDTs). Through a smart agriculture case study, we have demonstrated with RAG how LLMs can provide natural language explanations for autonomous decisions made by the DDT. Despite challenges, including the risk of hallucination, the integration of LLMs with DDT holds significant potential, paving the way for more trustworthy autonomous systems across domains. More sophisticated scenarios should be evaluated. Future research should also consider fine-tuning the LLM with domain datasets.

Acknowledgments. This study was supported by SUSTech-University of Birmingham Collaborative PhD Programme; SUSTech Research Institute for Trustworthy Autonomous Systems, Shenzhen, China.

References

1. Ahmed, A., Zulfiqar, S., Ghandar, A., Chen, Y., Hanai, M., Theodoropoulos, G.: Digital twin technology for aquaponics: Towards optimizing food production with dynamic data driven application systems. In: *Methods and Applications for Modeling and Simulation of Complex Systems*. pp. 3–14. Springer Singapore (2019)
2. An, D., Chen, Y.: Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) empowered digital twin on soil carbon emission management using proximal sensing. In: *IEEE 3rd International Conference on Digital Twins and Parallel Intelligence*. pp. 1–5 (Nov 2023)
3. Blasch, E.: DDDAS Advantages from High-Dimensional Simulation. In: *2018 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*. pp. 1418–1429 (2018)
4. Cao, C., Zhuang, J., He, Q.: LLM-assisted modeling and simulations for public sector decision-making: Bridging climate data and policy insights. In: *AAAI-2024 Workshop on Public Sector LLMs: Algorithmic and Sociotechnical Design* (2024)

5. Ghandar, A., Ahmed, A., Zulfiqar, S., Hua, Z., Hanai, M., Theodoropoulos, G.: A decision support system for urban agriculture using digital twin: A case study with aquaponics. *IEEE Access* **9**, 35691–35708 (2021)
6. Ghandar, A., Theodoropoulos, G., Zheng, B., Chen, S., Gong, Y., Zhong, M.: A dynamic data driven application system to manage urban agricultural ecosystems in smart cities. In: 4th Int. Conf. on Universal Village (UV). pp. 1–7 (2018)
7. Ghandar, A., Theodoropoulos, G., Zhong, M., Zhen, B., Chen, S., Gong, Y., Ahmed, A.: An agent-based modelling framework for urban agriculture. In: 2019 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC). pp. 1767–1778 (2019)
8. Giabbanelli, P.J.: GPT-based models meet simulation: How to efficiently use large-scale pre-trained language models across simulation tasks. In: Proceedings of the Winter Simulation Conference. pp. 2920–2931. WSC '23, IEEE Press (Feb 2024)
9. Huang, L., Yu, W., Ma, W., Zhong, W., Feng, Z., Wang, H., Chen, Q., Peng, W., Feng, X., Qin, B., Liu, T.: A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions (Nov 2023), arXiv:2311.05232
10. Kapteyn, M.G., Knezevic, D.J., Willcox, K.: Toward predictive Digital Twins via component-based reduced-order models and interpretable machine learning. In: AIAA SciTech 2020 Forum. pp. 1–19. AIAA, Reston, Virginia (Jan 2020)
11. Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.t., Rocktäschel, T., Riedel, S., Kiela, D.: Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks. In: 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 9459–9474 (Dec 2020)
12. Michael, J., Schwammberger, M., Wortmann, A.: Explaining cyberphysical system behavior with digital twins. *IEEE Software* **41**(1), 55–63 (Jan 2024)
13. Neupane, S., Fernandez, I.A., Patterson, W., Mittal, S., Parmar, M., Rahimi, S.: TwinExplainer: Explaining predictions of an automotive digital twin (Jan 2023)
14. Sun, Y., Zhang, Q., Bao, J., Lu, Y., Liu, S.: Empowering digital twins with large language models for global temporal feature learning. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems* **74**, 83–99 (Jun 2024)
15. Vilar-Dias, J.L., Junior, A.S.S., Lima-Neto, F.B.: An interpretable digital twin for self-aware industrial machines. *Sensors* **24**(1), 27 (Jan 2024)
16. Wang, L., Deng, T., Zheng, Z., Shen, Z.J.M.: Explainable Modeling in Digital Twin. In: Winter Simulation Conference. WSC '21, IEEE Press (2021)
17. Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Ichter, B., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D.: Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. vol. 35, pp. 24824–24837. Curran Associates, Inc. (2022)
18. Yang, H., Siew, M., Joe-Wong, C.: An LLM-based digital twin for optimizing human-in-the loop systems (Mar 2024), arXiv:2403.16809
19. Zhang, M., Wu, B., Yu, M., Zou, W., Zheng, Y.: Crop condition assessment with adjusted NDVI using the uncropped arable land ratio. *Remote sensing* **6**(6), 5774–5794 (2014)
20. Zhang, N., Bahsoon, R., Theodoropoulos, G.: Towards engineering cognitive digital twins with self-awareness. In: 2020 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC). pp. 3891–3891 (2020)
21. Zhang, N., Bahsoon, R., Tziritas, N., Theodoropoulos, G.: Explainable human-in-the-loop dynamic data-driven digital twins. In: Dynamic Data Driven Applications Systems. pp. 233–243. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham (2024)
22. Zhao, H., Chen, H., Yang, F., Liu, N., Deng, H., Cai, H., Wang, S., Yin, D., Du, M.: Explainability for large language models: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* **15**(2), 20:1–20:38 (Feb 2024)