

# LLM-Oracle Machines

Jie Wang \*

## Abstract

Contemporary AI applications leverage large language models (LLMs) for their knowledge and inference capabilities in natural language processing tasks. This approach aligns with the concept of oracle Turing machines (OTMs). To capture the essence of these computations, including those desired but not yet in practice, we extend the notion of OTMs by employing a cluster of LLMs as the oracle. We present four variants: basic, augmented, fault-avoidance, and  $\epsilon$ -fault. The first two variants are commonly observed, whereas the latter two are specifically designed to ensure reliable outcomes by addressing LLM hallucinations, biases, and inconsistencies.

## 1 Introduction

In the computation of an OTM, the oracle represents a decision problem and acts as an almighty device that instantly provides the correct answer to whether an instance, also known as a query, generated during the computation is a positive instance of the decision problem. OTM has played an important role in the development of the theory of computation and the computational complexity theory.

Inspired by the idea of utilizing external knowledge to help complete a computing task and the recent progress in LLMs that offer powerful sources of knowledge and strong inference abilities, we use LLMs in place of the oracle.

We treat an LLM as a black box, capable of answering queries in its area of expertise, not instantly but with a delay<sup>1</sup>. Both queries and answers are expressed in natural language, including formatting. Since different LLMs are trained using different technologies on various datasets, they have different capabilities. Therefore, we use a cluster of LLMs as the oracle for an LLM-Oracle Machine (LLM-OM).

Unlike in an OTM where the oracle represents a decision problem and a query asks whether an instance is positive, a query generated in the computation of an LLM-OM consists of a task and a sequence of specifications, and the answer is a solution for completing the task.

In a nutshell, the computation of an LLM-OM takes an input that represents a task to accomplish, generates queries, acquires an answer to each query from an appropriate LLM

---

\*Richard Miner School of Computer and Information Sciences, University of Massachusetts, Lowell, MA 01854, USA. Copyright ©Jie Wang, 2024.

<sup>1</sup>The assumption of delay may be omitted if we are focusing on generating trustworthy results.

in the LLM-oracle, and continues this process until the LLM-OM reaches the halting state with the final answer.

Unlike in an OTM where the oracle reliably provides an answer to a query, LLMs can generate fabricated or misleading information, resulting in incorrect or inadequate answers (e.g., see [1, 2]). LLMs may also provide answers with different meanings to the same query at different times. These issues—information hallucination, inadequacy, and inconsistency—are common in LLMs. While advancing technologies aim to mitigate these issues, complete elimination remains challenging. Therefore, we assume that there exists a probability that an LLM may provide an unacceptable answer to a query. Depending on the context of the application, an unacceptable answer could be one that is outright incorrect or one that, while not incorrect, fails to meet the required level of adequacy.

## 2 LLM-OM Basics and Variants

An LLM-OM is a deterministic algorithm with access to an LLM-oracle, where each move is a transition as in an OTM. Let  $M$  denote an LLM-OM,  $Q$  denote the input representing a task with optional specifications, and  $A$  denote the output, which is the answer to  $Q$ .

During the computation,  $M$  may generate a query in the form of  $(x; y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k)$ , denoted as  $q_x$ , where  $x$  is an intermediate task for completing  $Q$  and each  $y_i$  is an attribute. An attribute represents, with respect to  $x$ , a selected text, a specific requirement, a description of how a solution should be expressed, a verification to be performed, a self critique, or a specification of some other kind. Such a query is commonly referred to as a “prompt”.

The computation begins by interpreting the input  $Q$  and decomposing it into a sequence of sub-tasks  $Q_1, \dots, Q_m$  if possible. If  $Q$  cannot be decomposed, then its sub-task is itself.

### 2.1 Basic variants: adaptive and non-adaptive

The basic variant includes two forms of queries: adaptive and non-adaptive.

In an adaptive LLM-OM, sub-tasks are not independent, or some sub-tasks cannot be accomplished by generating all queries before acquiring answers. In other words, for a certain sub-task  $Q_i$ , the computation generates a query  $q_{i,x}$  at a certain step, with  $x$  being the task in the query, acquires an answer  $a_x$  from a selected LLM in the LLM-oracle, and proceeds to the next step based on  $a_x$ . The final answer is obtained from the answers to the sub-tasks that may involve the LLM-oracle again.

In a non-adaptive LLM-OM, the sub-tasks are independent, with each sub-task  $Q_i$  being accomplished by acquiring answers from the LLM-oracle to a set of independent queries generated during the computation. The final answer is produced from these answers without using the LLM-oracle again.

The basic functionality of many LLM web applications, such as ChatGPT and Gemini, allows users to input queries and receive answers directly from the underlying LLM. This falls within the framework of basic LLM-OM with the user’s query as the input.

## 2.2 Augmented LLM-OM

In an augmented LLM-OM, the input is a pair  $(T, Q)$ , where  $T$  is an augmented text expressed in natural language serving as the ground truth, and  $Q$  is a task that specifies what information to extract or infer from  $T$ , such as specific sentences, topics, summaries, entities, relations between entities, events, relations between events, logical consequences, or numerical consequences. The answer  $A$  to  $Q$  should ideally conform to  $T$ , but compliance is not guaranteed. The notion of compliance is defined as follows:

- Let  $I_Q(A)$  denote the set of information contained in  $A$  with respect to  $Q$ , and  $I_Q(T)$  is similarly defined. We say that  $A$  *complies with*  $T$  with respect to  $Q$  if  $I_Q(A) \subseteq I_Q(T)$ .

Queries generated during the computation may either be adaptive or non-adaptive. To complete the sub-task  $x$  in a query  $q_x$ ,  $M$  first identifies the matched contents  $C_x$  in  $T$ , and then use  $C_x$  and an appropriate LLM from the LLM-oracle to obtain an answer  $a_x$  to  $q_x$ , ideally complying with  $C_x$  with respect to  $q_x$ , namely,  $I_{q_x}(a_x) \subseteq I_{q_x}(C_x)$ .

Web applications using various techniques to implement RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation), such as ChatGPT 4o, fall within the framework of augmented LLM-OM.

## 2.3 Fault-avoidance LLM-OM

The major drawback of both the basic and augmented variants is that they don't guarantee that  $M$  is consistent, correct, or adequate. The definitions of these terms are given below:

- We say that  $M$  is *consistent* if, for any queries  $Q$  and  $Q'$  asked at different times with  $\text{mng}(Q') = \text{mng}(Q)$ , where  $\text{mng}(X)$  denotes the meaning of text  $X$ ,  $M$  outputs an answer  $A$  to  $Q$  and an answer  $A'$  to  $Q'$  such that  $\text{mng}(A) = \text{mng}(A')$ .

Note that  $\text{mng}(X) = \text{mng}(Y)$  does not necessarily imply  $X = Y$ , as there are many different ways to generate a text to express the same meaning.

- Suppose  $M$  is augmented with input  $(T, Q)$  and output  $A$ . We say that  $A$  is *correct* for  $Q$  with respect to  $T$  if the following two conditions hold:

1.  $A$  complies with the ground truth  $T$  with respect to  $Q$ . Namely,  $I_Q(A) \subseteq I_Q(T)$ .
2.  $A$  doesn't contain information unrelated to  $Q$ . Namely,  $I_{\overline{Q}}(A) = \emptyset$ , where  $I_{\overline{Q}}(A)$  represents any other meanings contained in  $A$  that is not in the meaning of  $Q$ .

Then  $M$  is *correct* with respect to  $T$  if for any query  $Q$ ,  $M$  returns an answer  $A$  that is correct for  $Q$  with respect to  $T$ .

- Suppose  $M$  is augmented with input  $(T, Q)$  and output  $A$ . We say that  $A$  is *inadequate* for  $Q$  with respect to  $T$  if the following two conditions hold:

1.  $A$  complies with the ground truth  $T$  with respect to  $Q$ .
2.  $A$  contains information unrelated to  $Q$ . Namely,  $I_{\overline{Q}}(A) \neq \emptyset$ .

Then  $M$  is *adequate* with respect to  $T$  if for any query  $Q$ ,  $M$  returns an answer  $A$  that is adequate for  $Q$  with respect to  $T$ .

- If  $M$  is not augmented, assume the existence of a set of texts, denoted by  $U$ , that represents the true knowledge and information for the areas of interest. We say that  $M$  is correct if  $M$  is correct with respect to  $U$ ,  $M$  is adequate if  $M$  is adequate with respect to  $U$ . Set  $U$  is referred to as the absolute truth.

A fault-avoidance LLM-OM is an augmented LLM-OM that is consistent, correct, and adequate with respect to the augmented input  $T$ . It is necessary for  $M$  to identify the best-matched content  $C_x$  from  $T$  for each query  $q_x$ , and the chosen LLM from the LLM-oracle must comply with  $C_x$  when generating an answer  $a_x$  to  $q_x$ .

To guarantee fault avoidance,  $M$  needs to verify the correctness and adequacy of the answer  $A$  for a given query  $Q$  with respect to  $T$ . This calls for concrete implementations of  $I_Q(A)$  and  $\text{mng}(A)$  using techniques in natural language processing, machine learning, deep learning, and other methods.

Consistency, however, is much more difficult to verify. We may aim to develop a method that provides a certain guarantee that  $M$  is consistent with a desired high probability.

## 2.4 $\epsilon$ -fault LLM-OM

An  $\epsilon$ -fault LLM-OM is a non-augmented LLM-OM that is consistent, correct, and adequate with probability of  $1 - \epsilon$  with respect to the absolute truth for the areas of interest, where  $\epsilon$  is some small positive parameter.

Let  $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_k$  be the LLMs in the LLM-oracle, where each  $L_i$  has a small probability  $p_i$  of generating hallucinated answers to queries. Different LLMs may hallucinate on different queries. However,  $M$  doesn't know which LLM will hallucinate an answer to a given query, and  $M$  alone cannot verify if an answer is incorrect, as the absolute truth is not provided as an augmented input.

We aim to investigate whether it is possible to utilize these LLMs to obtain an answer to a query with a certain level of guarantee that the answer is correct and adequate with a desired probability  $1 - \epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon$ .

Making certain reasonable assumptions may be useful in the quest to obtain such a result. For example, we may assume that for a given query, there is always an  $L_i$  that produces a correct and adequate answer; we just don't know which one.

## References

- [1] J. Li, J. Chen, R. Ren, X. Cheng, W. X. Zhao, J.-Y. Nie, and J.-R. Wen, "The dawn after the dark: An empirical study on factuality hallucination in large language models," 2024. arXiv 2401.03205.
- [2] R. Stureborg, D. Alikaniotis, and Y. Suhara, "Large language models are inconsistent and biased evaluators," 2024. arXiv 2405.01724.