

DDD-GenDT: Dynamic Data-driven Generative Digital Twin Framework

Yu-Zheng Lin[†], Qinxuan Shi[‡], Zhanglong Yang[‡], Banafsheh Saber Latibari[†], Sicong Shao[‡],
Soheil Salehi[†] (Member, IEEE), and Pratik Satam^{*}

[†]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Arizona

^{*}Department of Systems and Industrial Engineering, University of Arizona

[‡]School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of North Dakota

Email: {[†]yuzhenglin, ^{*}pratiksatam, [†]banafsheh, [†]ssalehi}@arizona.edu; {[‡]qinxuan.shi, [‡]zhanglong.yang, [‡]sicong.shao}@und.edu

arXiv:2501.00051v1 [cs.LG] 28 Dec 2024

Abstract—Digital twin (DT) technology has emerged as a transformative approach to simulate, predict, and optimize the behavior of physical systems, with applications that span manufacturing, healthcare, climate science, and more. However, the development of DT models often faces challenges such as high data requirements, integration complexity, and limited adaptability to dynamic changes in physical systems. This paper presents a new method inspired by dynamic data-driven applications systems (DDDAS), called the dynamic data-driven generative of digital twins framework (DDD-GenDT), which combines the physical system with LLM, allowing LLM to act as DT to interact with the physical system operating status and generate the corresponding physical behaviors. We apply DDD-GenDT to the computer numerical control (CNC) machining process, and we use the spindle current measurement data in the NASA milling wear data set as an example to enable LLMs to forecast the physical behavior from historical data and interact with current observations. Experimental results show that in the zero-shot prediction setting, the LLM-based DT can adapt to the change in the system, and the average RMSE of the GPT-4 prediction is 0.479A, which is 4.79% of the maximum spindle motor current measurement of 10A, with little training data and instructions required. Furthermore, we analyze the performance of DDD-GenDT in this specific application and their potential to construct digital twins. We also discuss the limitations and challenges that may arise in practical implementations.

Index Terms—Generative AI, Large Language Model, Digital Twin, Dynamic Data Driven Application System (DDDAS), Industrial 4.0, System Security

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, rapid advances in computing, communication, and AI have enabled the creation of software systems that accurately model physical processes, called the digital twin model [1–3]. These virtual representations of real-world entities are designed to simulate, predict, and optimize interaction with their physical counterparts, bridging the gap between the physical and digital domains. Such DTs are finding applications across various fields. In climate science, DT improves the accuracy of weather prediction and supports disaster preparedness by modeling complex atmospheric systems [4]. In medicine, digital twins are advancing precision medicine by enabling personalized diagnosis and treatment through patient-specific simulations [5]. In manufacturing, digital twins serve

as virtual replicas of production systems, enabling real-time monitoring, maintenance, optimization, and safety [6]. These diverse applications demonstrate the transformative potential of DTs across industries.

However, building accurate DTs of the physical world requires large amounts of high-quality data that is difficult to collect and acquire due to challenges in instrumentation, privacy, and data collection costs [7]. In addition, these challenges increase with the complexity of the physical system, requiring a set of behavior models to build an accurate DT [8], highlighting the need to explore more flexible and efficient digital twin construction methods. Furthermore, the concept of digital twins goes beyond simulating physical shapes or behaviors and emphasizes continuous updating with real-time data and history data [9]. Given this, we consider the physical system and its digital twin as interconnected dynamic systems that progress over time. This system considers two-dimensional changes, including mechanical and process changes, illustrated in Figure 1. The vertical axis represents changes in mechanical




Fig. 1: Conceptual model of digital-twin adaptive with physical space behavior dynamically. Vertical axis: mechanical changes over time; Horizontal axis: operation process changes over time.

properties caused by vibration, physical wear and tear, and material fatigue over time [10]. The horizontal axis represents changes in the different processes of physical system operation. The circular markers represent the digital twin, designed to adapt dynamically to both mechanical state changes and process changes from observation data from the physical system to the digital twin. Such a dynamic adaptive process can map the behavior of the physical system at different stages and provide decisions based on the digital twin behavior to the physical system as feedback to achieve interoperability.

Building upon this conceptual model, we propose a new dynamic data-driven generative digital twin framework, DDD-GenDT, to enable coupling and interaction between the dynamic digital twin and physical systems. The key idea of this framework is to take advantage of the broad problem solving capabilities of large language models to integrate into the Dynamic Data-Driven Application System (DDDAS) paradigm [11]. The advantage of LLM for time series applications is that it can use a small amount of data to predict time series without training and fine-tuning [12]. We make mapping the physical state a zero-shot behavior prediction task for LLM by dynamically adjusting the input with selected related historical information to generate time series predictions that approximate the ground truth. In this framework, LLM acts as dynamic data-driven digital twins by continuously triggering and updating the LLM input from the physical system's past and current behavior observation. Combined with real-time observations from the physical system, these predictions are utilized as feedback to adaptively analyze, predict, optimize, and control the system effectively. This framework leverages LLMs' adaptability and zero-shot capabilities, enabling efficient time-series predictions with minimal data and no additional training, offering a flexible and scalable solution for building dynamic digital twins in complex systems.

To demonstrate the practical application of this approach, this study provides an example of CNC machining using DDD-GenDT with NASA's milling dataset. In this example, the DDD-GenDT framework monitors the current of the CNC spindle motor during CNC machining operations to show how the LLM-based DT adapts to the electrical behavior change caused by a change in mechanical tool wear in the machining process.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- The paper introduces a reference architecture for digital twins to guide the development and implementation of DT systems, focusing on key aspects of the stack between physical space and virtual space and the essential metrics of DT.
- The paper proposes the Dynamic Data-Driven Generative Digital Twin (DDD-GenDT) framework, which integrates LLMs into the DDDAS paradigm, enabling dynamic and adaptive digital twin construction.
- This validates the DDD-GenDT framework by building a DT for a CNC machining scenario, where the proposed DT predicts the CNC machining physical state with high accuracy while relying on small amounts of data. Moreover, the results also demonstrate the ability of the

DT to dynamically adapt its behavior to tool wear from the CNC machining process.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we review studies of digital twin, DDDAS, and LLM application on the physical systems; in Section III, we propose a digital twin reference model; in Section IV, we present the DDD-GenDT framework; in Section V, we present the experimental evaluation of the DDD-GenDT framework with the NASA milling dataset, and in Section VII, we conclude the paper.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Digital Twin

A digital twin is a software system that models the physical system. The virtual model interacts with the physical system through continuous data interaction. The model reflects the system behavior based on the physical state and provides feedback to the physical system based on the digital twin output. This concept first originated in the field of aerospace engineering. Shafto et al. defined digital twins as simulation-based systems engineering in the 2010 NASA Technology & Processing Roadmap draft [13]. This report suggests that the digital twin concept can obtain high-fidelity models with multiphysics and multiscale simulations, sensor updates, and history data. Using digital twins' continuous prediction outputs can study the impact of vehicle parameters, abnormal conditions, and environmental factors on the system and improve mission success rates. While digital twins are powerful and offer many advantages, computing resources or methods will limit the construction of complex behavioral physics models, making the simulation model difficult for physical interaction or not reflecting the physical behavior [14].

With the maturity of machine learning technology and benefiting from the development of computer computing power, digital twin modeling based on machine learning has brought new opportunities for developing digital twins [2, 3]. It enables the modeling of complex systems that originally required huge computing resources and were difficult to formulate with physics and statistics. The machine learning-based DT developments demonstrate the great potential of machine learning applications in building digital twins. More insights into the physical process can be obtained through the continuous interaction between the machine learning-based digital twin model and the physical system.

B. Dynamic Data Driven Applications Systems

The concept of digital twins has various advantages and has become a potentially transformative technology with applications in many fields, but they are not without limitations. One of the main challenges is that relying on predefined models limits their ability to simulate systems that change dynamically over time [15]. For example, in the operation of industrial equipment, in addition to the physical behavior caused by different manufacturing processes, the resulting vibration, temperature, mechanical wear and tear, etc. These will result in physical behavior changes over time, which

means that constructing a high-fidelity digital twin model requires a large amount of data covering different operating conditions and the corresponding models based on various processes, and it is very challenging.

Dynamic Data-Driven Application Systems (DDDAS) present a promising solution to address these challenges. By integrating real-time data acquisition, computational models, and adaptive feedback mechanisms, DDDAS enhances simulations and predictions dynamically [11]. Combining the concept of DDDAS with digital twins can allow digital twins to continue to evolve and maintain accuracy as the system changes [16]. Although deep learning has made great progress in the development of digital twins, to enable the model to adapt to dynamic input, deep learning-based DDDAS requires repeated training of the deep learning model or multi-model management [17]. This increases the complexity of DDDAS system design.

The DDD-GenDT framework introduces the LLMs as a digital twin, the powerful function of LLM makes it more flexible and simple to build a digital twin system with DDDAS concept. DDD-GenDT does not require retraining the model, and only needs to adjust the LLMs input to generate digital twin prediction output.

C. LLM with Physical Systems

Many researchers have recently proposed LLM as the bridge between reality and virtuality, and its impact spans from laboratories to industry. Coscientist, an artificial intelligence system for automated chemical experiments proposed by Boiko et al. [18], which can semi-automatically plan the overall experiment and operate heater vibrator modules and liquid handling instruments. The system completed complex chemical synthesis tasks, demonstrating the potential of LLM for operating instruments to complete complex tasks. In industrial manufacturing applications, Gkournelos et al. used the GPT model with another customized GPT model for human-robot Collaboration to control human-robot collaborative robots using natural language [19]. In addition, to cope with diverse product manufacturing requirements, Zhao et al. reported that using multi-agent technology based on LLM to schedule manufacturing equipment on the physical shopfloor can make it more flexible in responding to changes in task requirements [20]. This experiment shows that multiple LLM-based agents can effectively schedule and improve efficiency on the physical shop floor. By developing peripheral interfaces and fine-tuning models for specific tasks, LLM can operate physical systems and understand tasks well. However, using LLM interactive with physical systems is still in its early stages. Our DDD-GenDT framework hopes to take advantage of LLM by using a small amount of data to construct a digital twin to map physical behavior. This framework enables the LLM-based digital twin to interact with the physical system continuously.

Attracted by LLM's multitask characteristics, researchers began to use LLMs for time series-related tasks. This includes using carefully designed prompts to test the performance of general LLMs for time series prediction or using a large number of time series to train LLMs, which makes it good at




Fig. 2: The Digital Twin Reference Architecture.

generalizing for time prediction tasks. This feature allows us to use LLMs and physical time series measurement data to construct a digital twin. In 2024, Gruver et al. demonstrated that multiple large-scale language models can perform time series predictions without fine-tuning and training by preprocessing time series data and using task prompts as well-designed prompts and statistical point estimates [12]. Moreover, Jin et al. proposed reprogramming time series into natural language form for time series prediction tasks without adjusting LLMs [21]. On the other hand, methods that use a large amount of data to train transformer-based models for creating time series foundation models include TimeGPT-1, proposed by Garza et al. in 2023 [22]. These methods improve LLMs' ability to perform time series-related tasks and provide a new perspective on time series task application. Still, using LLMs for time series prediction in digital twins coupled with physical systems is in its early stages. The DDD-GenDT framework in this study fills this gap by integrating LLMs into the DDDAS paradigm as adaptive digital twins that generate time series data coupled with the behavior of physical states. This approach provides a novel method for dynamic interaction between LLMs and physical systems, emphasizing online data assimilation and adaptive prediction, which sets our work apart from existing studies.

III. THE DIGITAL TWIN REFERENCE ARCHITECTURE

To address the growing complexity and diversity of digital twin (DT) systems, we define a digital twin reference architecture as a foundational guide for the building and implementing DT systems [23]. This architecture illustrates the connection between physical and virtual spaces through digital twinning, as shown in Figure 2.

In the physical space, the basis is the physical system, and the sensors attached to the physical system capture data to measure the physical quantities of interest [24] and transmit




Fig. 3: High-Level Architecture of DDD-GenDT. During the system operation, DT Trigger captures the current execution state and extracts history from the database to define LLM-based DT and output physical behavior prediction. Then, the current observations from the physical system are combined to perform feedback control and early quality inspection.

them through the data network. Network communication is a bridge that ensures a seamless flow of data between physical space and virtual space. In the virtual space, behavioral modeling simulates the physical characteristics of physical systems and is supplemented by interoperability to ensure seamless collaboration between systems and even models. At the upper level, process management coordinates various operations in the virtual space and maintains consistency with the physical space. At the same time, visualization presents digital twin data and simulations to users in an easily accessible manner. Furthermore, the architecture emphasizes fundamental considerations such as security, accessibility, synchronization, interoperability, and fidelity [25–28], which are critical to ensuring the stability, accuracy, and overall performance of the digital twin system.

This DT reference architecture offers a structured starting point for guiding the development and implementation of complex DT systems. By detailing the connections between physical and virtual spaces and highlighting the performance metrics of DT, this reference architecture can be applied to different domain-specific needs to promote the application of digital twins in various fields.

IV. DDD-GENDT FRAMEWORK

This article proposes a framework called DDD-GenDT. The concept of dynamic decision-making and abstraction forms for digital twins are inspired by Kapteyn et al. [29], enabling the framework to adapt to different physical states and interact with physical systems. The concept of DDD-GenDT is illustrated in Figure 3. We apply it to CNC machine tools as a concrete example, but please note that its abstraction forms and dynamic LLM-based digital twin allow this framework to be applied in various fields. In the following subsections, we will discuss the details of the LLM-based dynamic DT and how it interacts with the physical systems. Table I lists the main notations.

TABLE I: Notations in This Article

Notation	Meaning
\mathbb{N}^+	The positive integer set $\{x \in \mathbb{N} x > 0\}$
\mathcal{P}	The physical process
D	The dynamic data-driven digital-twin
M	The physical measurement
C	The current measurement
Q	Quantities of interest
O	The set of observational data
$o_t \in \mathbb{R}$	The observation at time t
$U(\cdot)$	The control input function
$R(\cdot)$	The reward function for quantifies overall performance
$\mathcal{M}_{LLM} f_x(\cdot)$	the function of large language model
\mathcal{X}	Dataset of LLM-based DT Input
Y	The ground truth of DT output
\hat{Y}	LLM-based DT output
\hat{y}	Time series sample vector of DT attempts
$\hat{y}(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}$	The LLM-based DT prediction prediction at time \hat{t}_i
\mathbf{t}	The vector of the same timestamp from DT attempts
L_w	Window length of sliding window
T	Threshold
τ	Temperature parameter of LLM
p_{top}	Top-P parameter of LLM
e	Error
r	Record in measurement database
$t \in \mathbb{N}^+$	Discrete timestamp of observation
$\hat{t} \in \mathbb{N}^+$	Discrete timestamp of DT output
$c \in \mathbb{N}^+$	The current process state
$k \in \mathbb{N}^+$	The total number of machining process states
$i \in \mathbb{N}^+$	The number of index
$n \in \mathbb{N}^+$	The total number of samples
$j \in \mathbb{N}^+$	The prediction length
$m \in \mathbb{N}^+$	The number of the history data

A. LLM-Based Dynamic Digital Twin

The goal of LLM-based dynamic digital twin is to obtain a mapping of the current physical behavior state through adaptive input. To use LLM as a dynamic digital twin, we use the DT Trigger component to monitor the current execution state \mathcal{P}_c and obtain history data from different measurements corresponding to the current state. The history data are time series data, denote as $\mathbf{x}_{k,1:L_w} = [x_{k,1}, x_{k,2}, \dots, x_{k,L_w}]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where L_w is the window length, and k represents the process state index. The definition of history data for input is defined as Equation 1.

$$\mathcal{X}_{\text{hist}} = [\mathbf{x}_k^{r_c-m:r_c-1}]_{k=\mathcal{P}_c} \quad (1)$$

Here, $\mathbf{x}_k^{C-n:C-1}$ denotes the ensemble time series data from the n measurements before the current measurement C up to $C-1$. The index $k = \mathcal{P}_c$ indicates that we focus on the measurements corresponding to the current execution state \mathcal{P}_c . The expansion of this history data is written as $[\mathbf{x}_k^{C-n} \dots \mathbf{x}_k^{C-2} \mathbf{x}_k^{C-1}]$. To control the randomness of model output, we used Top-P (p_{top}) and Temperature (τ). The temperature adjusts the randomness of the predictions of the model. Lower values make the output more deterministic and focused, while higher values increase diversity and creativity by favoring less probable tokens [30]. Top-P controls the range of possible results by limiting the model to a subset of the most probable symbols whose cumulative probability is below a threshold [31]. Next, we input these historical data ($\mathcal{X}_{\text{hist}}$), Top-P (p_{top}), and Temperature (τ) as parameters into the LLM

function $\mathcal{M}_{LLMfx}(\cdot)$, and define this LLM function as the current-state digital twin D_c , as shown in Equation 2.

$$D_c := \mathcal{M}_{LLMfx}(\mathcal{X}_{\text{hist}}, p_{top}, \tau, L_w) \quad (2)$$

Despite p_{top} and τ controlling the randomness of the model output, LLMs, designed for a wide range of general tasks, still exhibit varying degrees of error when mapping physical states to the corresponding ground truth in time series tasks. To generate accurate physical state mappings, we make LLM function attempts to reconstruct the physical state mapping n times and use the statistical point estimation method to calculate the final output of the dynamic DT LLM base \hat{Y} [12, 32]. The output of each attempt of measurement reconstruction is denoted as vector \hat{y} . where $\hat{y} = [\hat{y}(t_1) \ \hat{y}(t_2) \ \dots \ \hat{y}(t_{L_w})]$, and $\hat{y}(t_i) = \hat{y}_{c,i}$. We collect these n attempts into a matrix as the current state digital twin output D_c^{out} , shown in Equation 3.

$$D_c^{out} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_1 \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_1(t_1) & \hat{y}_1(t_2) & \dots & \hat{y}_1(t_{L_w}) \\ \hat{y}_2(t_1) & \hat{y}_2(t_2) & \dots & \hat{y}_2(t_{L_w}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hat{y}_n(t_1) & \hat{y}_n(t_2) & \dots & \hat{y}_n(t_{L_w}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

Each column of the D_c^{out} matrix is regarded as a vector $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i$, illustrated in 5. The vector $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i$ defined as Equation 4.

$$\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i = [\hat{y}_1(t_i) \ \hat{y}_2(t_i) \ \dots \ \hat{y}_n(t_i)]^T \quad (4)$$

$$D_c^{out} = \begin{bmatrix} | & | & & | \\ \hat{\mathbf{t}}_1 & \hat{\mathbf{t}}_2 & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{t}}_{L_w} \\ | & | & & | \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

Next, we apply the statistical point estimation to D_c^{out} . Here, we use the median as a function $median(\cdot)$ and apply it to D_c^{out} to obtain the median of the vector $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i$ at each time step, using median can reduce the influence from bias, and the median of $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i$ denoted as $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$. Finally, the reconstruction signal of the current physical state mapping is \hat{Y}_c , defined as Equation 6.

$$\hat{Y}_c = median(D_c^{out}) = [\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_1 \ \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_2 \ \dots \ \tilde{\mathbf{t}}_{L_w}] \quad (6)$$

The LLM-based dynamic digital twin algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1. In the next subsection, we will discuss a case study of how LLM-based dynamic digital twins interact with physical systems.

B. Interactive with Physical System

The way in which LLM-based DT interacts with the physical system is illustrated in Figure 4. The LLM, as a dynamic DT, continuously maps the corresponding physical behavior state that changes over time through the input of dynamic history data. In addition, based on the output of the digital twin and the current physical behavior observations, the LLM-based dynamic DT can make decisions on the physical system. After obtaining the output \hat{Y}_c of the LLM-based dynamic DT's mapping of the current physical state, we combine

Algorithm 1 LLM-based Dynamic Digital Twin Algorithm

Input: Database DB , LLM Function \mathcal{M}_{LLMfx} , Current Physical Process State \mathcal{P}_c , Number of Records m , Temperature Parameter τ , Prediction Length L_w , Number of Reconstruction Attempts n .

Output: Transmit Predicted Signal \hat{Y}_c to calculate quantities of interest

- 1: **while** Machining process is running **do**
- 2: $\mathcal{X}_{\text{hist}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ \triangleright Initialize history data set
- 3: $D_c^{out} \leftarrow \emptyset$ \triangleright Initialize output matrix
- 4: $k \leftarrow$ Obtain current process state \mathcal{P}_c
- 5: Identify the current record $\mathbf{x}_k^{r_c}$ in DB
- 6: $\mathcal{X}_{\text{hist}} \leftarrow$ Retrieve the m records preceding r_c with the same state k from DB , denoted as $\{\mathbf{x}_k^{r_c-m}, \mathbf{x}_k^{r_c-m+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k^{r_c-1}\}$
- 7: Concatenate all history signal subsets in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{hist}}$.
- 8: $\mathcal{X}_{\text{hist}} \leftarrow [\mathbf{x}_k^{r_c-m:r_c-1}]$
- 9: $D_c \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{LLMfx}(\mathcal{X}_{\text{hist}}, p_{top}, \tau, L_w)$ \triangleright Define DT
- 10: **for** $i = 1$ to n **do**
- 11: $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leftarrow$ Obtain output vector from $D_c.output()$
- 12: Append $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$ as a row in D_c^{out}
- 13: **end for**
- 14: $\hat{Y}_c \leftarrow median(D_c^{out})$ \triangleright Predicted signal
- 15: Send \hat{Y}_c to downstream calculations (e.g., quantities of interest).
- 16: Update DB with the latest physical process data
- 17: **end while**

it with the observation O_c of the current physical state to calculate the quantities of interest Q_c . The O_c is a current machining state measurement of the online workpiece, where $O_{c,1:L_w} = [o_{c:1}, o_{c:2}, \dots, o_{c:L_w}]$ and $o \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case, the quantities of interest Q_c is the root mean square error (RMSE) between the current observation O_c and the LLM-based dynamic DT output \hat{Y}_c , and Q_c defined as Equation 7.

$$Q_c = e_c^{\text{RMSE}} = \text{RMSE}(O_c, \hat{Y}_c) \quad (7)$$

Next, if the error between the current measurement and the digital twin output is too large, there is a possibility of anomaly. If there are abnormalities during the processing, it may lead to material waste or equipment damage. Therefore, early warning or stopping the machine is crucial to avoid further impact. The $U(\cdot)$ is the control input function, which controls the physical system, CNC machine, based on Q_c . We can consider continuing manufacturing, reporting a warning, or stopping the machine through the threshold T_{low} and T_{high} setting. The reason for providing the warning is to avoid the variability of the errors generated by large language models, which may frequently bring the machine to a halt and cause damage to the machine. The control input function $U(\cdot)$ is defined in Equation 8.

$$U(Q_c) = \begin{cases} \text{Continue} & \text{if } Q_c < T_{low} \\ \text{Warning} & \text{if } T_{low} \leq Q_c \leq T_{high} \\ \text{Stop} & \text{if } Q_c > T_{high} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

This framework can also provide information on the quality of finished products at an early stage. We define the reward function $R(\cdot)$ to evaluate the quality of the overall product machining process. The reward function can be used as an early inspection of product quality through cumulative RMSE during the interaction process and setting the production health threshold T_{health} . The cumulative RMSE is defined as Equation 9, and the reward function is defined as Equation 10. If the cumulative RMSE exceeds the product health threshold setting, early information will be provided that the product inspection failed. If it is lower than the product health threshold, early information will be provided that the product has passed the inspection.

$$e_{cum} = \sum_{i=1}^c e_i \quad (9)$$

$$R(e_{cum}) = \begin{cases} \text{Fail} & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^c e_i^{RMSE} > T_{health} \\ \text{Pass} & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^c e_i^{RMSE} \leq T_{health} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

V. EXPERIMENT AND RESULT ANALYSIS

This study will use CNC machining with spindle current measurement as an example of an application of DDD-GenDT. When CNC machining workpieces are being manufactured, different machining behaviors will have different patterns in power consumption curves, and we can analyze and gain insight into the machining process by observing these patterns. In 2019, Lin et al. reported using side channels to measure CNC spindle power consumption as a monitoring indicator of the cutting process, which can be used to detect product quality during the cutting process to avoid cyber-physical attacks [33]. The framework can continuously monitor the




Fig. 4: LLM-Based Dynamic Digital Twin Interactive with Physical System. The system will capture the sliding window with the same state from history data as input to LLM for getting the prediction output \hat{Y}_c . Then, combine the current online observation O_c to calculate current quantities of interest Q_c to control the operating process with control function U and early quality inspection with reward function R .

output of the interaction between the digital twin and physical measurements during manufacturing, avoiding material waste caused by anomalies in the early stages. In addition, tool wear will affect the spindle motor current, which can be used to assess tool condition [34, 35]. Therefore, the spindle motor's electrical behavior is a vital monitor target of the CNC machining process's quality and security.

We used GPT-4 and GPT 3.5 Turbo as LLM-based dynamic DTs in the DDD-GenDT framework in experiments. For the GPT 3.5 Turbo and GPT-4 models, we use the LLTime method proposed by Gruver et al. [12] to generate time series data corresponding to the physical state. Our scenario is to apply a digital twin to map the CNC cutting process, and We conducted experiments using the spindle current in the NASA milling data set [36]. Figure 5 is the spindle current measurement from case 1 after the 8Hz Butterworth low-pass filter in the NASA milling dataset, and Table II shows the details of the measurement values of the flank wear in different runs. Here, "runs" refer to repeated executions of the same CNC cutting program to the machining process. Each "run" represents a complete manufacturing cycle of a workpiece using the same machining process. We can observe that from the first run to the final run, the current level of the spindle motor increases, different fluctuation behavior, and different stable and finished time lengths due to tool wear. Our goal is to use the LLM-Based DT method to adaptively reflect the physical behavior of the motor current behavior under different tool wear conditions. This section discusses physical state mapping and LLM-based dynamic DT output error analysis using the DDD-GenDT framework.

A. Digital Twin Mapping of Physical States

The example results of mapping the spindle motor current in different processing stages and the visualization results are shown in Figure 6. The light-colored areas above and below the solid line are plus and minus one standard deviation. In these results, GPT-4 is closer to ground truth than GPT 3.5 Turbo in the initial cutting stage. Although GPT 3.5 Turbo captures some physical behavior, its behavior deviates significantly




Fig. 5: Low-Pass Filtered CNC Spindle Current Signal at 8Hz: NASA Milling Dataset (Case 1)

TABLE II: Reconstruction Results of Spindle Current

Runs	Flank Wear (mm)	Spindle Current Reconstruction (A)							
		GPT 3.5 Turbo		GPT-4		1D CNN AE (Training with Run 1-4)		1D CNN AE (Training with Run 3-4)	
		Err_{avg}	Err_{std}	Err_{avg}	Err_{std}	Err_{avg}	Err_{std}	Err_{avg}	Err_{std}
1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	0.0367 (Linear interpolation)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	0.0734 (Linear interpolation)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	0.11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	0.155 (Linear interpolation)	2.791	0.718	0.951	0.244	0.162	0.224	0.419	0.328
6	0.2	1.832	0.867	0.812	0.504	0.173	0.246	0.449	0.362
7	0.24	1.304	1.01	0.608	0.425	0.204	0.286	0.53	0.409
8	0.29	1.002	1.127	0.553	0.661	0.172	0.27	0.464	0.398
9	0.28	0.86	0.861	0.34	0.578	0.173	0.269	0.462	0.396
10	0.29	0.52	0.848	0.385	0.685	0.174	0.277	0.468	0.405
11	0.38	0.4	0.68	0.27	0.458	0.165	0.270	0.442	0.407
12	0.4	0.338	0.651	0.352	0.679	0.102	0.187	0.27	0.315
13	0.43	0.281	0.55	0.283	0.598	0.118	0.214	0.317	0.352
14	0.45	0.257	0.516	0.243	0.495	0.119	0.213	0.314	0.349




Fig. 6: Example results of mapping and predicting spindle motor current behavior. The black line is an ensemble time series input to LLM for mapping and predicting the behavior change in the same physical state.

from the ground truth, and its output fluctuation range is inconsistent with the ground truth. The GPT-4 output is more stable and consistent with the ground truth trend. Furthermore, in the stable cutting stage, the performance of GPT-4 and GPT 3.5 Turbo is also different. The output of GPT 3.5 Turbo has more significant fluctuations within the standard deviation range. However, the results of GPT-4 show smaller deviations, and its overlap with ground truth is higher, indicating that its stable cutting stage mapping has higher precision. These results highlight that GPT-4 is more stable and accurate in performing physical behavior mapping, effectively capturing the behavioral patterns of real systems. The superior performance of GPT-4 can be attributed to its improved architecture and improved training process, which allow the GPT-4 model to capture complex patterns and relationships in the data more effectively [37]. As the core solution of LLM-based dynamic DT, GPT-4 completes the physical behavior mapping task more effectively, providing more reliable and consistent results.




Fig. 7: Boxplot of LLM-Based Dynamic DT Performance

B. LLM-based Dynamic DT Output Analysis

To analyze the performance of different models, we used ten runs in case 1 from the NASA milling data set to evaluate the performance. In this dataset, the CNC cutting program is fixed for all runs within the same case, ensuring that observed variations in the signal collection are caused by physical system changes not caused by the program. Therefore, we divide the signal using the sliding window, treat each divided window as a state [38], and use the same state of the previous n runs as LLM input. n here is set to 4 to maximize the use of the LLM input length. The error is quantified by comparing the model outputs with the corresponding ground truth states, as defined in Equation 11. This error metric is represented as a vector, where each element corresponds to the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) computed between the predicted output \hat{Y}_i and the ground truth Y_i for a specific state i . The formulation is expressed as:

$$\mathbf{Err} = \begin{bmatrix} RMSE(\hat{Y}_1, Y_1) \\ RMSE(\hat{Y}_2, Y_2) \\ \vdots \\ RMSE(\hat{Y}_n, Y_n) \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

This structured representation ensures that the error is systematically evaluated across all states, comprehensively assessing the model’s performance. After obtaining the error information \mathbf{Err} , we use a box plot to visualize the error distribution of the physical state mapping of ten runs. In Figure 7, the box plots illustrate the RMSE distribution of CNC spindle current across ten runs for GPT-3.5 Turbo and GPT-4. The median RMSE values of GPT-4 are consistently lower than those of GPT-3.5 Turbo, highlighting its superior performance in mapping the physical state of the spindle motor current. Moreover, the interquartile range (IQR) variability is significantly narrower for GPT-4 than GPT-3.5 Turbo, indicating more stable and reliable predictions across different runs. The overlaid red line shows the progression of tool wear as the runs progress, indicating a gradual increase in wear. Interestingly, GPT-4 maintains a relatively low RMSE and reduced error and variability despite increasing tool wear, demonstrating its robustness in dynamically adapting to the system’s physical changes.

VI. DISCUSSION

This section summarizes the experimental results from Section IV, highlighting the performance and robustness of GPT-4 in physical state mapping. The average of GPT-4 \mathbf{Err}_{avg} in ten runs is 0.479A, which is 4.79% of the maximum spindle motor current measurement of 10A. These values can be referenced when determining the threshold parameters T_{low} and T_{high} for the control function. Although this level of fidelity may not effectively detect subtle anomalies, GPT-4 remains a competitive solution within the DDD-GenDT




Fig. 8: Performance Comparison between DDD-GenDT and Autoencoder

framework, especially given its ability to perform well with limited data through zero-shot behavior forecasting.

Furthermore, the results demonstrate that GPT-4 achieves performance levels comparable to traditional deep learning methods, such as 1D CNN AE, with significantly reduced training data. In Table II, the 1D CNN AE models, trained with 2434 and 1217 state windows (Runs 1-4 and Runs 3-4, respectively), achieve slightly better RMSE performance. However, the training cost for these models is substantially higher because they rely on larger datasets and fixed-data set training. This highlights the key advantage of GPT-4: its ability to achieve comparable performance with a minimal dataset, leveraging dynamic zero-shot learning. Figure 8 shows that starting from Run 7, the RMSE of GPT-4 is very close to that of 1D CNN AE (Trained with Run 3-4), and its performance is stable and gradually optimized as the physical behavior of the spindle motor current due to the growth of tool wear stabilizes. Furthermore, while fine-tuning the LLM for specific tasks can reduce inference errors, it requires substantial data quality, computational resources, and significant investments in expertise and hardware. Therefore, dynamically adjusting the prompt input to map the physical state used in this article is a low-cost and effective method [39].

VII. CONCLUSION

In this study, we proposed the DDD-GenDT framework using LLM as a dynamic digital twin to capture and map the physical state behavior of complex systems and proposed the CNC machining power consumption curve as an application case to make LLM Dynamic DT closely related to the physical system interact and take control. Our experimental results show that GPT 3.5 Turbo and GPT-4 exhibit acceptable fidelity and low variability, making them competitive options for integration into the dynamic decision-making process of the DDD-GenDT framework. Despite inherent computational limitations and input length constraints, the LLMs show great promise in generating time series for physical state mapping with a small amount of data.

The main limitation of this study is the computational resource requirements of LLMs. The limitation of their input length makes LLMs cannot input a large amount of history data, high-frequency data, or text description of physical behavior to provide more information to facilitate the mapping fidelity of physical states [40]. Also, because computing resources and model architecture limit the LLM response time and are not fast, this framework is unsuitable for a system with high-speed physical state change behaviors. However, without fine-tuning and training on LLMs, using dynamic historical corresponding data input to generate physical state mapping with good robustness is still a cost-effective solution with acceptable fidelity. Future work will focus on LLM-based dynamic DT for edge computing and improvement of inference speed and accuracy to improve the usability of the framework proposed in this article.

In conclusion, this framework enables LLM to be coupled to physical systems as a dynamic digital twin by leveraging abstraction forms. Our experimental result demonstrates the

potential application value of LLM as a digital twin. Although some limitations are caused by LLM features, the development of LLM is still in its early stages. Nonetheless, this framework still provides a development direction for establishing dynamic digital twins and brings new opportunities for interactive applications between digital twins and physical systems with insufficient data or difficult data collection scenarios.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under research projects 2335046 and OIA-2218046.

REFERENCES

- [1] Q. Min, Y. Lu, Z. Liu, C. Su, and B. Wang, "Machine learning based digital twin framework for production optimization in petrochemical industry," *International Journal of Information Management*, vol. 49, pp. 502–519, 2019.
- [2] M. J. Kaur, V. P. Mishra, and P. Maheshwari, "The convergence of digital twin, iot, and machine learning: transforming data into action," *Digital twin technologies and smart cities*, pp. 3–17, 2020.
- [3] M. M. Rathore, S. A. Shah, D. Shukla, E. Bentafat, and S. Bakiras, "The role of ai, machine learning, and big data in digital twinning: A systematic literature review, challenges, and opportunities," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 32 030–32 052, 2021.
- [4] Y. Rao, R. Redmon, K. Dale, S. E. Haupt, A. Hopkinson, A. Bostrom, S. Boukabara, T. Geenen, D. M. Hall, B. D. Smith *et al.*, "Developing digital twins for earth systems: Purpose, requisites, and benefits," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11175*, 2023.
- [5] G. Coorey, G. A. Figtree, D. F. Fletcher, and J. Redfern, "The health digital twin: advancing precision cardiovascular medicine," *Nature Reviews Cardiology*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 803–804, 2021.
- [6] C. Cimino, E. Negri, and L. Fumagalli, "Review of digital twin applications in manufacturing," *Computers in industry*, vol. 113, p. 103130, 2019.
- [7] T. Wuest, D. Weimer, C. Irgens, and K.-D. Thoben, "Machine learning in manufacturing: advantages, challenges, and applications," *Production & Manufacturing Research*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 23–45, 2016.
- [8] F. Tao and Q. Qi, "Make more digital twins," *Nature*, vol. 573, no. 7775, pp. 490–491, 2019.
- [9] F. Tao, H. Zhang, A. Liu, and A. Y. Nee, "Digital twin in industry: State-of-the-art," *IEEE Transactions on industrial informatics*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 2405–2415, 2018.
- [10] F. Xu, N. Ding, N. Li, L. Liu, N. Hou, N. Xu, W. Guo, L. Tian, H. Xu, C.-M. L. Wu *et al.*, "A review of bearing failure modes, mechanisms and causes," *Engineering Failure Analysis*, p. 107518, 2023.
- [11] F. Darema, E. P. Blasch, S. Ravela, and A. J. Aved, "The dynamic data driven applications systems (dddas) paradigm and emerging directions," *Handbook of Dynamic Data Driven Applications Systems: Volume 2*, pp. 1–51, 2023.
- [12] N. Gruver, M. Finzi, S. Qiu, and A. G. Wilson, "Large language models are zero-shot time series forecasters," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [13] M. Shafto, M. Conroy, R. Doyle, E. Glaessgen, C. Kemp, J. LeMoigne, and L. Wang, "Draft modeling, simulation, information technology & processing roadmap," *Technology area*, vol. 11, pp. 1–32, 2010.
- [14] C. Li, E. O. Adeniyi, and P. Zarzycki, "Machine learning surrogates for surface complexation model of uranium sorption to oxides," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 6603, 2024.
- [15] A. Rasheed, O. San, and T. Kvamsdal, "Digital twin: Values, challenges and enablers from a modeling perspective," *IEEE access*, vol. 8, pp. 21 980–22 012, 2020.
- [16] M. G. Kapteyn, D. J. Knezevic, D. Huynh, M. Tran, and K. E. Willcox, "Data-driven physics-based digital twins via a library of component-based reduced-order models," *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, vol. 123, no. 13, pp. 2986–3003, 2022.
- [17] S. Mondal, A. Chattopadhyay, A. Mukhopadhyay, and A. Ray, "Transfer learning of deep neural networks for predicting thermoacoustic instabilities in combustion systems," *Energy and AI*, vol. 5, p. 100085, 2021.
- [18] D. A. Boiko, R. MacKnight, B. Kline, and G. Gomes, "Autonomous chemical research with large language models," *Nature*, vol. 624, no. 7992, pp. 570–578, 2023.
- [19] C. Gkournelos, C. Konstantinou, and S. Makris, "An llm-based approach for enabling seamless human-robot collaboration in assembly," *CIRP Annals*, 2024.
- [20] Z. Zhao, D. Tang, H. Zhu, Z. Zhang, K. Chen, C. Liu, and Y. Ji, "A large language model-based multi-agent manufacturing system for intelligent shopfloor," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16887*, 2024.
- [21] M. Jin, S. Wang, L. Ma, Z. Chu, J. Y. Zhang, X. Shi, P.-Y. Chen, Y. Liang, Y.-F. Li, S. Pan *et al.*, "Time-llm: Time series forecasting by re-programming large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01728*, 2023.
- [22] A. Garza and M. Mergenthaler-Canseco, "Timegpt-1," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03589*, 2023.
- [23] V. Piroumian, "Digital twins: Universal interoperability for the digital age," *Computer*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 61–69, 2021.
- [24] N. Karnik, M. G. Abdo, C. E. Estrada-Perez, J. S. Yoo, J. J. Cogliati, R. S. Skifton, P. Calderoni, S. L. Brunton, and K. Manohar, "Constrained optimization of sensor placement for nuclear digital twins," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 2024.
- [25] C. Alcaraz and J. Lopez, "Digital twin: A comprehensive survey of security threats," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 1475–1503, 2022.
- [26] Z. Zhang, Z. Guan, Y. Gong, D. Luo, and L. Yue, "Improved multi-fidelity simulation-based optimisation: application in a digital twin shop floor," *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 1016–1035, 2022.
- [27] P. Jia, X. Wang, and X. Shen, "Digital-twin-enabled intelligent distributed clock synchronization in industrial iot systems," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 4548–4559, 2020.
- [28] R. Klar, N. Arvidsson, and V. Angelakis, "Digital twins" maturity: The need for interoperability," *IEEE Systems Journal*, 2023.
- [29] M. G. Kapteyn, J. V. Pretorius, and K. E. Willcox, "A probabilistic graphical model foundation for enabling predictive digital twins at scale," *Nature Computational Science*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 337–347, 2021.
- [30] G. Hinton, "Distilling the knowledge in a neural network," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [31] A. Holtzman, J. Buys, L. Du, M. Forbes, and Y. Choi, "The curious case of neural text degeneration," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09751*, 2019.
- [32] U. Katz, E. Cohen, E. Shachar, J. Somer, A. Fink, E. Morse, B. Shreiber, and I. Wolf, "Gpt versus resident physicians—a benchmark based on official board scores," *NEJM AI*, vol. 1, no. 5, p. A1d3p2300192, 2024.
- [33] Y.-Z. Lin, S. Shao, M. H. Rahman, M. Shafae, and P. Satam, "Dt4i4-security: Digital twin framework for industry 4.0 systems security," in *2023 IEEE 14th Annual Ubiquitous Computing, Electronics & Mobile Communication Conference (UEMCON)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 0200–0209.
- [34] H. Kim, J. Ahn, S. Kim, and S. Takata, "Real-time drill wear estimation based on spindle motor power," *Journal of Materials Processing Technology*, vol. 124, no. 3, pp. 267–273, 2002.
- [35] M. Uekita and Y. Takaya, "Tool condition monitoring for form milling of large parts by combining spindle motor current and acoustic emission signals," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 89, pp. 65–75, 2017.
- [36] NASA, "Milling wear dataset," 2024, accessed: 2024-12-18. [Online]. Available: https://data.nasa.gov/Raw-Data/Milling-Wear/vjv9-9f3x/about_data
- [37] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat *et al.*, "Gpt-4 technical report," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [38] P. Satam and S. Hariri, "Wids: An anomaly based intrusion detection system for wi-fi (ieee 802.11) protocol," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1077–1091, 2020.
- [39] X. Zhang, N. Talukdar, S. Vemulapalli, S. Ahn, J. Wang, H. Meng, S. M. B. Murtaza, D. Leshchiner, A. A. Dave, D. F. Joseph *et al.*, "Comparison of prompt engineering and fine-tuning strategies in large language models in the classification of clinical notes," *medRxiv*, pp. 2024–02, 2024.
- [40] M. Jin, H. Tang, C. Zhang, Q. Yu, C. Liu, S. Zhu, Y. Zhang, and M. Du, "Time series forecasting with llms: Understanding and enhancing model capabilities," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10835*, 2024.



Yu-Zheng Lin is a Ph.D. candidate in the Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Arizona. He received his M.S. degree from the National Taiwan University of Science and Technology (TaiwanTech). Previously, he worked as a research assistant at the National Synchrotron Radiation Research Center in Taiwan. His research interests include signal processing, control systems, artificial intelligence, and cyber-physical security.



Qinxuan Shi is a PhD student in the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at the University of North Dakota (UND), supervised by Dr. Sicong Shao. He is a member of the the Intelligent Software and System Security Lab (iSSSL) at UND. He received his B.E. degree in Software Engineering from Nanjing University, China, in 2020 and his M.S. degree in Computer Science from University of Florida in 2023. His research focuses on cybersecurity, machine learning, and software engineering.



Zhanglong Yang is a PhD student of the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at the University of North Dakota (UND), supervised by Dr. Sicong Shao. He is a member of the the Intelligent Software and System Security Lab (iSSSL) at UND. He received his B.S. degree in Mathematics-Physics Fundamental Science from University of Electronic Science and Technology of China in 2023. His research focuses on cybersecurity, machine learning, and artificial intelligence.



Banafsheh Saber Latibari received the B.Sc. degree in computer engineering from the K. N. Toosi University of Technology, in 2014, and the M.Sc. degree in computer architecture from the Sharif University of Technology, in 2017. She is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree with the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, University of California at Davis. From 2019 to 2021, she was a Graduate Research Assistant with the GATE Laboratory, George Mason University. Her research interests include computer vision, machine learning, embedded system security, and computer architecture.



Sicong Shao is an Assistant Professor in the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at the University of North Dakota (UND). He leads the Intelligent Software and System Security Lab (iSSSL), which focuses on advancing cutting-edge research in system security, software security, digital forensics, and AI-assisted cybersecurity techniques. Prior to joining UND, he was a Research Assistant Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) at the University of Arizona, where he also received his Ph.D. in ECE.

His research interests include cybersecurity, machine learning, artificial intelligence, and software engineering.



Soheil Salehi (Member, IEEE) received the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in ECE from the University of Central Florida (UCF), in 2016 and 2020, respectively. He is currently an Assistant Professor with the Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) Department, The University of Arizona (UofA). Prior to joining UofA, he was a NSF-Sponsored Computing Innovation Fellow with the Accelerated, Secure, and Energy-Efficient Computing Laboratory, and the Center for Hardware and Embedded Systems Security and Trust, University of California at Davis (UC Davis). He has expertise in the areas of hardware security and the IoT supply-chain security as well as applied ML for secure hardware design. Moreover, he has designed novel circuits and architectures for secure and accelerated computing. He has received several nominations and award recognition, which include the Outstanding Reviewer Award at IEEE/ACM DAC'23, the Best Poster Award at ACM GLSVLSI'19, the Best Paper Award Nominee at IEEE ISQED'17, the Best Presentation at UC Davis Postdoctoral Research Symposium, in 2021, and the Best Graduate Teaching Assistant Award at UCF, in 2016



Pratik Satam is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Systems and Industrial Engineering at the University of Arizona. He received his B.E. degree in electronics and telecommunication engineering from the University of Mumbai, in 2013, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical and computer engineering from The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA, in 2015 and 2019, respectively. From 2019 to 2022, he has been a Research Assistant Professor with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of Arizona.

His current research interests include autonomic computing, cyber security, cyber resilience, secure critical infrastructures, secure smart manufacturing and cloud security. He is an Associate Editor for the scientific journal Cluster Computing.