

QuArch: A Question-Answering Dataset for AI Agents in Computer Architecture

Shvetank Prakash* Andrew Cheng* Jason Yik* Arya Tschand* Radhika Ghosal*
 Ikechukwu Uchendu* Jessica Quaye* Jeffrey Ma* Shreyas Grampurohit[§] Sofia Giannuzzi*
 Arnav Balyan Fin Amin^γ Aadya Pipersenia[§] Yash Choudhary[§] Ankita Nayak^φ
 Amir Yazdanbakhsh[†] Vijay Janapa Reddi*

*Harvard University [§]Indian Institute of Technology Bombay

^γNorth Carolina State University ^φQualcomm AI Research [†]Google DeepMind

Abstract—We introduce QuArch, a dataset of 1500 human-validated question-answer pairs designed to evaluate and enhance language models’ understanding of computer architecture. The dataset covers areas including processor design, memory systems, and performance optimization. Our analysis highlights a significant performance gap: the best closed-source model achieves 84% accuracy, while the top small open-source model reaches 72%. We observe notable struggles in memory systems, interconnection networks, and benchmarking. Fine-tuning with QuArch improves small model accuracy by up to 8%, establishing a foundation for advancing AI-driven computer architecture research. The dataset and leaderboard are at <https://harvard-edge.github.io/QuArch/>.

I. INTRODUCTION

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has transformed domain-specific tools across diverse fields such as medicine, mathematics, law, finance, and software engineering [1]. In contrast, hardware engineering has lagged significantly in adopting AI-driven solutions. This gap is evident in both the limitations of current language models (LMs) and the scarcity of specialized datasets tailored for hardware. For instance, engineering tasks often perform poorly on general benchmarks like MMLU-Pro [2], highlighting the inadequacy of existing models in understanding domain-specific intricacies. While electronic design automation (EDA) has seen recent progress with datasets for tasks such as register-transfer level (RTL) generation [3], [4], security analysis [5], and verification [6], computer architecture remains underrepresented. Without resources to benchmark and advance AI models, the field is limited in its ability to improve AI-driven solutions.

Datasets play a key role in enabling AI agents. While general-purpose datasets provide broad knowledge, domain-specific datasets are indispensable for developing expertise in areas like computer architecture. These targeted datasets enable AI models to not only demonstrate foundational understanding but also tackle advanced problem-solving tasks within specific domains [7]. Mastery of domain knowledge is a prerequisite for sophisticated reasoning [8], [9]. In architecture, such proficiency is essential for developing practical AI-driven tools and agents [10]. Without a deep understanding of core concepts—such as processor execution, memory hierarchy, and parallelism—it becomes impossible to conduct analyses of the complex trade-offs inherent in system design.

Example 1

Topic: Processor Architecture

Q: In ____, each processor has its own local memory system.

A: (a) symmetric multiprocessing (b) asymmetric multiprocessing (c) core-based multiprocessing (d) **clustered multiprocessing**

Example 2

Topic: Storage Systems

Q: Moving compute closer to the ____ in solid state drives (SSDs) offers higher bandwidth but introduces challenges in managing frequent errors.

A: (a) controller (b) **NAND dies** (c) cache (d) DRAM

Example 3

Topic: Architectural Support

Q: ____ translates the logical address into a physical address.

A: (a) **MMU** (b) Translator (c) Compiler (d) Linker

Fig. 1: Example QAs from QuArch for various topics curated from different sources. The bolded answer is correct.

To address this challenge, we introduce QuArch (pronounced ‘quark’)—the first **Question-Answering Dataset** specifically tailored for Computer **Architecture**. This dataset addresses a critical gap in evaluating LMs understanding of architectural concepts. QuArch comprises 1,500 rigorously curated question-answer pairs, manually annotated by domain experts. It spans both foundational computer architecture principles and contemporary topics, such as deep learning accelerators and quantum computing architectures.

QuArch is designed to assess an LMs’ ability to retrieve and apply domain-specific knowledge, a prerequisite for addressing advanced problem-solving challenges. The dataset serves as a benchmark for both theoretical understanding and practical application in computer architecture.

Leveraging QuArch, we provide the first comprehensive evaluation of the architectural knowledge encoded in state-of-the-art (SOTA) LMs. Our results show LM accuracies ranging from 39% to 84%, revealing a significant 12% knowledge gap between the best-performing small open-source LM and large closed-source LM. Additionally, our experiments demonstrate the utility of QuArch in fine-tuning small LMs, yielding performance improvements of 5.4%–8.3%.




Fig. 2: QuArch dataset construction pipeline.

II. RELATED WORK

Recent efforts have explored the use of GenAI in hardware design. For example, NVIDIA’s ChipNeMo [11] introduced foundation models tailored for chip design tasks, while other studies have focused on developing LM-based tools for RTL generation [4] and hardware verification [6]. Additionally, evaluation datasets in this domain have been created for specific implementation tasks, such as VerilogEval [3] for RTL generation, and general-purpose benchmarks like MMLU [12], which assess engineering knowledge broadly across disciplines. However, none of these prior works specifically evaluate LM understanding of computer architecture concepts. This critical gap limits the ability to assess and advance LM capabilities for architectural challenges. QuArch addresses this unmet need by introducing a focused question-answering dataset specifically designed to evaluate architectural knowledge (Figure 1). The dataset combines synthetic data generation [13] with rigorous expert validation, ensuring both comprehensive coverage and high-quality questions.

III. QUARCH

In this section, we discuss the construction and characteristics of the first version of the dataset: QuArch v0.1.

A. Dataset Curation: The Archipedia Corpus

The construction of QuArch follows a systematic process, as depicted in Figure 2. We first curated “Archipedia,”¹ a term we use to describe a comprehensive compilation of computer architecture knowledge that was assembled for this work. Archipedia synthesizes five decades of information, drawing from academic literature, educational materials, technical documentation, and industry sources across the computing landscape. This extensive corpus captures the evolution of the field over the past 50 years, incorporating contributions from leading institutions, researchers, and organizations globally. Currently, the corpus exceeds 1 billion tokens in size.

Archipedia covers the full spectrum of computing systems, from foundational topics in computer architecture to cutting-edge technologies. It includes design domains such as VLSI design




Fig. 3: Distribution of computer architecture topics in QuArch.

and technology, embedded systems and IoT, parallel and distributed processing, hardware-software co-design, and design automation. In addition, the corpus integrates specialized areas such as computer-aided design tools, hardware security, and quantum computing. To ensure comprehensive coverage, this resource is further enriched with advanced lecture materials and thus provides a diverse and balanced knowledge base.

B. Dataset Generation: QA Creation

The knowledge curation phase (Steps 1 and 2 in Figure 2) established a foundation of well-accepted architectural concepts and principles by leveraging diverse sources. This effort utilized the Archipedia corpus, which provided a comprehensive resource for generating questions for QuArch.

In the QA generation phase (Step 3), commercial LMs were used to synthesize questions grounded in the academic content of Archipedia to ensure technical rigor. The LMs were tasked with creating cloze-style multiple-choice QAs [7] to balance educational value with practical assessment.

The validation phase (Step 4) involved a multi-tiered review process that combined human expertise with LM assistance. Questions derived from undergraduate-level sources were reviewed by an expert with graduate-level architectural expertise, supplemented by LM validation using the “LLM-as-a-judge” technique [14]. Advanced topics were evaluated by a pool of eight experts, and QAs were independently validated by three reviewers who reached consensus to ensure accuracy.

To further enhance the validation process, human experts and LM reviewers received contextual fragments of the source text, transforming the task into a focused reading comprehension exercise. This approach enabled the identification and removal of questions lacking definitive answers or those too narrowly scoped for meaningful assessment. The validation process, facilitated through the Label Studio platform [15], ensured the resulting dataset effectively tests both foundational principles and complex system trade-offs. The final dataset (Step 5) supplemented these expert-validated questions with additional QAs freely available from an online education platform, enriching the dataset’s depth and coverage.

C. Dataset Coverage: Architecture Topics

QuArch v0.1 contains 1,547 question-answer pairs. It captures the breadth of architecture in 13 core areas derived from key themes of the past decade (Figure 3). Processor

¹Data was downloaded and evaluated solely by Harvard University.




Fig. 4: QuArch accuracy ranges from 39%-84%. Larger models (>70B parameters) attain a max of 84%. Small model (<10B parameters) performance drops 12% in comparison.

architecture accounts for the largest proportion of questions (32%), followed by memory systems (22%) and interconnection networks (10%). The topic distribution was determined through a two-stage classification process using OpenAI’s `text-embedding-3-large` model [16]. In the first stage, the word embedding model generates vector representations of topics and questions, and cosine similarity [17] is used to identify the three most relevant topics for each question. In the second stage, an LM selects the final topic from these candidates for accurate categorization and scalability.

Figure 1 illustrates the diversity and depth of architectural concepts covered in QuArch. Foundational questions assess core principles of processor architecture, such as “In clustered multiprocessing, each processor has its own local memory system.” More advanced questions probe emerging trade-offs, exemplified by Question #2 in Figure 1, which addresses near-storage computing: Moving compute closer to NAND dies in solid-state drives increases bandwidth while mitigating the risk of silent data corruption. Finally, Question #3 highlights the dataset’s comprehensive scope by including critical system-level concepts, such as virtual memory and address translation.

IV. RESULTS

To evaluate the state of computer architecture knowledge embedded in LMs, we assess knowledge retrieval capabilities of SOTA models and explore opportunities to improve them.

A. Experimental Setup

We evaluated both open-source and closed-source language models on QuArch. The evaluation included large-scale models such as GPT-4o, Claude-3.5 Sonnet, and Gemini-1.5 Pro, as well as open-source models with parameter counts ranging from 1B to 70B from Google, Meta, and Mistral AI. Each model was presented with questions in a multiple-choice format, requiring the selection of the correct answer from four options. Models were prompted to “act as computer architecture experts” and were evaluated in a zero-shot setting, with no additional context provided beyond the questions themselves. This setup was designed to test the models’ baseline




Fig. 5: Performance breakdown across topics. Color intensity indicates topic’s relative (intra-model) performance, with darker green showing stronger understanding and darker red showing weaker areas. Memory systems and interconnects are more challenging for current LMs. Benchmarking also shows low performance but only accounts for 1% of the QAs.

understanding of architectural concepts. Accuracy (percentage of correct answers) served as the primary evaluation metric.

B. Understanding of Architecture Concepts

Figure 4 presents the baseline performance of LMs on QuArch. The top-performing model achieves 84% accuracy, reflecting a relatively strong but incomplete understanding of architecture concepts. In particular, a substantial knowledge gap exists: the best-performing small open-source LM (<10B parameters) underperforms by 12% on the same questions. The observed performance ceiling of 84% suggests that current LMs still have significant room for improvement in understanding the fundamentals of computer architecture concepts. These findings have important implications for the development of agentic tools for hardware design [10]. While current models exhibit a reasonable grasp of basic architectural concepts, they may require supplementary support or verification mechanisms when addressing complex system-level decisions.

C. Analysis by Architecture Topics

Figure 5 presents a heatmap illustrating LM performance across various architecture topics. Each cell contains the raw accuracy values for a specific topic and corresponding model. To account for substantial differences in raw accuracy due to varying model capacities, the heatmap employs color gradients to represent performance *relative to each model’s overall accuracy*. Dark green denotes the strongest performance for a given model, while dark red highlights the weakest, offering a clearer perspective on relative strengths and weaknesses.

The analysis reveals distinct patterns in how LMs comprehend different architecture topics. Models exhibit their strongest performance in topics such as EDA concepts, IP design and manufacturing, parallel processing architecture

Model	MMLU (%)	GPQA (%)	QuArch (%)
GPT-4o	88.7	53.6	83.0
Claude 3.5 Sonnet	88.3	59.4	84.0

TABLE I: SoTA QA benchmark accuracy versus QuArch.

fundamentals, and compute workload characterization (relative to other topics). Conversely, significant challenges are observed in three critical areas: memory systems, interconnection networks, and benchmarking and measurement. These weaknesses are consistent with expectations, as questions in these areas often involve nuanced system-level interactions and intricate technical trade-offs. Although general trends are evident, individual model performance varies considerably. For example, Llama-3.1-70B demonstrates notable strength in storage systems QAs, outperforming larger models such as Claude 3.5 Sonnet and GPT-4o. Furthermore, it performs well in benchmarking and measurement—a topic that accounts for only 1% of the dataset (Figure 3)—unlike most other models.

These findings underscore specific gaps in the architectural knowledge of current LMs. Such disparities likely stem from differences in the data blends used during model training. For instance, the stronger performance in parallel processor architectures, such as GPUs and deep learning accelerators, likely reflects increased community focus and the abundance of academic text on these topics. In contrast, the weaker performance in memory systems and interconnection networks suggests these complex, system-level concepts warrant greater emphasis when developing future AI-based tools for architects.

D. QuArch as an Architecture Benchmark

To validate the effectiveness of QuArch as a benchmark, we evaluate its ability to distinguish between the capabilities of different LMs and compare it to established QA benchmarks. An effective benchmark should strike a balance—it should neither be trivial to solve nor overly challenging so that it’s unattainable. QuArch satisfies this criterion, as even the top-performing models, such as GPT-4o and Claude 3.5-Sonnet, achieve accuracies of only 83–84%. This highlights substantial room for improvement in architectural understanding.

This performance ceiling is consistent with what is observed on other well-established QA benchmarks. As shown in Table I, the same models achieve comparable performance (88–89% [18], [19]) on general knowledge benchmarks like MMLU [12], which include engineering-related QAs. This suggests that QuArch’s difficulty aligns well with other technical assessments. In contrast, GPQA [20], one of the most challenging benchmarks available, achieves lower accuracies (54–59%) due to its hand-crafted questions that require advanced QA skills beyond knowledge retrieval. QuArch’s positioning between MMLU and GPQA demonstrates its value as a meaningful and balanced measure of model capabilities. Furthermore, the room for improvement, particularly in advanced architecture topics, highlights QuArch’s potential to track progress in LMs’ understanding of computer architecture. However, further expansion and refinement of the dataset will be necessary to fully realize its benchmarking potential.

Model	Original (%)	Fine-Tuned (%)	Improvement (%)
Gemma-2-2B	38.7 ± 3.0	47.0 ± 3.0	+8.3
Llama-3.2-3B	59.6 ± 1.0	65.0 ± 2.0	+5.4

TABLE II: Mean and standard deviation of test accuracy when fine-tuning on QuArch using repeated random train-test splits.

E. QuArch as an Architecture Training Dataset

ML datasets serve dual purposes: benchmarking and training. In this section, we investigate whether QuArch can enhance the domain-specific knowledge of LMs through fine-tuning. To this end, we fine-tuned instruction-tuned variants of small open-source LMs using an 80-20 train-test split. To ensure robustness in the training evaluation, we employed repeated random train-test splitting with five different seeds.

Table II reports mean test set accuracy improvements after fine-tuning on QuArch across different train-test splits. The results indicate significant performance gains, even with the relatively small size of the dataset. On average, instruction-tuned variants of Gemma-2-2B and Llama-3.2-3B demonstrated improvements ranging from 5.4% to 8.3%. These substantial gains underscore the potential of QuArch to enhance LMs’ understanding of computer architecture. Moreover, the results highlight the importance of developing larger, diverse datasets to further advance AI-based solutions in this domain.

V. CONCLUSION

QuArch is the first question-answering dataset for computer architecture, providing a means to evaluate domain knowledge. Through QuArch, we uncover both the strengths and limitations of SoTA LMs to reveal substantial room for improvement in this domain. QuArch benchmarks knowledge retrieval—an essential foundation for advancing the integration of AI in computer architecture—but future datasets must build on QuArch to evaluate more complex capabilities, including advanced reasoning, system-level planning, and architectural design. Realizing these goals will require large-scale collaboration between academia and industry, ensuring AI tools for architecture evolve to meet the field’s growing demands.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge and thank the many students from around the world who were instrumental in the early development efforts of QuArch: Timothy Akert, Adolfo Balderas, Nandini Bhattad, Rushi Chavda, Arjun Chitla, Anjali Choudhary, Hardik Jagga, Satyapragnya Kar, Subash Katel, Anirvan Krishna, Ujjwal Kumar, Sushant Kumar, Shrestha Mishra, Vishnu Nand, Andrew Ogundimu, Arianna Ording, Elsa Oreen, Aarya Pakhale, Umair Paranjpye, Daksh Parikh, Hareesh Perera, LuzZelenia Perez-McNeill, Frankie Francisco Pinaminjarez, Arnav Raj, Debarpita Saha, Anmol Saraf, Fatima Shah, Akshit Sharma, Aishani Singh, Hartej Sooin, Yurun Song, Akarsh Srivastava, Samuel Stankiewicz, Keerthana Subramanian, Kavya Subramanian, Sujay Suribhotla, Aman Tyagi, Maneesh Vaddi, Ankit Walishetti, Judong Wang, Max Zhang, and Junchen Zhao. We also extend our gratitude to Derek Lockhart and James Laudon for their valuable feedback on this paper. Finally, we would like to thank Christos Kozyrakis for the use of a qualifying exam question that helped motivate the need for a dataset assessing foundational domain knowledge.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Chen *et al.*, “An overview of domain-specific foundation model: key technologies, applications and challenges,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04267*, 2024.
- [2] Y. Wang *et al.*, “Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark,” *Advances in NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [3] M. Liu *et al.*, “Verilogeval: Evaluating large language models for verilog code generation,” in *2023 IEEE/ACM ICCAD*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [4] S. Liu *et al.*, “Rtlcoder: Outperforming gpt-3.5 in design rtl generation with our open-source dataset and lightweight solution,” in *2024 IEEE LLM Aided Design Workshop (LAD)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 1–5.
- [5] H. Pearce *et al.*, “Examining zero-shot vulnerability repair with large language models,” in *2023 IEEE SP*. IEEE, 2023.
- [6] M. Cosler *et al.*, “nl2spec: Interactively translating unstructured natural language to temporal logics with large language models,” in *CAV 2023*, 2023, p. 383–396.
- [7] A. Rogers *et al.*, “Qa dataset explosion: A taxonomy of nlp resources for question answering and reading comprehension,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 1–45, 2023.
- [8] R. G. Duncan, “The role of domain-specific knowledge in generative reasoning about complicated multileveled phenomena,” *Cognition and Instruction*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 271–336, 2007.
- [9] S. H. Krieger, “Domain knowledge and the teaching of creative legal problem solving,” *Clinical L. Rev.*, vol. 11, p. 149, 2004.
- [10] S. Damani *et al.*, “Warpdrive: An agentic workflow for ninja gpu transformations,” 2024.
- [11] M. Liu *et al.*, “Chipnemo: Domain-adapted llms for chip design,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00176*, 2023.
- [12] D. Hendrycks *et al.*, “Measuring massive multitask language understanding,” *ICLR*, 2021.
- [13] S. Shakeri *et al.*, “End-to-end synthetic data generation for domain adaptation of question answering systems,” *EMNLP*, 2020.
- [14] L. Zheng *et al.*, “Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena,” *Advances in NeurIPS*, vol. 36, pp. 46 595–46 623, 2023.
- [15] M. Tkachenko *et al.*, “Label Studio: Data labeling software,” 2020-2024. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/HumanSignal/label-studio>
- [16] OpenAI, “Vector Embeddings,” <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/embeddings/>, 2024.
- [17] F. Rahutomo *et al.*, “Semantic cosine similarity,” in *The 7th international student conference on advanced science and technology ICAST*, vol. 4, no. 1. University of Seoul South Korea, 2012, p. 1.
- [18] OpenAI, “Hello GPT-4o,” <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>, 2024.
- [19] Anthropic, “Introducing Claude 3.5 Sonnet,” <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>, 2024.
- [20] D. Rein *et al.*, “Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12022*, 2023.