

# Empirical evaluation of LLMs in predicting fixes of Configuration bugs in Smart Home System

**Sheikh Moonwara Anjum Monisha (Author)**

Dept. Of Computer Science  
Blacksburg, VA  
msheikhmoonwaraa@vt.edu

**Atul Bharadwaj (Author)**

Dept. Of Computer Science  
Blacksburg, VA  
atulnm2002@vt.edu

**Abstract**—This empirical study evaluates the effectiveness of Large Language Models (LLMs) in predicting fixes for configuration bugs in smart home systems. The research analyzes three prominent LLMs - GPT-4, GPT-4o (GPT-4 Turbo), and Claude 3.5 Sonnet - using four distinct prompt designs to assess their ability to identify appropriate fix strategies and generate correct solutions. The study utilized a dataset of 129 debugging issues from the Home Assistant Community, focusing on 21 randomly selected cases for in-depth analysis. Results demonstrate that GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 Sonnet achieved 80% accuracy in strategy prediction when provided with both bug descriptions and original scripts. GPT-4 exhibited consistent performance across different prompt types, while GPT-4o showed advantages in speed and cost-effectiveness despite slightly lower accuracy. The findings reveal that prompt design significantly impacts model performance, with comprehensive prompts containing both description and original script yielding the best results. This research provides valuable insights for improving automated bug fixing in smart home system configurations and demonstrates the potential of LLMs in addressing configuration-related challenges.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The field of smart home automation has seen significant growth in recent years, with an increasing number of households adopting various Internet of Things (IoT) devices and systems to enhance their living environments. However, as these systems become more complex, users often encounter configuration bugs that can hinder the proper functioning of their smart home setups. This paper presents an empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of Large Language Models (LLMs) in predicting fixes for configuration bugs in smart home systems, focusing on the use of advanced AI models to address common issues faced by users[21].

### A. Smart Home Systems

Smart home systems are networks of interconnected devices and appliances that can be remotely controlled and automated to enhance comfort, energy efficiency, and security in residential environments[6]. These systems typically include:

- Smart lighting
- Thermostats and HVAC controls
- Security cameras and alarm systems
- Voice-activated assistants
- Smart appliances (e.g., refrigerators, washing machines)
- Automated window coverings and door locks

The global smart home market is projected to reach USD 338.28 billion by 2030, growing at a 20.1% CAGR. Key drivers include increasing internet use, rising disposable incomes, the need for remote home monitoring, and demand for energy-efficient solutions. Home Assistant (HA) stands out among various platforms for its open-source, privacy-focused design, with over 332,000 active installations as of March 2024[15]. The widespread adoption of HA presents a unique opportunity for software engineering research, as (1) its data and programs offer a comprehensive representation of smart home systems, and (2) our research can contribute to the future development of smart home technologies[6][12].

### B. Configuration Bugs

Configuration bugs in smart home systems refer to errors or inconsistencies in the setup and programming of automation rules, device interactions, and system behaviors. These bugs can arise from various sources, including:

- Incorrect syntax in automation scripts
- Mismatched trigger conditions
- Improper use of variables and templates
- Inconsistent state definitions
- Incompatible device integrations

Such bugs can lead to unintended system behaviors, reduced efficiency, or complete failure of automated processes, significantly impacting the user experience and the overall functionality of the smart home system.

### C. Large Language Models (LLMs)

Large Language Models are advanced artificial intelligence systems trained on vast amounts of text data to understand and generate human-like language[21]. These models have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in various natural language processing tasks, including:

- Text generation
- Language translation
- Question answering
- Code generation and analysis

In the context of this study, we focus on three prominent LLMs:

- GPT-4: Developed by OpenAI, GPT-4 is known for its advanced reasoning capabilities and versatility across a wide range of tasks[2].

- GPT-4o (GPT-4 Turbo): An optimized version of GPT-4, designed for faster processing and improved cost-effectiveness in large-scale applications[19][18].
- Claude 3.5 Sonnet: Created by Anthropic, this model emphasizes safety and the ability to handle large contexts, making it suitable for sensitive tasks[14].

#### D. Home Assistant Community (HAC)

The Home Assistant Community[12] is a platform where users of the popular open-source home automation system, Home Assistant, share knowledge, discuss issues, and seek solutions for their smart home setups. It serves as a valuable resource for both novice and experienced users, providing a wealth of real-world examples of configuration challenges and their resolutions.

#### E. Prompt Engineering

Prompt engineering refers to the process of designing and optimizing input prompts for LLMs to elicit desired outputs. In this study, we explore four distinct prompt designs:

- Description Only
- Description + Original Script
- Description + Original Script + Specific Issue
- Issue Only

These prompts are carefully crafted to provide varying levels of context and information to the LLMs, allowing us to assess their performance under different input conditions.

#### F. Configuration Bug Resolution Strategies

The study builds upon previous research that identified eight representative resolution strategies for common configuration bugs in smart home systems. These strategies encompass various aspects of automation configuration, including:

- Proper use of quotes and string literals
- Correct indentation and formatting
- Appropriate trigger selection
- Accurate state reading and specification
- Efficient handling of multiple triggers and entity values

By mapping these strategies to the dataset and using them as a framework for evaluation, we can assess the LLMs' ability to identify and apply appropriate fixes to configuration issues.

#### G. Significance of the Study

This research aims to bridge the gap between advanced AI technologies and practical smart home automation challenges. By evaluating the capability of LLMs to predict and generate fixes for configuration bugs, we seek to:

- Enhance the user experience for smart home enthusiasts by providing more accessible troubleshooting solutions
- Reduce the time and effort required to resolve common configuration issues
- Explore the potential for AI-assisted automation in smart home system maintenance and optimization
- Contribute to the broader field of AI applications in IoT and home automation

Through a rigorous empirical evaluation of different LLMs and prompt designs, this study offers valuable insights into the effectiveness of AI-driven approaches to solving real-world smart home configuration challenges. The findings presented here have implications for both end-users and developers in the smart home ecosystem, potentially paving the way for more intelligent and user-friendly automation systems in the future.

## II. APPROACH

### A. Dataset and Resolution Strategies

1) *Dataset Extraction*: We extracted the dataset from anik at el's work titled "Programming of Automation Configuration in Smart Home Systems: Challenges and Opportunities"[7]. They crawled Home Assistant Community (HAC)[12][6] and manually reviewed the discussion threads under the category "Configuration". They considered threads tagged with "automation" from 03/01/2022 to 08/31/2022. Then they retrieved a dataset of 438 candidate discussion threads based on the HAC ranking and timestamp range. After a manual inspection of each thread, they finally selected 190 threads. Among them, 129 (68%) examined issues concerning debugging. Although existing tools can detect at most 14 issues and fix none. We collected their 129 debugging issues and did further investigation utilizing Large Language Models and different prompt engineering. The overview of the debugging dataset is presented in Figure 1.

The dataset comprises the debugging data related to automation configuration issues in smart home systems. As we manually evaluated different Large Language Models considering different prompt designs (Evaluated on 3 models generating 4 prompts), we randomly selected 21 data from them.

2) *Representative Resolution Strategies*: Anik at el[7] observed something insightful among the data they have crawled from HAC. They identified some strategies (eight) that can be repetitively applied to resolve multiple issues of configuration bugs. They listed each strategy in terms of its focus, the relevant technical concepts, the number of issues it resolved, and a detailed description of the strategy's content shown in Figure 2. They also ranked the eight strategies in ascending order based on the number of relevant concepts. This structured information ensured clarity in understanding the purpose and applicability of each strategy, which we subsequently used as rules to map the strategies to the dataset. Our dataset is available here: [Configuration bug dataset with predicted fix and strategies](#).

### B. Prompt Engineering

*Prompt Design* : To evaluate how LLMs respond to different levels of contextual information and to test the models' ability to generalize across various configuration bug scenarios, we considered four types of prompts. These prompts were designed to guide LLMs in predicting strategies for resolving configuration bugs.

We designed different prompts to provide information to the LLMs, enabling them to generate accurate predictions. The four distinct prompts are as follows:

Sl	Issue ID	URL	Category	Issue Location	Title	Description	Original Script	Issue	Fix	Strategy	Tag
311	417131	<a href="https://commu">https://commu</a>	Debugging	Action	Automation with various conditions	I have a motion sensor that turns on my bathroom light. I had it to set a low light between 1-6 am and full-strength any other time. It then has a delay of 3 minutes	- alias: turn on/off main bathroom light using sensor4 trigger: - platform: mqtt topic: "zigbee2mqtt/KEA Sensor 4" service: timer.start data: {} target: entity_id: ([states"input_select.select_cooking_t	- error "" [choose] is an invalid option for [automation]" - Both sequence blocks are over-indented	- alias: turn on/off main Bathroom light using sensor4 trigger: - platform: mqtt topic: "zigbee2mqtt/KEA Sensor 4" service: timer.start data: {} target: entity_id: "[states"input_select.select_cooking_t	- Fix indentation - You forgot to quote your template - Surround entity_id in double quotes	Wrong Format
323	416149	<a href="https://commu">https://commu</a>	Debugging	Action	Call a timer in automation where timer is defined in a input_select	I want to clone the value of a counter from another one in an action on automation.	value: "([states"counter_aux_ac_pieza"])" light from input_select: ([states"input_select.selectedlight"])	unable to access sensor/counter value of another entity: formatting issue	value: "([states"counter_aux_ac_pieza"])" action: "([states"input_select.selectedlight"])"	quote usage	Wrong Format
110	442485	<a href="https://commu">https://commu</a>	Debugging	Action	Set counter value equals to other counter in automation	I have a Ikea s7rpar (4 button remote) which I want to use to toggle between lights, turn them off and on and adjust their color temperature. Therefore I have	value: "([states"counter_aux_ac_pieza"])" Color Temp: "([state_attr"([states"input_select.selectedlight"])"', "color_temp"])"	can't get the current color temperature of the current selected light	value: "([states"counter_aux_ac_pieza"])" action: "([state_attr"([states"input_select.selectedlight"])"', "color_temp"])"	quote usage, brace usage	Wrong Format <b>You cannot nest templates</b>
106	443009	<a href="https://commu">https://commu</a>	Debugging	Action	Get state attributes from entity by input_select	I am trying to create an automation that will send me a push notification whenever the state of my front door changes. I have an automation where I would like to check if an Ikea switch called switch.uttag_trapphus is still there. Can someone possibly help me figure out why does the below work but the second code post does not? (On the first code post, I get the message to both the iOS	message: "Front Door ([trigger.to_state.state])" service: notify.notify - service: notify.notifier_stroller data_template: message: > "% if to_state('switch.uttag_trapphus', 'off') -!o: dog_moose_oeactivated alias: Dog mode Deactivated initial_state: true trigger: - platform: state	Error in action: Message Malformed	message: "Front Door ([trigger.to_state.state])" service: notify.notify - service: notify.notifier_stroller data_template: message: > "% if to_state('switch.uttag_trapphus', 'off') -!o: dog_moose_oeactivated alias: Dog mode Deactivated initial_state: true trigger: - platform: state	Fix formatting issues, including indentation and quotes	Wrong Format
80	446318	<a href="https://commu">https://commu</a>	Debugging	Action	Message malformed: Unable to determine action @ data[action][0]	Looking for help with formatting if condition, notification needs resp with data section of text_notify script (data section works when called directly to service but not when its called through	message: > "% if to_state('switch.uttag_trapphus', 'off') -!o: dog_moose_oeactivated alias: Dog mode Deactivated initial_state: true trigger: - platform: state	missing a %) at the end	message: > "% if to_state('switch.uttag_trapphus', 'off') -!o: dog_moose_oeactivated alias: Dog mode Deactivated initial_state: true trigger: - platform: state	There is missing a %) at the end.	Wrong usage of %) (Format)
333	414335	<a href="https://commu">https://commu</a>	Debugging	Action	Looking for help with formatting if condition, notification needs resp with data section of text_notify script (data section works when called directly to service but not when its called through	figure out why does the below work but the second code post does not? (On the first code post, I get the message to both the iOS	message: > "% if to_state('switch.uttag_trapphus', 'off') -!o: dog_moose_oeactivated alias: Dog mode Deactivated initial_state: true trigger: - platform: state	Automation didn't trigger without any error	message: > "% if to_state('switch.uttag_trapphus', 'off') -!o: dog_moose_oeactivated alias: Dog mode Deactivated initial_state: true trigger: - platform: state	Fix indentation, You pass all data properties for the service call at a single indentation level.	Wrong indentation
95	444228	<a href="https://commu">https://commu</a>	Debugging	Action	Message malformed: Unable to determine action @ data[action][0]	Looking for help with formatting if condition, notification needs resp with data section of text_notify script (data section works when called directly to service but not when its called through	message: > "% if to_state('switch.uttag_trapphus', 'off') -!o: dog_moose_oeactivated alias: Dog mode Deactivated initial_state: true trigger: - platform: state	Automation didn't trigger without any error	message: > "% if to_state('switch.uttag_trapphus', 'off') -!o: dog_moose_oeactivated alias: Dog mode Deactivated initial_state: true trigger: - platform: state	Fix indentation, You pass all data properties for the service call at a single indentation level.	Wrong indentation

Fig. 1: Overview of the debugging dataset.

Idx	Focus	The Relevant Technical Concept(s)	# of Issues Resolved	Strategy Content
R1	Quote usage	Wrong format	10	Add or remove quotes to properly use String literals, variables, and templates
R2	Indentation usage	Wrong format	6	Add or remove white spaces to properly align statements
R3	Picking a trigger type	Wrong trigger type	4	Replace the device trigger with a (numeric) state trigger
R4	Reading an entity's state	Wrong data retrieval or calculation, to retrieve or calculate data	9	Use template <code>{{states('ENTITY')}}</code> to read the state of ENTITY
R5	Specifying states for matching	Wrong data specification for matching, to specify data for matching	8	Look up all possible states of the entity in Developer Tools -> States, and use one of the states with case sensitivity.
R6	Different service calls based on fired triggers	To reduce duplicated code, to avoid unnecessary triggering, wrong data specification for matching	5	Define multiple triggers, specify a unique ID for each trigger, and call services differently based on the fired trigger.
R7	Different service calls based on entity values	To reduce duplicated code, to define different service calls, wrong data specification for matching, wrong loop structure	7	Define a dictionary to map entity values to distinct service calls or service data, and call services based on the retrieved entity values.
R8	Handling a group or list of same-typed entities	To reduce duplicated code, to define different service calls, to define varying trigger(s), wrong data retrieval or calculation, wrong algorithm design	5	Use <code>expand()</code> to enumerate a group or list of entities, and define filters to pick elements that satisfy certain requirements.

Fig. 2: Representative Resolution Strategies.

1) *Prompt 1 (Description Only)*:: This prompt provided only a description of the configuration issue without including additional details like the original script or specifics of the bug. However, the description of the configuration bug contained key information necessary to understand the issue. An example of Prompt 1 is shown in Figure 3a.

2) *Prompt 2 (Description + Original Script)*:: This prompt offered more context to the model by combining the description with the original configuration script. It included both the description of the issue, which explained the problem in detail, and the script where the bug exists. This combination was intended to improve the model's accuracy in suggesting correct strategies and fixes. An example of Prompt 2 is shown in Figure 3b.

3) *Prompt 3 (Description + Original Script + Specific Issue)*:: Prompt 3 included a detailed outline of the specific

issue along with the description and the original script. In cases where the original script was too large or complex to understand, this prompt could be particularly effective in guiding the model to generate accurate predictions. An example of Prompt 2 is shown in Figure 3c.

4) *Prompt 4 (Issue Only)*:: Prompt 4 focused solely on the specific issue without providing broader context or the original script. The purpose of this prompt was to evaluate how accurately the LLMs could predict strategies and fixes for resolving configuration bugs when only the specific issue was provided. An example of Prompt 2 is shown in Figure 3d.

### C. Selection of Large Language Models

The application of Large Language Models (LLMs) in solving coding-related problems has been increasing significantly[21]. In our approach, we considered three advanced and popular LLMs for our empirical evaluation, which

Description of the configuration issue of the smart home system is given, select the strategy to fix each issue from these 8 strategies:

- Add or remove quotes to properly use String literals, variables, and templates.
- Add or remove white spaces to properly align statements.
- Replace the device trigger with a (numeric) state trigger.
- Use template `{{states('ENTITY')}}` to read the state of ENTITY.
- Look up all possible states of the entity in Developer Tools -> States, and use one of the states with case sensitivity.
- Define multiple triggers, specify a unique ID for each trigger, and call services differently based on the fired trigger.
- Define a dictionary to map entity values to distinct service calls or service data, and call services based on the retrieved entity values.
- Use `expand()` to enumerate a group or list of entities, and define filters to pick elements that satisfy certain requirements.

**Description:**

(a) Prompt 1

Description, original script and issue of the configuration issue of the smart home system is given, select the strategy to fix each issue from these 8 strategies:

- Add or remove quotes to properly use String literals, variables, and templates.
- Add or remove white spaces to properly align statements.
- Replace the device trigger with a (numeric) state trigger.
- Use template `{{states('ENTITY')}}` to read the state of ENTITY.
- Look up all possible states of the entity in Developer Tools -> States, and use one of the states with case sensitivity.
- Define multiple triggers, specify a unique ID for each trigger, and call services differently based on the fired trigger.
- Define a dictionary to map entity values to distinct service calls or service data, and call services based on the retrieved entity values.
- Use `expand()` to enumerate a group or list of entities, and define filters to pick elements that satisfy certain requirements.

**Description:**

**Original Script:**  
**Issue:**

(c) Prompt 3

Description and original script of the configuration issue of the smart home system are given, select the strategy to fix each issue from these 8 strategies:

- Add or remove quotes to properly use String literals, variables, and templates.
- Add or remove white spaces to properly align statements.
- Replace the device trigger with a (numeric) state trigger.
- Use template `{{states('ENTITY')}}` to read the state of ENTITY.
- Look up all possible states of the entity in Developer Tools -> States, and use one of the states with case sensitivity.
- Define multiple triggers, specify a unique ID for each trigger, and call services differently based on the fired trigger.
- Define a dictionary to map entity values to distinct service calls or service data, and call services based on the retrieved entity values.
- Use `expand()` to enumerate a group or list of entities, and define filters to pick elements that satisfy certain requirements.

**Description:**

**Original Script:**

(b) Prompt 2

Configuration issue of the smart home system is given, select the strategy to fix each issue from these 8 strategies:

- Add or remove quotes to properly use String literals, variables, and templates.
- Add or remove white spaces to properly align statements.
- Replace the device trigger with a (numeric) state trigger.
- Use template `{{states('ENTITY')}}` to read the state of ENTITY.
- Look up all possible states of the entity in Developer Tools -> States, and use one of the states with case sensitivity.
- Define multiple triggers, specify a unique ID for each trigger, and call services differently based on the fired trigger.
- Define a dictionary to map entity values to distinct service calls or service data, and call services based on the retrieved entity values.
- Use `expand()` to enumerate a group or list of entities, and define filters to pick elements that satisfy certain requirements.

**Issue:**

(d) Prompt 4

Fig. 3: Four prompt designs for generating fix strategies

were also accessible to us: GPT-4, GPT-4o, and Claude 3.5 Sonnet. These models were evaluated in this study to predict resolution strategies and fixes for configuration bugs in smart home systems.

These models possess advanced capabilities in understanding and generating code. The evaluation focused on mapping the predictions generated by the models to eight representative strategies and the suggested fixes. The Table I highlights the differences between the selected LLMs.

TABLE I: Comparison of GPT-4, GPT-4o, and Claude 3.5 Sonnet

Feature	GPT-4	GPT-4o	Claude 3.5
Focus	Advanced reasoning	Cost-effective, fast	Safety, large contexts
Applications	General-purpose	Production-scale apps	Sensitive, aligned tasks
Multimodal	Yes (limited)	Yes (platform-based)	Text only

1) *GPT4*: GPT-4 is a large language model developed by OpenAI, designed to excel in complex reasoning and natural language generation tasks. It performs exceptionally well in a variety of applications, including coding, content creation, and data analysis [2].

The architecture of GPT4 builds upon GPT3.5, offering enhanced contextual understanding and fine-grained accuracy[10]. These improvements make GPT4 particularly suitable for tasks that require in-depth problem-solving or nuanced responses[22].

2) *GPT4o*: GPT4o is a cost-effective and optimized version of GPT4 developed by OpenAI[19][18]. This model is also owned as GPT-4 Turbo. It is designed to deliver faster

responses while maintaining high accuracy. This model is particularly ideal for scenarios that require scalability, such as handling high-volume queries, without significantly compromising performance.

Although GPT4 Turbo may lack some depth in addressing complex tasks compared to GPT4, it offers notable advantages in terms of speed, cost, and capability, making it a practical choice for many applications[26].

3) *Claude 3.5 Sonnet*: Claude 3.5 Sonnet: Created by Anthropic, this model emphasizes safety and the ability to handle large contexts, making it suitable for sensitive tasks[27][14].

#### D. Mapping to Representative Strategies

We utilized the representative strategies suggested by Anik et al.[7], which contain structured information to aid in understanding the purpose and applicability of each strategy, to map the strategies to the dataset. Based on these eight listed strategies, we relabeled the dataset strategies accordingly.

#### E. Generating Configuration Fix Strategies and Fixes Using Prompts and LLMs

Our approach utilized Large Language Models (LLMs) to generate strategies for fixing configuration bugs in smart home automation by leveraging our designed prompts. We also applied the same approach to generate fixes for configuration bugs utilizing Large Language Models (LLMs). These prompts were carefully crafted to guide the models in effectively identifying and resolving configuration issues.

### F. Compare different models and prompts

After generating bug-fix strategies and the fixes for all 21 data points using four prompts and three large language models, we compared the outputs of the different models. Additionally, we analyzed the predictions of the models when using the same prompts.

## III. IMPLEMENTATION

### A. Dataset Collection

To conduct our work we considered the extracted 129 debugging issues and 8 representative resolution strategies from previous research on "Programming of Automation Configuration in Smart Home Systems: Challenges and Opportunities" [7]. They collected the dataset from the Home Assistant Community(HAC)[12] and provided the eight representative resolution strategies with relevant information such focus of the strategy, the relevant technical concept(s), the number of issues it resolved, and a detailed description of the strategy's content.

### B. Reform Dataset

We applied the eight representative resolution strategies, along with relevant information as rules, to map the strategies from the extracted dataset to these commonly used resolution strategies. The mapping for each issue was finalized through consensus between both authors.

### C. Generate prompts

We generated four types of prompts based on the data available to us. These prompts were designed to include attributes that could provide insightful information for predicting the fix strategies and generating fixed scripts.

### D. Select Large Language Models

We selected the large language models based on their advanced capabilities to read and generate code, and also their availability. We have considered three models, GPT4, GPT4o, and Claude 3.5 Sonnet, and implemented our approach using all four generated prompts. Selecting the Large Language Models for predicting strategies to fix configuration bugs.

### E. Configuration Fix Strategies Generation

1) *Input to LLMs*: We provided the models with the configuration bug details and the representative strategy list as input, using our predesigned prompts Figure 4a.

2) *Output from LLMs*: The models analyzed the information provided through prompts. Then suggested fixing strategies from the provided strategy list as output.

### F. Configuration Fixes Generation

1) *Input to LLMs*: Using our predesigned prompts, we provided the models with the configuration bug details as input. We specifically designed these prompts to provide the necessary context and guide the models generating fixed scripts figure 4b.

2) *Output from LLMs*: The models analyzed the information provided through different prompts. They generated fixed scripts for the given configuration bugs and presented them as output along with reasoning.

```
Example: Prompt 2 on Large Language models for fix strategy
Description and original script of the configuration issue of the smart home system are
given, select the strategy to fix each issue from these 8 strategies:
[ 8 strategies given]
Description:
I want to clone the value of a counter from another one in an action on
automation. the code is
Original Script:
value: '{{states('counter.aux_ac_pieza')}}'
```

(a) Example of prompt 2 as input to LLMs for fix strategies

```
Example: Prompt2 on Large Language models
Description and original script of the configuration issue of the smart home system are
given, select the strategy to fix each issue from these 8 strategies and write the fixed code :
[ 8 strategies given]
Description:
I want to clone the value of a counter from another one in an action on
automation. the code is
Original Script:
value: '{{states('counter.aux_ac_pieza')}}'
```

(b) Example of prompt 2 as input to LLMs for fixes

Fig. 4: Four prompt designs for generating fix strategies

### G. Compare Prompts

After generating the fix strategies and solutions for configuration bugs using three models and all four prompts, we compared the performance of the prompts. We also analyzed the output from different models for the same prompt. While evaluating the suggested fixes, we focused only on cases where the models correctly predicted the strategies.

### H. Compare LLMs

We evaluated the outcomes of the three models against the original strategies and fixes. Additionally, we compared the models' predictions for the same prompt.

The strategies of different prompts.

## IV. EVALUATION

We completed all the implementation steps and collected the suggested strategies and fixes generated by different prompts for each configuration bug. Subsequently, we manually evaluated all the fix strategies and suggested fixes from GPT4, GPT4o, and Claude 3.5 Sonnet against the strategies derived from the dataset.

### A. High-level evaluation of the models

The applied large language models each have distinct advantages. GPT4 demonstrates superior reasoning capabilities compared to GPT4o. On the other hand, Claude 3.5 Sonnet offers better reasoning for suggesting strategies and fixes for configuration bugs than GPT4o, though it is not as comprehensive as GPT4. An example of suggested fix strategy by these three models Figure 5

## GPT4

For the issue described, where you want to clone the value of one counter from another within an automation, the script issue lies in the usage of quotes within the template syntax. You need to ensure that quotes are used correctly to avoid syntax errors and allow for proper parsing of the template expression.

**Selected Strategy:** Add or remove quotes to properly use String literals, variables, and templates.

**Reasoning:** The original script uses nested single quotes, which can cause a parsing error in the template engine. To fix this, you should modify the script to use different types of quotes for the template and the inner function, or escape the inner quotes correctly.

**Corrected Script:**

```
yaml
value: "{{ states('counter.aux_ac_pieza' ) }}"
```

or

```
yaml
value: '{{ states("counter.aux_ac_pieza" ) }}'
```

Either of these corrections will ensure that the template engine correctly interprets the template string, thus fetching the state value of `counter.aux_ac_pieza` without syntax errors. Make sure that the automation script uses this corrected format to properly clone the counter value.

## GPT4o

The best strategy to fix this issue is:

**Use template `{{states('ENTITY')}}` to read the state of ENTITY.**

**Explanation:**

The issue lies in the improper use of the template syntax in the `value` field. The `{{states('counter.aux_ac_pieza')}}` template is correct in principle, but single quotes inside single quotes are invalid in YAML. This needs to be corrected by using consistent quoting or escaping the inner quotes.

## Claude 3.5Sonet

For this example of Prompt 2, let me walk through how we would analyze and present this to an audience:

"Let's look at a specific example of how Prompt 2 works in practice. In this case, we have a user who wants to clone a counter value from one automation to another. They've provided their original script which attempts to read the state of a counter using:

```
TEXT
value: '{{states('counter.aux_ac_pieza')}}'
```

Looking at this code, we can identify that the issue involves reading an entity's state, and the syntax shows some formatting concerns with quotes and templates. The appropriate strategy here would be Strategy 4: Use template `{{states('ENTITY')}}` to read the state of ENTITY.

This is a perfect example of why Prompt 2 was so effective in our research, achieving 80% accuracy. By having both the description and the original script, we could clearly see that the user was trying to access a counter's state but needed the correct template syntax. The solution would involve properly implementing the `states()` template to read the counter value.

This example also demonstrates why GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 performed particularly well with Prompt 2 - they could analyze both the intent from the description and the specific syntax issues in the code to provide accurate strategy recommendations."

Fig. 5: Example suggested fix strategies by three LLMs.

### B. Model Performance

We evaluated all the large language models considered in this study based on the fix strategies and fixes they generated for configuration bugs in smart home systems.

1) *Predicting Fix Strategies* : Overall, GPT4 and Claude 3.5 Sonnet demonstrated the strongest performance with Prompt 2 (Description + Original Script), achieving 80% accuracy in strategy prediction for fixing smart home system configuration bugs. GPT-4, however, exhibited more consistent results across different prompt types. The performance of GPT-4 was strong with Prompt 2 and Prompt 3 but poor with Prompt 1 and Prompt 4. Claude 3.5 Sonnet performed particularly well with Prompt 3. All three models demonstrated similar performance when using Prompt 4. Tables II, III, IV, and V show the performance of the three models utilizing the four selected prompts.

GPT-4 and GPT-4o provided 52% similar strategies when using Prompts 1 and 2. The similarity dropped to 38% for Prompts 3 and 4, as shown in Table VI.

TABLE II: Performance of LLMs predicting Fixes Strategies using Prompt 1

Total	GPT4	GPT4o	Claude	GPT4 %	GPT4o %	Claude %
21	8	11	8	38%	52%	38%

2) *Predicting Fixes*: By observing the predicted strategies for fixing configuration bugs across different models and prompts, we measured the number of matched strategies and the proportion of correct fixes generated by the models. During

TABLE III: Performance of LLMs predicting Fixes Strategies using Prompt 3

Total	GPT4	GPT4o	Claude	GPT4 %	GPT4o %	Claude %
21	17	10	11	80%	47%	52%

TABLE IV: Performance of LLMs predicting Fixes Strategies using Prompt 3

Total	GPT4	GPT4o	Claude	GPT4 %	GPT4o %	Claude %
21	15	14	17	71%	67%	80%

TABLE V: Performance of LLMs predicting Fixes Strategies using Prompt 3

Total	GPT4	GPT4o	Claude	GPT4 %	GPT4o %	Claude %
21	9	9	10	42%	42%	47%

TABLE VI: Similar Fix Strategies from GPT4 & GPT4o

Prompts	Prompt1	Prompt2	Prompt3	Prompt4
Similar suggestion from GPT4 & GPT4o	11	11	8	8
Percentage	52%	52%	38%	38%

the evaluation, some fixes could not be definitively assessed for correctness and were labeled as Do Not Know.

From the tables VII, VIII, IX, X it can be concluded that the overall performance of GPT4 is better than the other two models. While GPT4o performed poorly with Prompt 1, it showed good performance with the other three prompts. Claude 3.5 Sonnet performed well with Prompts 3 and 4;

however, it provided some incorrect fixes in all cases.

TABLE VII: Performance on predicting Fixes using Prompt 1

LLMs	GPT4	GPT4o	Claude
Matched Strategies	7	11	9
Correct	6	6	5
Percentage	85.71%	54.55%	55.56%
Do Not Know	1	2	2
Incorrect	0	3	3
Percentage	0 %	27.2727%	27.27%

TABLE VIII: Performance on predicting Fixes using Prompt 2

LLMs	GPT4	GPT4o	Claude
Matched Strategies	17	10	9
Correct	14	9	5
Percentage	82.35%	90%	55.56%
Do Not Know	1	0	0
Incorrect	2	1	4
Failure %	11.76%	10%	44.44%

TABLE IX: Performance on predicting Fixes using Prompt 3

LLMs	GPT4	GPT4o	Claude
Matched Strategies	15	14	15
Correct	14	12	13
Percentage	93.33%	85.71%	86.67%
Do Not Know	1	2	1
Incorrect	0	0	1
Failure %	0%	0%	6.67%

TABLE X: Performance on predicting Fixes using Prompt 4

LLMs	GPT4	GPT4o	Claude
Matched Strategies	9	9	9
Correct	7	7	7
Percentage	77.78%	77.78%	77.78%
Do Not Know	2	0	0
Incorrect	0	2	2
Failure %	0%	22.22%	22.22%

### C. Prompt Evaluation

1) *Predicting Fix Strategies* : We evaluated the different prompts based on the number of fix strategies the models predicted using them. Overall, Prompt 3 and Prompt 4 provided better suggestions than the other two prompts for selecting strategies to fix configuration bugs.

Table 3 shows that all three models performed well with Prompt 3, where each model provided the correct strategy for more than 67% of the total data. Among them, Claude 3.5

Sonnet outperformed GPT4 and GPT4o, even though it did not perform as well with the other prompts.

GPT4 performed well with Prompt 2 but provided poor suggestions with Prompt 1 and Prompt 4. Prompt 4 did not perform well with any of the three models. None of the models were able to correctly predict even half of the strategies for fixing bugs.

2) *Predicting Fixes*: We measured the number of matched strategies and how many of these included correct fixes generated by the models. During the evaluation of the fixes predicted by the models, there were instances where we could not determine their correctness, and we labeled these cases as Do Not Know.

For Prompt 2, GPT4 correctly predicted 85.71% of the fixes from the correct strategies it provided, with only one fix labeled as Do Not Know. On the other hand, GPT-4o produced more than 27% incorrect fixes among the correct strategies it provided. Table VII presents a detailed comparison.

GPT-4o outperformed the other models when using Prompt 2. Table VIII shows that GPT-4o correctly predicted 90% of the fixes from the correct strategies it provided, with only one fix labeled as Do Not Know. However, GPT-4 and GPT-4o produced 11.76% and 10% incorrect fixes, respectively. Table VIII presents the details.

For Prompt 3, GPT-4 excelled in providing correct fixes for configuration bugs, achieving more than 93% accuracy among the fix strategies it predicted correctly. GPT-4o also performed well, delivering approximately 86% correct fixes, although some of its other suggested fixes were labeled as Do Not Know. Table IX presents a detailed comparison.

The table X shows that GPT4 and GPT4o performed equally well in predicting fixes for configuration bugs correctly. Both models provided approximately 78% of the fixes accurately from the correct strategies they predicted. However, GPT-4o also suggested 22.22% of the fixes incorrectly.

## V. RELATED WORK

Several research efforts have explored ways to improve configuration challenges processes through automation and tool support.

The work of Duc et al. [13] examined the main failure patterns of smart home systems, this work focuses on hardware failure(wireless link loss, battery damage, power outage). Chen et al. [11] analyzed the fault symptoms and provided maintenance suggestions after modeling the IoT system with four layers: application, storage, communication, and data.

In the realm of natural language processing for code, [4] surveyed various techniques for learning from source code, including approaches for code summarization and bug detection. Their work provides a foundation for our use of NLP and machine learning to analyze code changes and generate human-readable comments. [24]

V. J. HELLENDORRN ET AL[25] explored the use of machine learning models(RNN, Transformer, GGRN etc.)[8], [16], [23] for code completion and bug detection. Their findings on the effectiveness of transformer-based models for code

understanding tasks inform our choice of model architectures for comment generation. However, they did not consider any large language model for analysis.

A few recent studies have focused on identifying and characterizing issues in IoT systems [5][9]. Makhshari and Mesbah [20] conducted interviews and surveys with IoT developers, revealing that testing and debugging are the primary challenges faced. However, their work does not address configuration issues. Brackenbury et al. [9] focused on the trigger-action programming (TAP) model. They analyzed and systematized temporal paradigms within TAP systems. Their work identified that TAP systems express rules and categorized TAP programming bugs into three main types: control logic errors, timing issues, and bugs arising from inaccurate user expectations. Ahmad et al. [3] designed and implemented a framework to quantitatively evaluate how effectively an LLM can fix specified bugs related to hardware security.

Focusing on root causes, fixes, triggers, and impacts Wang et al. [28] analyzed 330 device integration bugs from HAC. This work is similar to our work, rather than addressing device integration, our study concentrates on coding issues in automation configuration.

S. M. H. Anik et al. [7] conducted a comprehensive study on the challenges and opportunities in programming automation configurations for smart home systems [17]. Their work provides valuable insights into the complexities of setting up and maintaining smart home devices, which has informed our approach to developing AI-assisted configuration tools. Our study was conducted using the dataset extracted in their work.

In the realm of IoT security, the Bitdefender 2024 IoT Security Landscape Report[1] offers crucial insights into the evolving threats facing smart homes. This report highlights the need for robust security measures in smart home configurations, which our AI-assisted approach aims to address.

Although none of these previous works focused on the evaluation of LLMs in predicting fixes of Configuration bugs in Smart Home System, these insights help us understand the problem fully and design our solution design considering it.

## VI. CONCLUSION

GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 Sonnet demonstrated exceptional capabilities in predicting fix strategies for smart home configuration bugs, achieving 80% accuracy when provided with both bug descriptions and original scripts[1]. GPT-4 maintained consistent performance across different prompt types, while GPT-4o offered advantages in processing speed and cost-effectiveness despite slightly lower accuracy rates.

The research revealed that prompt design significantly influences model performance. Prompt 2 (Description + Original Script) and Prompt 3 (Description + Original Script + Specific Issue) consistently outperformed other designs across all models[1]. This finding suggests that providing comprehensive context is crucial for accurate bug fix prediction. GPT4 achieved remarkable accuracy in fix generation, reaching 93.33% success rate with Prompt 3, while GPT-4o achieved 90% accuracy with Prompt 2[1]. These results demonstrate the

models' strong capability in not only identifying appropriate fix strategies but also generating correct solutions. This study introduces a novel framework for evaluating LLMs in the context of smart home configuration debugging. The development of four distinct prompt types and their systematic evaluation provides valuable insights for future research in automated bug fixing. The findings offer immediate practical value for smart home system developers and users. The high accuracy rates achieved by the models suggest that LLM-based tools could significantly streamline the debugging process in smart home configurations. Future research should focus on improving model performance for complex configuration scenarios and reducing the occurrence of incorrect fix suggestions. Particular attention should be paid to cases where models currently produce uncertain or incorrect results. The promising results suggest opportunities for developing automated debugging tools that integrate LLMs with existing smart home platforms. Such integration could provide real-time assistance to users encountering configuration issues. Further investigation into prompt design optimization could yield even better results. Special attention should be given to reducing the 22.22% failure rate observed in some scenarios with GPT4o. While the study demonstrates significant progress in automated bug fixing for smart home systems, some limitations remain. The research was conducted on a dataset of 21 randomly selected cases from a larger pool of 129 debugging issues[1]. Future work with larger datasets could provide more comprehensive insights into model performance across a broader range of configuration scenarios.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are grateful to our professor, Na Meng, in the Department of Computer Science at Virginia Tech for their insightful feedback and support throughout the research process. The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Anik et al. for providing the valuable dataset used in this study. Finally, we acknowledge the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments that helped improve the quality of this paper.

## REFERENCES

- [1] *Bitdefender 2024 IoT Security Landscape Repo*. Accessed: 2024-10-09.
- [2] 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).
- [3] B. AHMAD, S. THAKUR, B. TAN, R. KARRI, AND H. PEARCE, *On hardware security bug code fixes by prompting large language models*, IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security, 19 (2024), pp. 4043–4057.
- [4] M. ALLAMANIS, E. T. BARR, P. DEVANBU, AND C. SUTTON, *A survey of machine learning for big code and naturalness*, ACM Comput. Surv., 51 (2018).
- [5] O. ALRAWI, C. LEVER, M. ANTONAKAKIS, AND F. MONROSE, *Sok: Security evaluation of home-based iot deployments*, in 2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), 2019, pp. 1362–1380.
- [6] ANAYTIC, *analytics.home-assistant.io/*, 2024. <https://analytics.home-assistant.io/> [Accessed: December 14, 2024].



- [7] S. M. H. ANIK, X. GAO, H. ZHONG, X. WANG, AND N. MENG, *Programming of automation configuration in smart home systems: Challenges and opportunities*, in Woodstock '18: ACM Symposium on Neural Gaze Detection, New York, NY, USA, 2018, ACM, pp. 1–20.
- [8] H. BANI-SALAMEH, M. SALLAM, AND B. AL SHBOUL, *A deep-learning-based bug priority prediction using rnn-lstm neural networks*, e-Informatica Software Engineering Journal, 15 (2021).
- [9] W. BRACKENBURY, A. DEORA, J. RITCHEY, J. VALLEE, W. HE, G. WANG, M. L. LITTMAN, AND B. UR, *How users interpret bugs in trigger-action programming*, in Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '19, New York, NY, USA, 2019, Association for Computing Machinery, p. 1–12.
- [10] T. BROWN, B. MANN, N. RYDER, M. SUBBIAH, J. KAPLAN, P. DHARIWAL, A. NEELAKANTAN, P. SHYAM, G. SASTRY, A. ASKELL, S. AGARWAL, A. HERBERT-VOSS, G. KRUEGER, T. HENIGHAN, R. CHILD, A. RAMESH, D. ZIEGLER, J. WU, C. WINTER, AND D. AMODEI, *Language models are few-shot learners*, 05 2020.
- [11] Y. CHEN, Z. ZHEN, H. YU, AND J. XU, *Application of fault tree analysis and fuzzy neural networks to fault diagnosis in the internet of things (iot) for aquaculture*, Sensors (Basel, Switzerland), 17 (2017).
- [12] COMMUNITY.HOME ASSISTANT, *community.home-assistant.io*, 2024. <https://community.home-assistant.io/> [Accessed: December 14, 2024].
- [13] A. N. DUC, R. JABANGWE, P. PAUL, AND P. ABRAHAMSSON, *Security challenges in iot development: a software engineering perspective*, in Proceedings of the XP2017 Scientific Workshops, XP '17, New York, NY, USA, 2017, Association for Computing Machinery.
- [14] M. ENIS AND M. HOPKINS, *From llm to nmt: Advancing low-resource machine translation with claude*, ArXiv, abs/2404.13813 (2024).
- [15] FORTUNEBUSINESSINSIGHT, *Smart home market size, value & trends — growth report [2032]*, n.d. Retrieved from Fortune Business Insights.
- [16] K. HAN, A. XIAO, E. WU, J. GUO, C. XU, AND Y. WANG, *Transformer in transformer*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 34 (2021), pp. 15908–15919.
- [17] B. HUANG, H. DONG, AND A. BOUGUETTAYA, *Conflict detection in iot-based smart homes*, 09 2021, pp. 303–313.
- [18] A. HURST, A. LERER, A. P. GOUCHER, A. PERELMAN, A. RAMESH, A. CLARK, A. OSTROW, A. WELIHINDA, A. HAYES, A. RADFORD, ET AL., *Gpt-4o system card*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276, (2024).
- [19] K. KHAKZAD SHAHANDASHTI, M. SIVAKUMAR, M. M. MOHAJER, A. BOAYE BELLE, S. WANG, AND T. LETHBRIDGE, *Assessing the impact of gpt-4 turbo in generating defeaters for assurance cases*, in Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE/ACM First International Conference on AI Foundation Models and Software Engineering, FORGE '24, New York, NY, USA, 2024, Association for Computing Machinery, p. 52–56.
- [20] A. MAKHSHARI AND A. MESBAH, *Iot bugs and development challenges*, in 2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), 2021, pp. 460–472.
- [21] H. NAVEED, A. U. KHAN, S. QIU, M. SAQIB, S. ANWAR, M. USMAN, N. BARNES, AND A. S. MIAN, *A comprehensive overview of large language models*, ArXiv, abs/2307.06435 (2023).
- [22] Z. SÁGODI, G. ANTAL, B. BOGENFÜRST, M. ISZTIN, P. HEGEDŰS, AND R. FERENC, *Reality check: assessing gpt-4 in fixing real-world software vulnerabilities*, in Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering, 2024, pp. 252–261.
- [23] R. TKACHENKO, I. IZONIN, N. KRYVINSKA, I. DRONYUK, AND K. ZUB, *An approach towards increasing prediction accuracy for the recovery of missing iot data based on the grnn-sgtm ensemble*, Sensors, 20 (2020), p. 2625.
- [24] M. TUFANO, C. WATSON, G. BAVOTA, M. DI PENTA, M. WHITE, AND D. POSHYVANYK, *An empirical study on learning bug-fixing patches in the wild via neural machine translation*, ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology, 28 (2019), pp. 1–29.
- [25] V. J. HELLENDORRN ET AL., *Global relational models of source code*, in International Conference on Learning Representations, 2020.
- [26] VELLUM, *Analysis: Gpt-4o vs gpt-4 turbo*, 2024. <https://www.vellum.ai/blog/analysis-gpt-4o-vs-gpt-4-turbo> [Accessed: December 14, 2024].
- [27] ———, *Claude 3.5 sonnet vs gpt-4o*, 2024. <https://www.vellum.ai/blog/claude-3-5-sonnet-vs-gpt4o> [Accessed: December 14, 2024].
- [28] T. WANG, K. ZHANG, W. CHEN, W. DOU, J. ZHU, J. WEI, AND T. HUANG, *Understanding device integration bugs in smart home system*, in Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Sym-

posium on Software Testing and Analysis, ISSTA 2022, New York, NY, USA, 2022, Association for Computing Machinery, p. 429–441.