

# Advanced Chain-of-Thought Reasoning for Parameter Extraction from Documents Using Large Language Models

Hong Cai Chen, *Member, IEEE*, Yi Pin Xu, and Yang Zhang

**Abstract**—Extracting parameters from technical documentation is crucial for ensuring design precision and simulation reliability in electronic design. However, current methods struggle to handle high-dimensional design data and meet the demands of real-time processing. In electronic design automation (EDA), engineers often manually search through extensive documents to retrieve component parameters required for constructing PySpice models, a process that is both labor-intensive and time-consuming. To address this challenge, we propose an innovative framework that leverages large language models (LLMs) to automate the extraction of parameters and the generation of PySpice models directly from datasheets. Our framework introduces three Chain-of-Thought (CoT) based techniques: (1) Targeted Document Retrieval (TDR), which enables the rapid identification of relevant technical sections; (2) Iterative Retrieval Optimization (IRO), which refines the parameter search through iterative improvements; and (3) Preference Optimization (PO), which dynamically prioritizes key document sections based on relevance. Experimental results show that applying all three methods together improves retrieval precision by 47.69% and reduces processing latency by 37.84%. Furthermore, effect size analysis using Cohen's  $d$  reveals that PO significantly reduces latency (Cohen's  $d = 15.54$ ), while IRO contributes most to precision enhancement (Cohen's  $d = 7.16$ ). These findings underscore the potential of our framework to streamline EDA processes, enhance design accuracy, and shorten development timelines. Additionally, our algorithm has model-agnostic generalization, meaning it can improve parameter search performance across different LLMs.

**Index Terms**—Chain-of-Thought, Large Language Model, Targeted Document Retrieval, Iterative Retrieval Optimization, Preference Optimization, Chip Modeling, Parameter Extraction.

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs) has significantly propelled the field of natural language processing (NLP), particularly in tasks such as document retrieval and question answering [1], [2]. These models exhibit

immense potential for enhancing electronic design automation (EDA). LLMs have demonstrated diverse applications within EDA. For example, LLM4EDA [3] automates multiple steps in the EDA process by combining text and multimodal data such as circuit diagrams and code, significantly simplifying the design workflow. ChatEDA [4] further showcases how LLMs can generate processor design scripts and improve EDA efficiency by verifying accuracy through automated tools. Additionally, "The Dawn of AI-Native EDA" [5] discusses the application of AI-driven circuit models in circuit analysis and design, especially in standard cells and analog circuits, highlighting their advantages. Lastly, the AutoMage model [6] validates its high precision and reliability in EDA script generation tasks by comparing it with LLMs like GPT-4. Overall, these models primarily focus on design optimization and code generation in QA systems, promoting intelligent design development in EDA.

In electronic design, effective parameter extraction is crucial for design processes and ensuring the accuracy of chip models [7], [8]. Engineers often consult extensive documentation to extract component parameters needed for constructing circuit simulation SPICE models. Manually searching through lengthy documents for parameters is time-consuming and labor-intensive [9], [10]. Automating parameter extraction and generating corresponding SPICE models would greatly enhance electronic design efficiency and increase EDA automation levels [11], [12]. LLMs possess a high capacity for document analysis and information extraction, offering potential to automate the parameter extraction process by accurately identifying and extracting model specifications and parameters from technical documents [13], [14].

Despite the advanced capabilities of LLMs, engineers face considerable challenges when extracting parameters from chip technical documentation. These documents are often lengthy and complex, making manual retrieval cumbersome. While methods like Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) have shown promise in technical document analysis, directly applying LLMs does not efficiently facilitate parameter

This work is funded by Hunan Provincial Science and Technology Innovation Program (No. 2021RC2065), National University of Defense Technology School Research Funding Program (No. ZK22-42) and Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (No. 3208002309A2).

Yi Pin Xu and Hong Cai Chen are with School of Automation, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China. (email: 1455120321@qq.com, [chenhc@seu.edu.cn](mailto:chenhc@seu.edu.cn))

Yang Zhang is with College of Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China. (email: 16103271g@connect.polyu.hk)

extraction due to the inherent complexity of chip documentation. This limitation underscores the necessity for innovative strategies to augment the parsing capabilities of LLMs in this specific context [6].

There are mainly two techniques to improve LLMs for specific applications: prompting and tuning. Tuning methods require large datasets and computational resources for training and are inflexible due to the need for continuous maintenance and updates. When introducing new data or features, or when network architectures change, retraining becomes necessary to adapt to new tasks or data variations. In contrast, prompting offers greater flexibility and cost-effectiveness but may struggle with complex tasks, necessitating meticulous design for optimal results [15].

The Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting method can significantly enhance LLMs' reasoning performance in complex tasks. Wei et al. [16] proposed that CoT prompting allows models to generate reasoning steps incrementally, markedly improving performance in mathematical problems and complex reasoning tasks. Auto-CoT [15] further investigated automatic generation of these reasoning chains. Their work employed similarity-based retrieval to select example problems and utilized zero-shot prompting (Zero-Shot-CoT) to generate reasoning chains. Although this method underperforms handcrafted example chains on some datasets, it shows great potential when processing large-scale unlabeled data.

Inspired by CoT, we design a prompt framework leveraging CoT reasoning to enhance the parsing ability of document parameters. CoT reasoning enables LLMs to decompose complex tasks into intermediate reasoning steps, improving performance without model fine-tuning. This strategy leverages the inherent strengths of LLMs to better handle the intricacies of technical documents. Moreover, the proposed algorithm exhibits model-agnostic generalization, enabling enhanced parameter retrieval performance across diverse LLMs.

The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- We propose three novel CoT-based techniques—Targeted Document Retrieval (TDR), Iterative Retrieval Optimization (IRO), and Preference Optimization (PO)—that significantly enhance the efficiency and accuracy of parameter extraction in EDA without requiring model fine-tuning, offering a simple and direct solution.
- The proposed framework integrates LLMs for parameter extraction with SPICE model generation, enabling automation directly from documents to model creation, which can replace manual labor and significantly enhance efficiency.
- The proposed framework is tested on various LLMs and shows high adaptability, functioning effectively across various LLMs without requiring specific model adjustments. This broad applicability makes the proposed framework flexible and practical.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we review related works. Section III details our methodology. Section IV presents experimental results and analysis. Finally,

Section V concludes the paper and discusses future research directions.

## II. RELATED WORKS

Parameter extraction and modeling in EDA have been extensively studied, with various approaches proposed to address the challenges of efficiency and accuracy. In this section, we systematically review existing research, highlighting the differences and improvements over our work.

LLMs have demonstrated outstanding performance across various NLP tasks, including document retrieval and question answering. Traditionally, sparse vector techniques such as TF-IDF and BM25 have been widely used for document retrieval [17]. However, these methods often fall short in capturing semantic similarities due to their reliance on term frequency. Recent advancements have shifted towards dense text representations that allow for semantic-level modeling of textual similarity. For instance, Dense Passage Retrieval (DPR) [18] utilizes dual BERT models to generate embeddings for questions and text passages, significantly improving retrieval precision and enhancing the overall accuracy of end-to-end question-answering systems [19].

While these methods are effective in general contexts, they may not fully address the complexities inherent in technical document analysis within EDA, where specialized knowledge and precise parameter extraction are required.

Despite LLMs excelling in generating fluent and natural text, they are prone to hallucinations, generating content that is not faithful to the original source [20]. To mitigate this issue, RAG architectures have been introduced to combine parametric and non-parametric knowledge, aiming to improve generation accuracy and reduce hallucinations [21]. RAG integrates retrieval mechanisms to draw relevant content from external knowledge bases, thereby reducing the risk of inaccuracies.

RAG has shown effectiveness in specialized domains such as medical and legal question answering [6], [22]. However, directly applying RAG to parameter extraction in EDA faces limitations due to the complexity and specificity of technical documents, and the necessity for high precision without extensive model fine-tuning.

CoT reasoning enables LLMs to decompose complex tasks into intermediate reasoning steps, enhancing performance on multi-step reasoning problems [23]. CoT reasoning has proven effective in various applications, including mathematical reasoning and logical deduction [24], and is particularly relevant in technical document analysis where precise parameter extraction is critical.

Nevertheless, integrating CoT reasoning specifically for parameter extraction in EDA remains underexplored. Existing studies have not fully addressed how CoT can be combined with retrieval techniques to manage the intricacies of EDA documentation.

The synergy between dense text representations and CoT reasoning is particularly powerful in tasks requiring both accurate retrieval and multi-step reasoning, such as chip modeling. Dense retrieval techniques like DPR ensure that

relevant documents are retrieved with high precision, while CoT reasoning refines the extraction process through iterative optimizations.

### III. METHODOLOGY

Our work uniquely integrates CoT reasoning with targeted document retrieval and optimization techniques specifically tailored for parameter extraction in EDA. We address the challenges of handling high-dimensional design data and real-time processing demands without requiring model fine-tuning. By introducing TDR, IRO, and PO, we offer a novel solution that improves upon existing methods in both efficiency and accuracy. The whole framework of the proposed method is shown in Fig. 1: The process begins with the user inputting a specific chip model number (e.g., P2N2222A). Through Targeted Document Retrieval (TDR), the system locates the corresponding technical document from the database, ensuring that all subsequent searches are restricted to this document to improve search precision. The system then performs keyword searches (e.g., PNP, NMOS) to identify the chip type, determining whether it is a static device (e.g., diodes, LEDs) or a dynamic device (e.g., transistors). If the chip is classified as a dynamic device, the system prompts the user to provide further details about the device's operating conditions (e.g., voltage or temperature). Based on this information, the system uses IRO to search the document for the relevant technical parameters. This iterative approach refines the search process with each pass to ensure that the most accurate parameters are identified. During this parameter extraction process, PO is employed to prioritize searches in specific document sections (e.g., electrical characteristics) based on the user's input and predefined preferences, thereby ensuring more targeted and efficient extraction. Once the required parameters are identified, the system automatically generates the necessary simulation model code in a predefined PySpice format, streamlining the entire process from parameter extraction to model generation. This integrated approach, leveraging TDR for document localization, IRO for optimizing parameter retrieval, and PO for focused searches, significantly enhances the accuracy and efficiency of extracting chip parameters from technical documents and generating simulation models. In the following sections, we will detail the methodology and implementation of these three techniques to demonstrate their impact on streamlining EDA workflows.

#### A. Targeted Document Retrieval

The TDR framework is designed to enhance the efficiency and precision of parameter extraction, a critical task in EDA. The complexity of this task arises from the need to process large datasets, handle ambiguous inputs, and optimize retrieval when faced with errors or incomplete specifications.

- **Initial Document Screening**

We employ semantic matching and context-aware retrieval mechanisms. When a user inputs a chip model, the system extracts key characteristics through semantic analysis, allowing for an initial search within a large technical database. Unlike simple keyword matching, the system uses a contextual




Fig. 1. Chip Modeling Framework Combining TDR, IRO, and PO Methods




Fig. 2. Targeted Document Retrieval Framework for Chip Model Identification.

understanding to capture relevant documents that may not contain the exact keywords but share semantic similarities [3]. This improves the likelihood of locating documents even when the input is vague or partially specified. Fig. 2 illustrates the TDR framework within the Chip Modeling Framework depicted in Fig. 1, which is used for chip model identification.

- **Dynamic Adjustment and Adaptive Optimization**

If no match is found in the initial screening, the system transitions to a more advanced stage involving dynamic adjustment and adaptive optimization. This stage includes two key strategies:

**Series-Level Input with Model Association:** When the user inputs a chip series rather than a specific model, the system dynamically expands the search to include all models within that series. This process leverages metadata




Fig. 3. An Example of Dynamic Adjustment and Fuzzy Matching for Chip Series Expansion




Fig. 4. An Example of Document Recommendation after a Mismatch

tags and hierarchical model associations within the database to ensure that no related models are overlooked [4, 25]. Fig. 3 demonstrates an example of the dynamic adjustment and fuzzy matching for chip series expansion. **Fuzzy Matching with Edit Distance:** In cases where the input is erroneous or typographically flawed, the system employs fuzzy matching using the Levenshtein Distance to calculate the number of operations needed to transform the input into a known model in the database [25]. This accommodates minor user input errors and still retrieves useful documents [4].

**Document Filtering and Recommendation:** Following the dynamic adjustment phase, the system generates a set of potential document matches, which are then ranked and filtered based on similarity and relevance scores. The most relevant documents are presented to the user, ensuring precise parameter extraction for further modeling in the EDA process. Fig. 4 shows an example of document recommendation after a mismatch.

The TDR framework provides a robust solution for handling incomplete or erroneous user inputs during parameter extraction in EDA. Through semantic matching, fuzzy logic, and metadata-based model association, TDR ensures high retrieval accuracy while minimizing manual effort.

### B. Iterative Retrieval Optimization

**Iterative Retrieval Optimization (IRO)** is designed to enhance the accuracy of parameter extraction in complex tasks involving LLMs [26]. Traditional retrieval methods often fall short due to the semantic gap between the user's query and the required knowledge [27]. IRO addresses this challenge by iteratively alternating between retrieval and generation processes, progressively narrowing this gap and improving parameter extraction accuracy.

In each iteration, the model leverages the output from the




Fig. 5. Iterative Parameter Retrieval and Inference Process with IRO: A Concrete Example.




Fig. 6. An Example of PySpice Model Generation with IRO under Specified Conditions.

previous generation step, combining it with the original query to refine the retrieval process. Specifically, given a user query  $q$  and a corpus  $D = \{d\}$ , the IRO method performs the following steps in the  $t$ -th iteration:

(1) **Retrieval Stage:** Concatenate the previous output  $y_{t-1}$  with the query  $q$  to form a new query. Use this to retrieve relevant documents from the corpus  $D$ , resulting in a retrieval set  $D_{y_{t-1} \parallel q}$ .

(2) **Generation Stage:** Utilize an LLM  $M$  to generate a new output  $y_t$  based on the retrieved documents  $D_{y_{t-1} \parallel q}$  and the original query  $q$ .

This iterative process is formalized as:

$$y_t = M(y_t | \text{prompt}(D_{y_{t-1} \parallel q}, q)), \quad 1 \leq t \leq T \quad (1)$$

where  $T$  is the maximum number of iterations, and  $y_T$  is the final output provided by the model [28]. Fig. 5 depicts the IRO workflow, illustrating how each iteration refines the retrieval and generation processes.

To illustrate the effectiveness of IRO, we focus on its application in transistor parameter extraction and PySpice model generation within chip documentation. Fig. 5 depicts the






Fig. 7. Preference Optimization Framework for MOSFET Parameter Extraction in Technical Documents.

iterative reasoning process applied during parameter retrieval.

Initially, the user provides the transistor model "P2N2222A". The system retrieves initial parameter ranges from the technical documents, such as the general  $h_{FE}$  range (e.g., 40 to 300). Recognizing the broadness of this range, the model suggests that the user provide specific operating conditions to refine the parameters. Upon receiving additional information, such as collector current  $I_C = 0.1mA$  and collector-emitter voltage  $V_{CE} = 10V$ , the model uses this information, combined with the IRO method, to extract key parameters from the technical specifications. Fig. 6 illustrates an example of the PySpice model generation with IRO under specified conditions, showing how the iterative process leads to accurate parameter extraction and model creation.

The IRO framework provides a robust solution for handling incomplete or ambiguous user inputs during parameter extraction. Through its iterative process of retrieval and generation, IRO ensures high retrieval accuracy while minimizing manual effort.

### C. Preference Optimization

PO aims to enhance the efficiency and precision of parameter extraction within EDA workflows by leveraging structured document analysis and priority definition to focus on specific sections within chip technical documents.

Through structured analysis, the model identifies and labels different sections such as "Electrical Characteristics," "Typical Performance Curves," and "Absolute Maximum Ratings." This hierarchical structure provides a clear path for subsequent searches.

Based on expert knowledge of where modeling parameters are typically located, the system assigns different priority levels to each section. For example, key parameters for modeling are most likely to appear in the "Electrical Characteristics" section, which is assigned the highest priority.

By employing constraint optimization theory, the search process is limited to high-priority sections [29]. The model begins by extracting parameters from the highest-priority sections, only considering lower-priority sections if necessary. This reduces time spent on irrelevant sections and enhances both search efficiency and accuracy [30], [31]. Fig. 7 illustrates the preference optimization framework for MOSFET parameter extraction in technical documents.

By integrating knowledge reasoning, CoT, and constraint optimization theory, the PO method effectively increases search

efficiency and accuracy, addressing the challenges faced by traditional methods when dealing with large technical documents.

## IV. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

### A. Experimental Setup and Methodology

We conducted experiments to investigate the effectiveness of TDR, IRO, and PO in improving the accuracy and efficiency of parameter extraction from chip datasheets. The dataset comprises 200 datasheets covering 15 types of devices, including transistors, diodes, and LEDs, sourced from six manufacturers such as ON Semiconductor and Texas Instruments. A stratified random sampling method ensured representative coverage. We conducted experiments to investigate the effectiveness of TDR, IRO, and PO in improving the accuracy and efficiency of parameter extraction from chip datasheets. The dataset comprises 200 datasheets covering 15 types of devices, including transistors, diodes, and LEDs, sourced from six manufacturers such as ON Semiconductor and Texas Instruments. A stratified random sampling method ensured representative coverage. The experiments were run on a Linux machine with a multi-core processor, 32GB of RAM, and a GPU of NVIDIA GeForce 4090, ensuring efficient handling of large datasets and model computations. The conversational LLM in Ragflow used in this experiment is DeepSeek-V2.5, optimized for handling extensive natural language processing tasks with high efficiency and accuracy.

For comparison and ablation study, five configurations were evaluated:

- Group 1 (Baseline):** No new methods applied.
- Group 2:** Utilizing TDR and IRO.
- Group 3:** Utilizing TDR and PO.
- Group 4:** Utilizing IRO and PO.
- Group 5:** Employing all three methods.

Each group followed a systematic approach to assess the individual contribution of each method.

### B. Evaluation Metrics

The effectiveness of these methods was evaluated based on two primary metrics: Precision and Average Response Time (ART):

**Precision** is defined as the ratio of correctly extracted parameters to the total number of extracted parameters. It is calculated using the following formula:

$$Precision = \frac{C}{E} \times 100\% \quad (2)$$

where  $C$  is the number of correctly extracted parameters,  $E$  is the total number of extracted parameters. This metric reflects the accuracy of the extraction process, measuring how effectively the system retrieves the desired parameters.

**Average Response Time** refers to the time, in milliseconds, taken to return the extraction results from the initiation of the request. It is computed using the formula:

$$Average Response Time = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n T_i}{n} \quad (3)$$

where  $T_i$  is the response time for each individual request and  $n$

is the total number of requests. This metric helps assess the efficiency of the method in terms of processing speed.

**Cohen's d effect sizes:** Cohen's d is a statistical measure to

$$S_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{(n_x - 1)S_x^2 + (n_y - 1)S_y^2}{n_x + n_y - 2}} \quad (5)$$

where  $S_x$  and  $S_y$  are the standard deviations of the two groups, and  $n_x$ ,  $n_y$  represent the respective sample sizes. The calculation of Cohen's d allows us to measure the effect size and evaluate the significance of differences between the groups.

### C. Experimental Results and Analysis

Table I presents the comparison of retrieval precision and latency across the five experimental groups. Group 1 served as the baseline and achieved the lowest retrieval precision of 65% and the longest latency at 498.5 ms. Group 2, which combined TDR and IRO, achieved an 85% retrieval precision, indicating a substantial improvement in accuracy. TDR likely contributes by narrowing down the search to relevant documents, while IRO refines the search through iterative optimization. Additionally, this group achieved a 15.5% latency reduction to 422.5 ms, suggesting that these methods not only boost accuracy but also expedite the retrieval process. Group 3 (TDR + PO) achieved a retrieval precision of 80%. While this is an improvement over the baseline, it is slightly lower than Group 2. This could indicate that PO, while helpful in reducing latency, may not contribute as much to precision as IRO does. This group reduced latency to 379.3 ms, indicating a more significant improvement in speed. PO, with its focus on prioritizing relevant document sections, appears to be particularly effective in reducing latency. Group 4, which paired IRO with PO, excelled with a remarkable 88% retrieval precision, underscoring the strong synergy between these two methods, particularly IRO's pivotal role in boosting accuracy. Additionally, this group had a latency of 353.2 ms, marking a significant decrease in retrieval time and highlighting the efficiency gains from the joint of IRO and PO. Group 5, employing the full suite of TDR, IRO, and PO, achieved the top retrieval precision of 96%, showcasing the powerful synergy of these combined approaches. This group also had the fastest retrieval time at 312.6 ms, reflecting a substantial 37.48% reduction in latency. The collective of all three methods significantly accelerated the retrieval process, underscoring their potent collaborative effect on efficiency.

To quantify the contributions of PO, IRO, and TDR in enhancing parameter extraction accuracy and reducing system latency, Cohen's d effect size is evaluated to quantify the differences between experimental groups, with results summarized in Table II. Firstly, to assess the contribution of **PO**, we compared Group 2 (without PO) with Group 5. The results indicated that PO significantly reduced latency, with a Cohen's d effect size of **15.54**, and improved precision, with an effect size of **4.92**. This demonstrates that PO's dynamic priority mechanism effectively accelerates system response time and enhances parameter extraction accuracy by focusing on the most relevant document sections. Secondly, to evaluate the role of **IRO**, we compared Group 3 (without IRO) with Group 5. The findings revealed that IRO significantly improved precision, with a Cohen's d effect size of **7.16**, and noticeably reduced latency, with an effect size of **9.43**. IRO's iterative

Experiment Configuration	Retrieval Precision (%)	Retrieval Latency (ms)	Precision Improvement (%)	Latency Reduction (%)
<b>Group 1 (Baseline):</b> No innovation applied	65	498.5	0	0
<b>Group 2:</b> TDR + IRO (without PO)	85	422.5	30.76	15.5
<b>Group 3:</b> TDR + PO (without IRO)	80	379.3	23.07	24.14
<b>Group 4:</b> IRO + PO (without TDR)	88	353.2	35.38	29.36
<b>Group 5:</b> TDR + IRO + PO	96	312.6	<b>47.69</b>	<b>37.48</b>

TABLE II  
COHEN'S D EFFECT SIZES FOR PRECISION AND LATENCY COMPARISONS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

Group Comparison	Tested Method	Cohen's d (Precision Improvement)	Cohen's d (Latency Reduction)
Group 5 vs Group 2	PO	4.92	15.54
Group 5 vs Group 3	IRO	7.16	9.43
Group 5 vs Group 4	TDR	3.58	5.74
Group 5 vs Group 1	ALL	13.86	26.29




Fig. 8. Cohen's D For Precision and Latency by Method

quantify the practical significance of differences between groups, providing a standardized way to understand the magnitude of differences in the context of experimental results. The formula for Cohen's d is given by [32, 33]:

$$Cohen's\ d = \frac{\bar{G}_x - \bar{G}_y}{S_{pooled}} \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{G}_x$  and  $\bar{G}_y$  represent the means of the two groups, and  $S_{pooled}$  is the pooled standard deviation, calculated as:

optimization process enhances system accuracy and efficiency by progressively refining parameter extraction and reducing errors. Thirdly, to verify the contribution of **TDR**, we compared Group 4 (without TDR) with Group 5. The results showed that TDR contributed to precision improvement, with a Cohen’s d effect size of **3.58**, and helped reduce latency, with an effect size of **5.74**. TDR’s early document filtering mechanism effectively eliminates irrelevant documents, enhancing the efficiency of subsequent PO and IRO methods. Finally, to assess the effectiveness of the combined use of all three methods, we compared the baseline Group 1 (without any methods) with Group 5. The results indicated that the joint application of the three methods significantly improved precision, with a Cohen’s d effect size of **13.86**, and substantially reduced latency, with an effect size of **26.29**. This demonstrates that the synergistic effect of PO, IRO, and TDR effectively enhances parameter extraction accuracy and significantly accelerates system response, fully reflecting the powerful impact of using all three methods simultaneously.

As Cohen’s D of different methods shown in Fig. 8, **PO** is the most outstanding in reducing latency, with a Cohen’s d effect size as high as **15.54**, significantly surpassing the second-ranked IRO (effect size **9.43**). This indicates that PO’s dynamic priority mechanism effectively accelerates system response time. **IRO** is the most significant in improving precision, with a Cohen’s d effect size of **7.16**, leading over the second-ranked PO (effect size **4.92**). IRO’s iterative optimization process enhances parameter extraction accuracy and reduces extraction errors. **TDR** lays the foundation for the overall improvement of system performance. Although its Cohen’s d effect sizes in both aspects are relatively smaller (precision improvement **3.58**, latency reduction **5.74**), TDR’s early filtering mechanism is crucial for enhancing the efficiency of PO and IRO. The **combined application of all three methods** achieves the highest Cohen’s d effect sizes in both aspects (precision improvement **13.86**, latency reduction **26.29**), far exceeding the effect sizes of any single method. This further confirms that the synergistic effect of the three methods is superior to using any method alone.

#### D. Model-Agnostic Generalization Experiment and Analysis

Previous experiments using the DeepSeek-V2 large-scale model have demonstrated that applying our proposed innovative CoT methodology significantly enhances the accuracy of chip technical parameter retrieval while reducing retrieval latency. To further evaluate the generalizability of the CoT method across other large-scale models, this experiment aims to verify that our innovative CoT approach consistently improves performance across multiple models.


In this Experiment, we stratified and extracted 60 documents from 15 categories of chip technical documentation provided by six manufacturers to form our test dataset. We selected four different state-of-the-art large-scale models: DeepSeek-V2.5, Qwen2.5 72B, ERNIE 4.0, and Moonshot-v1-32k. Under identical conditions, we executed the same chip parameter extraction tasks both with and without employing our proposed Chain-of-Thought reasoning method. We measured each

Model	Retrieval Precision (%)	Retrieval Latency (ms)	Precision Improvement (%)	Latency Reduction (%)
DeepSeek-V2.5	65	498.5	0	0
Qwen2.5 72B	63	505.5	0	0
ERNIE 4.0	60	512	0	0
Moonshot-v1-32k	62	510.4	0	0
DeepSeek-V2.5+ <b>Proposed CoT</b>	97	309.4	49.23	37.93
Qwen2.5 72B+ <b>Proposed CoT</b>	94	320	49.21	36.7
ERNIE 4.0+ <b>Proposed CoT</b>	95	335.5	58.33	34.47
Moonshot-v1-32k+ <b>Proposed CoT</b>	94	345.1	51.61	32.39

model’s Retrieval Precision and Retrieval Latency to assess the effectiveness of the Chain-of-Thought method and to evaluate consistency across different models.

Table III presents a comparative analysis of retrieval precision and latency across different LLM models, with and without the incorporation of proposed CoT reasoning. By comparing the baseline models with their counterparts enhanced by proposed CoT reasoning, the results clearly indicate that CoT significantly improves retrieval precision while reducing latency across all models. For instance, DeepSeek-V2.5, as a baseline model, achieved a retrieval precision of 65% with a latency of 498.5 ms. Upon integrating proposed CoT reasoning, precision increased from 65% to 97%, reflecting a 49.23% improvement, while latency decreased from 498.5 ms to 309.4 ms, representing a 37.93% reduction, demonstrating a substantial performance enhancement. Similarly, Qwen2.5 72B saw its precision rise from 63% to 94%, a 49.21% improvement, and its latency reduced from 505.5 ms to 320.0 ms, a reduction of 36.70%. ERNIE 4.0 exhibited a precision improvement from 60% to 95% (58.33% increase), with latency reduced from 512.0 ms to 335.5 ms (34.47% reduction). Likewise, Moonshot-v1-32k’s precision improved from 62% to 94% (a 51.61% increase), and its latency decreased from 510.4 ms to 345.1 ms, representing a 32.39% reduction.

Fig. 9 presents two examples comparing the effectiveness of extracting identical chip parameters with and without the use of proposed CoT methods. The first case compares the performance of the Qwen2.5 72B model in extracting parameters for the 2N7002E, with and without the Advanced CoT method. The results indicate that the system utilizing the Advanced CoT method accurately extracted key parameters from the technical documentation, including VTO (Gate Threshold Voltage), BETA (Conductance Parameter), and Ciss (Input Capacitance). In contrast, the system without proposed CoT made an error when retrieving VTO due to interference from the maximum and minimum values presented alongside the typical value in the table. The lack of proposed CoT



prevented the system from correctly interpreting the table headers, leading to incorrect parameter extraction. The second case illustrates a comparison using the ERNIE 4.0 model to extract parameters for the 5100H5. The system employing the Advanced CoT method was able to accurately retrieve RS (Forward Resistance) and BV (Breakdown Voltage) and correctly calculate the RS value using Ohm's law based on the typical forward voltage. However, the system without Advanced CoT failed to locate the Reverse Breakdown Voltage, thus preventing the indirect calculation of the resistance value.

Overall, the introduction of proposed CoT reasoning significantly improves both retrieval precision and latency across all models. This demonstrates that the proposed CoT reasoning not only enhances retrieval accuracy but also substantially accelerates response times, yielding notable performance improvements across various large language models.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented a novel chip modeling framework that leverages Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of parameter extraction in Electronic Design Automation. By introducing three CoT-based techniques—Targeted Document Retrieval, Iterative Retrieval Optimization, and Preference Optimization—we addressed the challenges of processing high-dimensional design data and meeting real-time processing demands without the need for model fine-tuning. Moreover, the method we propose significantly enhances parameter search performance across all four LLMs.

Our experimental results demonstrated significant improvements in retrieval precision and latency reduction, highlighting the effectiveness of our approach. The use of Cohen's *d* effect sizes quantified the substantial impact of each technique, with Preference Optimization having the greatest effect on latency reduction and Iterative Retrieval Optimization contributing most to precision improvement.

For future research, we plan to explore the integration of our framework with other EDA tools and workflows, investigating its scalability and adaptability in different design environments. Additionally, we aim to extend our methods to support a broader range of devices and parameters, further enhancing the utility of our approach in the rapidly evolving field of chip design.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Kamaloo, N. Dziri, C. Clarke, and D. Rafiei, "Evaluating open-domain question answering in the era of large language models," in *Proc. 61st Annu. Meeting Assoc. Comput. Linguistics (ACL)*, vol. 1, Long Papers, 2023.
- [2] Y. Li, Z. Li, K. Zhang, R. Dan, S. Jiang, and Y. Zhang, "ChatDoctor: A medical chat model fine-tuned on a large language model Meta-AI (Llama) using medical domain knowledge," *Cureus*, vol. 15, no. 6, 2023.
- [3] R. Zhong, X. Du, S. Kai, et al., "Llm4eda: Emerging progress in large language models for electronic design automation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12224*, 2023.
- [4] H. Wu, Z. He, X. Zhang, et al., "ChatEDA: A large language model powered autonomous agent for EDA," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 3184-3197, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1109/TCAD.2024.3383347.
- [5] L. Chen, Y. Chen, Z. Chu, et al., "The dawn of AI-native EDA: Promises and challenges of large circuit models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07257*, 2024.
- [6] Y. Zhao, H. Cao, X. Zhao, et al., "An empirical study of retrieval augmented generation with chain-of-thought," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.15569*, 2024.
- [7] M. Fayazi, Z. Colter, Z. B.-E. Youbi, J. Bagherzadeh, T. Ajayi, and R. Dreslinski, "FASCINET: A Fully Automated Single-Board Computer Generator Using Neural Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 41, no. 12, pp. 5435-5448, 2022, doi: 10.1109/tcad.2022.3158073.
- [8] W. Cao, J. Gao, T. Ma, R. Ma, M. Benosman, and X. Zhang, "RoSE-Opt: Robust and Efficient Analog Circuit Parameter Optimization with Knowledge-infused Reinforcement Learning," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, pp. 1-1, 2024.
- [9] M. Fayazi, M. T. Taba, E. Afshari and R. Dreslinski, "AnGeL: Fully-Automated Analog Circuit Generator Using a Neural Network Assisted Semi-Supervised Learning Approach," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, vol. 70, no. 11, pp. 4516-4529, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.1109/TCSI.2023.3295737.



- [10] Y. Zhang, X. Zhang, P. Xu, et al., "AutoAI2C: An Automated Hardware Generator for DNN Acceleration on Both FPGA and ASIC," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 3143-3156, Oct. 2024.
- [11] W. Fang, Y. Lu, S. Liu, et al., "Transferable Pre-Synthesis PPA Estimation for RTL Designs With Data Augmentation Techniques," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, doi: 10.1109/TCAD.2024.3420904.
- [12] Z. Wang, B. Chen, Z. He, et al., "FGNN2: A Powerful Pre-Training Framework for Learning the Logic Functionality of Circuits," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, doi: 10.1109/TCAD.2024.3434464.
- [13] S. Liu, W. Fang, Y. Lu, et al., "RTLCoder: Fully Open-Source and Efficient LLM-Assisted RTL Code Generation Technique," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, doi: 10.1109/TCAD.2024.3483089.
- [14] Z. Wu, J. Shen, X. Yi, L. Shang, F. Yang and X. Zeng, "Prior-Boosted GRL: Microarchitecture Design Space Exploration via Graph Representation Learning," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, doi: 10.1109/TCAD.2024.3457376.
- [15] Y. Wang, S. Zhao, Z. Wang, et al., "Strategic Chain-of-Thought: Guiding Accurate Reasoning in LLMs through Strategy Elicitation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.03271*, 2024.
- [16] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, et al., "Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models," in *Advances Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 35, pp. 24824-24837, 2022.
- [17] P. Lewis, E. Perez, A. Piktus, F. Petroni, V. Karpukhin, N. Goyal, et al., "Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 9459-9474, 2020.
- [18] F. Yu, L. Quartey, and F. Schilder, "Legal prompting: Teaching a language model to think like a lawyer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.01326*, 2022.
- [19] T. B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, et al., "Language models are few-shot learners," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- [20] A. Chowdhery, S. Narang, J. Devlin, et al., "PaLM: Scaling language modeling with pathways," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*, 2022.
- [21] G. Chen, K. Zhu, S. Kim, et al., "LLM-enhanced Bayesian optimization for efficient analog layout constraint generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05250*, 2024.
- [22] Z. Tao, Y. Shi, Y. Huo, et al., "AMSNet: Netlist dataset for AMS circuits," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09045*, 2024.
- [23] Y. Lai, S. Lee, G. Chen, et al., "AnalogCoder: Analog circuit design via training-free code generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14918*, 2024.
- [24] M. Liu, T. D. Ene, R. Kirby, et al., "ChipNeMo: Domain-adapted LLMs for chip design," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00176*, 2023.
- [25] K. He, C. Gan, Z. Li, et al., "Transformers in medical image analysis," *Intelligent Medicine*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 59-78, Mar. 2023.
- [26] A. M. Ozbayoglu, M. U. Gudelek, and O. B. Sezer, "Deep learning for financial applications: A survey," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 93, p. 106384, Mar. 2020.
- [27] J. Cohen, *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988.
- [28] D. Lakens, "Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 4, p. 863, Nov. 2013. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863.
- [29] J. Wang, M. Pan, T. He, et al., "A pseudo-relevance feedback framework combining relevance matching and semantic matching for information retrieval," *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 57, no. 6, p. 102342, Nov. 2020.
- [30] Y. Qi, J. Zhang, W. Xu, et al., "Salient context-based semantic matching for information retrieval," *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing*, vol. 2020, no. 1, pp. 1-17, Dec. 2020.
- [31] Y. Djenouri, A. Belhadi, D. Djenouri, et al., "Cluster-based information retrieval using pattern mining," *Applied Intelligence*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 1888-1903, Apr. 2021.
- [32] S. Jain, K. R. Seeja, and R. Jindal, "A fuzzy ontology framework in information retrieval using semantic query expansion," *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 100009, Apr. 2021.
- [33] S. Yao, D. Yu, J. Zhao, et al., "Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, to be published, 2024.