

# LayoutCopilot: An LLM-powered Multi-agent Collaborative Framework for Interactive Analog Layout Design

Bingyang Liu<sup>2†</sup>, Haoyi zhang<sup>1†</sup>, Xiaohan Gao<sup>3,1</sup>, Zichen Kong<sup>1</sup>  
Xiyuan Tang<sup>1,4</sup>, Yibo Lin<sup>1,5,6\*</sup>, Runsheng Wang<sup>1,5,6</sup>, Ru Huang<sup>1,5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Integrated Circuits <sup>2</sup>School of Electronics Engineering and Computer Science <sup>3</sup>School of Computer Science

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Artificial Intelligence, Peking University, Beijing, China

<sup>5</sup>Beijing Advanced Innovation Center for Integrated Circuits, Beijing, China

<sup>6</sup>Institute of Electronic Design Automation, Peking University, Wuxi, China

## ABSTRACT

Analog layout design heavily involves interactive processes between humans and design tools. The tools are usually designed to use scripting commands or visualized buttons for manipulation, especially for those interactive automation functionalities, which have a steep learning curve and cumbersome user experience, making a notable barrier to their adoption by designers. Aiming to address such a usability issue, this paper introduces LayoutCopilot, a pioneering multi-agent collaborative framework powered by Large Language Models (LLMs) for interactive analog layout design. LayoutCopilot simplifies human-tool interaction by converting natural language instructions into executable script commands, and it interprets high-level design intents into actionable suggestions, significantly streamlining the design process. Experimental results demonstrate the flexibility, efficiency, and accessibility of LayoutCopilot in handling real-world analog designs.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Analog layout design is a critical phase in analog circuit design that relies heavily on the manual effort of skilled designers. This dependence is largely due to the complexity of analog circuit performance models and the additional considerations such as symmetry, matching, signal flow, and other constraints, which pose significant challenges in generating high-quality layouts with superior performance. Therefore, efficiently generating high-quality layouts of analog circuits is a major challenge for both commercial tools and academic research.

Commercial analog layout design platforms like Cadence Virtuoso [1] mainly provide manual layout drawing interfaces and a few interactive layout automation functionalities. However, the learning curve for such platforms is very steep due to complicated buttons, shortcut keys, and scripting commands for manipulation. Their interactive layout automation functionalities require designers to type all the constraints, which is extremely tedious and rarely adopted by designers in practice.

Academic studies have focused on both fully automated analog design methodologies and interactive automation. Over the past four decades, a series of analog placement & routing algorithms have been proposed to automate layout design. These algorithms explore various methods and perspectives, including traditional algorithmic approaches [2–6], domain-knowledge based methods [7–11], and the integration of machine learning techniques [12–14]. All are aimed at boosting the efficiency and performance of final layout results, paving the way for the development of fully automated tools. Recent advancements in fully automated tools for analog layout design such as ALIGN [15–17] and MAGICAL [18–20], have significantly improved design efficiency in analog layout generation. However,




Figure 1: A brief introduction of analog layout automation and our motivation.

despite their advancements, these tools often fall short of accommodating the highly customized needs of analog layout design. To address this, interactive analog layout editing tools [21, 22] have been developed to allow designers to modify and optimize layouts more easily. While these tools offer enhanced flexibility in layout design, similar to commercial tools, they also introduce a new usability challenge as designers must master complex command sets and effectively apply them in circuit optimization.

The above usability challenges come from the fundamental gap between human natural language and machine language. It is not easy to convert both designers' concrete tasks and abstract design intents into executable commands for machines. Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) bring a new opportunity to bridge the gap. Recently prevailing models like GPT-3 [23], Llama [24, 25], GPT-4 [26], and Claude [27] [28] have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in not only understanding and generating human-like text but also reasoning and comprehending abstract domain knowledge, paving the way for innovative applications across various domains. This evolution, along with advances in knowledge retrieval techniques [29] and the proven effectiveness of multi-agent approaches in tackling complex reasoning tasks [30–32], sets a new stage for enhancing human-computer interaction in intricate technical tasks. Such advancements have led to diverse applications within EDA [33–40], but mainly focused on digital circuits, where mature automation solutions have been widely adopted without heavy human-tool interaction. Thus, the field of analog layout design presents a unique opportunity as it has not yet fully explored using LLMs to tackle layout tool usability challenges.

<sup>†</sup>Equal Contribution.

\*Corresponding author: yibolin@pku.edu.cn.

In this paper, we introduce *LayoutCopilot*, a pioneering multi-agent collaborative framework powered by LLMs for interactive analog layout design. *LayoutCopilot* is proficient in processing concrete layout adjustment requests, translating them into executable commands that reduce the learning curve associated with interactive tools. Additionally, it leverages a comprehensive knowledge base to generate practical suggestions according to the designer’s high-level design intents, thus addressing the usability challenges posed by the inherent complexity of analog design. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, *LayoutCopilot* is the first LLM-powered interactive analog layout design framework, offering a novel approach to enhance design flexibility and efficiency in analog circuit design.
- We bridge the interaction gap between designers and analog layout tools with a framework powered by LLMs, overcoming the usability challenge of layout tools and refining the methodology of interactive layout design.
- We utilize a multi-agent collaborative framework that progressively transforms designer requirements into executable commands through coordinated efforts among multiple LLM agents, achieving high accuracy.
- Bulk testing and experiments on real-world analog designs have shown that *LayoutCopilot* can accurately address the designer’s concrete layout adjustment requests and offer actionable suggestions to complete layout optimization based on their high-level design intents.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the background; Section 3 explains the detailed implementation; Section 4 demonstrates the results; Section 5 concludes the paper.

## 2 PRELIMINARIES

This section reviews the background concepts of our study, including the integration of LLMs with EDA, prompt engineering, multi-agent collaboration, and the interactive placement and routing in analog layout design, additionally outlining the scope of *LayoutCopilot*.

### 2.1 Integrating LLMs into EDA Applications

Recent advancements in pre-trained large language models (LLMs) have unveiled new opportunities for enhancing EDA applications. The ability of LLMs to generate human-like text and understand complex concepts makes them ideally suited for integration into EDA tasks, ranging from auto-generating Hardware Description Language (HDL) code to facilitating interactive design workflows through conversational interfaces.

One segment of research has focused on harnessing LLMs to tackle textual or language-based tasks in EDA autonomously. This includes efforts to auto-generate HDL code using tools like RTL-Coder and VeriGen [33, 34], along with benchmarks like RTLLM and VerilogEval for assessing these capabilities [35, 36]. Additionally, RTLfixer [37] is exploring automated debugging and code repair, whereas ChipNeMo [38] serves as an engineering assistant chatbot, facilitating EDA script generation and bug analysis.

Another pathway seeks to help traditional design flows and existing EDA tools with LLMs, thus enhancing their accessibility and ease of use. This is exemplified by ChatEDA [39] and ChatPattern [40], which typically feature a conversational interface that allows designers to express their needs in natural language, thereby facilitating the indirect manipulation of EDA tools via LLMs. Introducing conversational interfaces powered by LLMs helps tackle long-standing usability challenges in EDA tools. Inspired by conversational interfaces




Figure 2: System comparison: overcoming single agent limitations through multi-agent collaboration.


in EDA tools, we applied LLMs to interactive analog layout design. Considering the custom nature of analog circuits, *LayoutCopilot* not only facilitates direct command execution but also generates actionable suggestions based on high-level design intents, streamlining the design process.

### 2.2 Prompt Engineering

*Prompts* are natural language instructions that provide context to guide the generative language model. *Prompt engineering* is the process of leveraging prompts to enhance model efficacy without modifying parameters of the core model [41].

Prompt Engineering offers a lightweight solution for utilizing large models to solve real-world problems. Unlike traditional methods that require extensive data set creation, fine-tuning, and repetitive adjusting to enhance a model’s performance on specific tasks, prompt engineering allows practitioners to directly transmit knowledge and methodologies to the model through carefully designed prompts. This approach is especially crucial in fields where data acquisition and cleansing are challenging, such as EDA. Many approaches of prompt engineering such as *few-shot learning* [42], *chain-of-thought* [43], *least-to-most* [44], and *self-refine strategy* [45] have been explored and proven to enhance the reasoning capabilities and overall performance of LLMs. To handle complex reasoning tasks in our application, *LayoutCopilot* integrates various Prompt Engineering techniques. Each agent is tailored according to the specific task it performs to achieve better performance. Details about the structure of prompts will be presented in Section 3

Apart from manually configured prompts, there are also techniques for automatic prompt generation. A classic example is Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [46], which enhances the model’s interaction with external knowledge bases. As previously mentioned, prompts often contain a few examples, thus aligning with the ‘few-shot’ approach. RAG allows these examples to be automatically retrieved from a database or knowledgebase, providing an interface through which LLMs can access external knowledge



**Figure 3: Illustration of basic analog layout automation method.**

and align their responses accordingly. However, the retrieved context, combined with system instructions and designer requests, is fed as text input to the LLM, which could lead to prompt dilution if the context is overly extensive. This can result in a decrease in response quality, an issue we have observed in our experiments. To address this, we employ a multi-agent methodology to segment different tasks among several LLM agents, ensuring that knowledge retrieval does not compromise the performance of other system components. By separating agents with distinct responsibilities, we maintain system efficiency even as we integrate context-extensive retrieval technologies into our framework.

### 2.3 Multi-Agent Collaboration with LLMs

The objective of multi-agent collaboration is to enable multiple autonomous agents to effectively collaborate towards a shared goal [47]. Figure 2 illustrates the contrast between the capabilities of single and multi-agent systems, highlighting how multi-agent collaboration significantly enhances the system’s capacity by leveraging the specialized expertise of each agent and preventing task interference. This allows the system to manage a considerably larger workload than possible without such specialization, leading to improved efficiency and output quality [48].

After role-playing capabilities were introduced into communicative agent interactions by [49], [50] proposed a comprehensive LLM-based multi-agent collaboration framework that demonstrated efficiency enhancements in handling complex tasks. Based on these works, multi-agent methodologies have been successfully deployed in various applications, proving their effectiveness in scenarios such as text understanding, reasoning, mathematics, coding, and tool utilization [51–53]. Furthermore, several improvements have been proposed to enhance multi-agent collaboration, including [54], which transfers professional knowledge and management experience to LLM agents for more structured collaboration, and [47], which improves cooperation by enabling agents to predict their collaborators’ actions.

In LayoutCopilot, we have developed a multi-agent collaborative framework that divides complex tasks into specialized subtasks. This strategic division of labor ensures that each agent can operate within its expertise without diluting the prompt or compromising other tasks’ performance.

### 2.4 Interactive Analog Layout Design

Analog layout automation has engaged many researchers in recent years and several basic methodologies have emerged [5, 6, 8–11, 13–22]. The analog placement problem can be formulated into a nonlinear optimization problem. The most common objective function is half-perimeter wire length (HPWL), indicating the performance of wire length. Different from digital placement, analog placement will

consider more constraints such as symmetry, array, etc. The analog routing problem is a pathfinding problem that can be solved by a typical shortest path algorithm (A-star).

An interactive analog layout design framework offers flexible adjustments to the layouts while relieving designers from tedious manual layout drawing. By introducing high-level interactive controllers, the framework can leverage placement and routing kernels to automatically adjust the layout, as shown in Figure 3. Based on the interactive layout design framework, designers can add arbitrary placement constraints and refine the routing solution according to their design experience. After several adjustments, designers can finally obtain a high-quality layout.

### 2.5 The Scope of LayoutCopilot

LayoutCopilot functions as a multi-agent collaborative framework designed to enhance the interaction between designer and layout tools, illustrated by Figure 1. Its primary objective is to interpret design intents expressed in natural language and generate actionable commands that effectively interact with layout tools.

**Problem 1. (Objective of LayoutCopilot)** Develop an LLM-powered framework that accepts both high-level design intents and concrete requests in natural language from designers and then transforms them into precise executable commands. These commands aim to manipulate the layout tools directly, ensuring that the design intents are accurately translated into layout adjustments.

## 3 LAYOUTCOPILOT FRAMEWORK

This section introduces the architecture and functionality of LayoutCopilot, a multi-agent collaboration framework enhanced by LLMs for interactive analog layout design. LayoutCopilot enhances the interaction between designers and layout tools by understanding complex requirements in natural language, utilizing a knowledge base for solution generation, and automating layout design. It consists of two primary components: the Analog Circuit Analyzer and the Concrete Request Processor, as illustrated in Figure 4. The Analog Circuit Analyzer initiates the processing of requests, transforming them into concrete requests that adhere to layout tool manuals. These concrete requests are then transferred to the Concrete Request Processor, which generates executable commands to facilitate layout editing. This workflow simplifies interactions between layout tools and designers, enhancing the overall design process. Detailed discussions on each component’s functionality and the rationale for their design are provided in the subsequent subsections.

### 3.1 Analog Circuit Analyzer

The Analog Circuit Analyzer plays a key role in LayoutCopilot, managing and processing diverse requests from designers. It performs a series of functions including categorization of requests, retrieval of relevant knowledge, iterative adjustments in collaboration with designers, and analyzing netlists to transform abstract requests into concrete ones that align with layout tool manuals. This component is powered by four specialized LLM agents, each dedicated to a specific aspect of the processing pipeline: classification, analysis, solution refinement, and solution adaptation, as shown in Figure 4. Details of these agents will be shown as follows:

At the head of the analyzer lies a task classifier agent, determining designers’ requirements as either concrete or abstract requests based on the manual of layout tools. Concrete tasks are identified by their direct translatability into commands or combinations explicitly supported by the layout tools, for example, ‘add symmetry between M6 and M7’. Conversely, abstract requests are recognized for their




Figure 4: Overview of LayoutCopilot.

high-level, conceptual nature, necessitating a comprehensive analysis grounded in the netlist of circuits and knowledge of layout design to be deconstructed into executable steps, such as ‘Enhance the matching’ and ‘Improve the CMRR’. Building on these criteria, an LLM agent executes the task classification. Once classified, the tasks are directed into two distinct flows: concrete tasks are sent directly to the Concrete Request Processor for immediate processing. At the same time, abstract requests undergo a series of steps to be transformed into concrete requests before they are processed in the same manner as concrete requests. Classifying tasks before further processing allows for their assignment to specialized agents, simplifying the overall workflow and enhancing the quality of the responses.

The Analyzer Agent is dedicated solely to the analysis and knowledge retrieval task, which is crucial given LLMs’ limitations with long context lengths. Tasks that require extensive context can use up much of this capacity, potentially diluting prompts and reducing the effectiveness of other tasks. Thus, this agent focuses exclusively on knowledge retrieval to prevent these issues. The Analyzer Agent operates within a vast knowledge base that spans specialized literature on the analog circuit and layout design, layout tool manual, and archives of previous tasks and solutions. It crafts high-level solutions based on knowledge, functioning similarly to a skilled architect drafting a blueprint before construction and outlining strategic approaches to the task. For example, when tasked with ‘enhancing the CMRR of an OTA’, the agent might suggest optimizing component placement to enhance symmetry and rerouting connections to improve parasitic matching, all tailored to the specific capabilities of the chosen layout tools.

Considering analog designers’ rich experience and highly customized requirements, enhancing their involvement in the workflow is crucial. The Solution Refiner Agent effectively facilitates this by presenting high-level solutions to designers with evaluations and explanations, allowing them to select from or modify these solutions as needed. If the designers find the solutions unsatisfactory, they can add more details or revert to the Analyzer Agent for adjustments. This ensures that the process is highly responsive to designer needs.

Refined solutions are then passed to the Solution Adapter Agent to be transformed into concrete requests aligned with the circuit’s netlist.

The Solution Adapter Agent is the final component of the Analog Circuit Analyzer, tasked with converting refined solutions into concrete, actionable requests. Depending on the size, netlists are either communicated directly to the LLM during dialogues or stored in a knowledge base accessed via the LLM’s retrieval interface. This agent meticulously analyzes the netlist to extract specific parameters following the directives from refined solutions. For example, when receiving a refined solution that says ‘enhance the symmetry of differential pairs and capacitors’, the Solution Adapter Agent locates these components in the netlist by their connectivity and device parameters. It then formulates concrete requests to apply symmetry constraints to the identified components, such as ‘add symmetry between M6 and M7’. This agent is also familiar with the layout tools’ manuals, which ensures that the generated requests are compatible with the back-end tools. This stage guarantees that the solutions are not merely theoretical but practically implementable, guiding further design steps precisely.

### 3.2 Concrete Request Processor

The Concrete Request Processor is dedicated to accurately translating concrete tasks into executable commands that fulfill designer requirements via layout tools. The process begins by decomposing concrete tasks into subtasks, each corresponding to a command detailed in the manual of layout tools, akin to the processes used by ChatEDA [39] and ChatPattern [40]. However, merely adopting these methods does not guarantee that the generated commands will execute correctly or achieve the desired results. Distinct from previous works, our approach incorporates role-playing and task decomposition techniques while conveying the syntactic and logical rules dictated by the layout tools’ manuals to the Code Generator Agent. This enrichment ensures that the command sequences generated by the agent maintain high accuracy in syntax and logic, especially when dealing with complex input requests. This strategic




Figure 5: Illustration of the configuration for a single agent in LayoutCopilot.

enhancement is committed to improving the precision and reliability of the process, closely aligning with the specific operational requirements of the layout tools.

### 3.3 Agent Configuration and Prompt Design

Each agent in the LayoutCopilot framework is equipped with prompts tailored to its designated task. These prompts are crafted using the prompt engineering techniques described in Section 2, chosen to enhance the overall expressive capabilities of the agents based on experimental results, as illustrated in Figure 5.

The seven prompt sections are described in detail as follows: *A. Role Play* encourages the agent to adopt a persona that helps simulate a realistic and professional scenario for task handling. *B. Workflow Overview* provides agents with an understanding of their roles within the whole system, highlighting how their outputs influence subsequent stages of the design process. *C. Task Description* delineates the specific responsibilities and objectives of the agent, ensuring focused and relevant task execution. *D. Pipeline* guides agents through a chain-of-thought approach to tackle the assigned tasks efficiently. This enhances the agents’ reasoning capabilities and directs them to break down complex tasks into manageable sub-tasks, improving their ability to handle intricate problems. *E. Information Verification* instructs the agent to verify the completeness of the input before proceeding, prompting for additional information if required. This acts as a self-refine strategy, effectively preventing errors arising from incomplete or inaccurate inputs. *F. Interaction Guideline* directs the agent on interacting with the user and other agents, ensuring that the entire process remains cohesive and efficient. *G. External Knowledge* enables the agent to access a comprehensive repository of books, manuals, and experiential knowledge, which are either communicated directly to the LLM during dialogues or stored in a knowledge base accessed via the LLM’s retrieval interface. This enriches its output with domain-specific insights

In summary, these prompt components ensure that each agent operates not only as a specialist in its respective domain but also as a coherent part of the larger system, enhancing the overall functionality and efficiency of the LayoutCopilot.

### 3.4 Interactive Layout Editor

Interactive layout editor bridges the gap between fully automated analog layout tools and real-world industrial applications. Our interactive analog editor is based on previous interactive works [21, 22] with some extensions. Figure 6 shows the overview of the interactive layout editor. Before the interactive adjustment flow starts, an initial layout is given by fully automated tools. These tools take the netlists, technology files, and some basic constraints as the input. Based on the initial layout, users can start making interactive layout adjustments more intuitively through the user interface. The user interface consists of a natural language interface and a layout GUI. Compared

Table 1: Interactive command set.

Command	Parameters
deviceMove	device $v_i$ , destination location $(x, y)$
deviceSwap	devices $v_i, v_j$
arrayAdd	a list of devices $v_i$ , array shape $x, y$
arraySpace	an array group $g_i$ , horizontal space $x$ , vertical space $y$
symAdd	devices $v_i, v_j$ , symmetry axis $A_k$
netRemove	net $n_i$
netReroute	net $n_i$
wireWidth	wire $w_i$ of net $n_j$ , new wire width $W$
wireSpacing	wire $w_i$ of net $n_m$ , wire $w_j$ of net $n_t$ , spacing width $S$ wire $w_i$ of net $n_m$ , device $v_j$ , spacing width $S$
netPriority	a list of nets $n_i$ with their priorities
netTopology	net $n_i$ , rough guide with points $p_i$

to the previous script-based interface [21, 22], users can use natural language to adjust the analog layout directly. After converting the natural language into a list of commands in the command set shown in Table 1, the command interpreter will decompose each command into placement and routing operations. After the adjustment, the layout result will be shown in the GUI. Users can further adjust the layout according to the given result.

For placement adjustment, users are provided with seven different commands. Theoretically, arbitrary placement adjustments can be achieved by the combination of these commands. `move` command can move a device to a given location. `swap` command can swap




Figure 6: Overview of the interactive layout editor.

**Table 2: Sanity checks and comparison for single-agent with instruction vs. multi-agent with and without instruction.**

Category	Single-agent w/ Instruction				Multi-agent w/o Instruction				Multi-agent w/ Instruction			
	GPT-3.5	GPT-4	Claude 3	Avg.	GPT-3.5	GPT-4	Claude 3	Avg.	GPT-3.5	GPT-4	Claude 3	Avg.
Formatting	71.14%	90.91%	99.25%	87.20%	82.00%	97.92%	99.83%	93.25%	95.38%	99.76%	99.92%	<b>98.26%</b>
Validity	91.36%	93.60%	95.44%	93.47%	96.88%	99.20%	98.40%	98.16%	98.24%	99.28%	98.88%	<b>98.77%</b>
Syntax	67.11%	88.87%	95.24%	83.74%	79.20%	95.28%	97.76%	90.75%	92.65%	97.20%	96.96%	<b>95.60%</b>
Logic	66.44%	83.04%	91.67%	80.38%	76.16%	93.44%	95.20%	88.27%	91.24%	94.24%	98.80%	<b>94.76%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	66.27%	82.91%	90.77%	79.98%	75.76%	93.36%	94.56%	87.89%	90.92%	93.92%	96.80%	<b>93.75%</b>

the location of two given devices. For array-based adjustment, the `arrayAdd` command adds the array constraints to a group of devices and `arraySpace` adjusts the space between devices in the array group. Symmetry constraints can be added by `symAdd` command. With these commands, users can make placement adjustments easily. For instance, the Solution Refiner Agent decided earlier to enhance the symmetry of differential pairs, and the Solution Adapter Agent identified a differential pair {M6, M7}. Then the layout modification can be achieved by executing `symAdd M6 M7`, generated by the Concrete Request Processor.

For routing adjustment, users are provided with six different commands. `remove` and `reroute` are basic commands for removing unsatisfied wires and rerouting them. `wireWidth` command can change the width of a given net or wire to improve the layout performance. `wireSpacing` command can adjust the spacing between two nets to avoid the signal cross-talk. `netPriority` command can designate a specific routing priority of nets. Manual guidance can be set by `netTopology` command, and the final routing solution will follow the guidance tightly. With these commands, users can accomplish arbitrary routing adjustments.

## 4 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

LayoutCopilot is designed as a multi-agent collaborative framework that incorporates mechanisms for agent cooperation and detailed configurations for each agent. It is adaptable to various LLMs and layout tools, facilitating flexible deployment across different environments. In our experiments, we utilize a mature interactive analog layout design tool [21, 22] for demonstration. Moreover, we employ different versions of prevailing LLMs to demonstrate the versatility of LayoutCopilot including GPT-3.5 [23], GPT-4 [26], and Claude3 [28]. Next, we will conduct experiments separately for concrete and abstract requests, showcasing LayoutCopilot’s accuracy in handling basic tasks and its capacity to manage complex and comprehensive circuit optimization tasks.

### 4.1 Concrete Requests: Comprehensive Evaluation

To assess the effectiveness of our framework and the quality of the outputs it generates, we conduct experiments on concrete requests. These requests are expressed in natural language that can be straightforwardly transformed into command sequences for back-end tools. We utilize GPT-3.5 [42] and Claude-3 [28] to generate a total of 1,250 cases, consisting of 1,134 valid concrete requests and 116 invalid requests. The invalid requests typically lack essential parameters or described operations in an order that violates the predefined rules in the manual, and we have verified these manually to confirm their invalidity. Each request contains between 1 to 40 commands from Table 1, ensuring a variety of scenarios in requests. LayoutCopilot processes each concrete request to generate a command sequence that the layout tool could execute to fulfill the requirement. To fully validate the performance of LayoutCopilot, we performed sanity

check and functionality check on those test cases as described below:

**4.1.1 Sanity Check.** This subsection introduces the experimental condition settings, test criteria, and results of the sanity check.

To validate the effectiveness of our agent configuration, we execute experiments under two distinct settings: one with the comprehensive configuration of the LLM through prompt engineering as outlined in Section 3.3, and the other by simply providing the LLM with the layout tool manual along with a straightforward task description that included input-output requirements. Additionally, comparative experiments are conducted using a single-agent setup under instructed conditions to demonstrate the necessity of the multi-agent methodology. In the multi-agent scenario, LayoutCopilot acts as a multi-agent collaborative framework, employing its Concrete Request Processor to manage requests from the test set. Conversely, the single-agent configuration merges all agent prompts mentioned in Section 3 into a single LLM agent aimed at encompassing the entire functionality of LayoutCopilot for handling the test requests. To minimize the impact of different LLM engines on the experimental outcomes, bulk testing is performed using GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and Claude-3 as the LLM engines.

Regarding testing standards, the sanity check covers formatting, validity, syntax, logic rules, and overall accuracy. (i) For the output format, the agent is required to generate processing status and results in JSON following regular text dialogue, ensuring that layout tools can accurately interpret the content and implement the necessary layout adjustments. (ii) Validity is measured by the rate at which the system correctly identifies and responds to invalid inputs. We expect LayoutCopilot to be capable of detecting invalid inputs and providing feedback to designers, such as commands missing specific parameters. (iii) & (iv) We conduct syntactic and logical verification. Based on the command set in Table 1, we establish four syntactic and two logical rules to ensure the integrity and logic of the command sequence. For example, a syntax rule ensures each command contains the correct number of parameters and one of the logic rules says that a device cannot appear in multiple symmetry pairs. Due to the page limit, we do not list all the rules here. (v) Successful processing of a request that either generates correctly formatted code adhering to these rules or accurately identifies an illegal request is considered correct handling and included in the overall accuracy statistics.

We conduct experiments on the previously mentioned test set of 1,250 cases following the outlined criteria, with the results displayed in Table 2. Firstly, it is evident that instructions significantly enhance accuracy across various LLM engines, with average improvements of 6.49% in logical verification, 4.85% in syntactic verification, and an overall increase of 5.89% in overall accuracy. This confirms the effectiveness of our LLM agent settings described in Subsection 3.3 and enhances the quality of LayoutCopilot’s outputs. Secondly, the accuracy rates for the single-agent configuration are consistently lower than those for the multi-agent setup, regardless of whether instructions are used across different LLM engines. This demonstrates the effectiveness of introducing a multi-agent methodology




Figure 7: Functionality check with different LLM engines across instructional conditions.

in this application scenario. Lastly, under conditions using Claude-3, multi-agent configuration, and with instructions, the overall correctness rate of the sanity check reaches 96.80%. This confirms that LayoutCopilot’s comprehensive capabilities are sufficient to meet practical application requirements.

**4.1.2 Functionality Check.** To further assess the functional correctness of the outputs generated by LayoutCopilot on the aforementioned test set, we randomly select 25 cases from the 1,250 generated results that have passed the sanity check. These are subjected to a manual functionality check to verify if they fully implemented the corresponding requests. Like the standards used in ChatEDA [39], we categorize the output results into three levels: A, B, and C. Level A corresponds to output functionally correct and displays clear analytical reasoning. Level B indicates outputs where the functionality has minor flaws, but the analytical reasoning is clear, allowing designers to identify and rectify issues easily through interaction with the LLM. Level C represents outputs that fail both functionally and conceptually, offering little valuable information to help diagnose issues.

We conduct tests using the Concrete Request Processor both with and without instructions, corresponding to the multi-agent section in Table 2. The single-agent scenario is omitted due to its significantly lower pass rate in sanity check, which do not offer valuable comparative insights. As summarized in Figure 7, functionality check results with instructions significantly outperform those without instructions across different LLM engines: on one hand, the proportion of Level A increases by 16% to 32%, reaching up to 92% with GPT-4 at the highest; on the other hand, Level C, which are not uncommon without instructions, almost disappear under instructed conditions, with no more than 8% in GPT-3.5. This indicates that the use of instructions, as discussed in Section 3.3, substantially enhances the usability of LayoutCopilot, where the majority of outputs are either correct or can be easily corrected through simple interactions. Additionally, the percentage of C level under instructed conditions is low regardless of the LLM engine used, thus proving its effectiveness across LLM engines. Overall, the functionality validation demonstrates that LayoutCopilot’s design significantly enhances the output quality, proving its practical utility.

## 4.2 Abstract Requests: Case Studies

In this subsection, we illustrate LayoutCopilot’s capabilities in addressing abstract requests by optimizing layouts in real-world designs. To verify its versatility, we applied LayoutCopilot to two practical circuits, an Operational Transconductance Amplifier (OTA) and a Comparator (COMP), depicted respectively in Figure 8 (a) and (b).

**4.2.1 Operational Transconductance Amplifier (OTA).** Figure 8(a) showcases the layout optimization process for an OTA. We employ the MAGICAL [18–20] to generate the initial placement layout ①, without any constraints applied. The initial layout is irrelevant to our framework, which focuses solely on modifications rather than origins. From layout ①, we engage LayoutCopilot to suggest improvements during the placement phase, simulating real-world scenarios faced by designers. LayoutCopilot proposes a series of high-level solutions, briefly shown as follows:

### Designer:

I got an OTA layout, but it has poor performance. How can I improve it?

### LayoutCopilot:

Improving the performance of your OTA layout can involve... Here are some potential high-level solutions:

1. Enhance Symmetry with `symAdd`: ...
2. Improve Matching with `deviceMove` and `deviceSwap`: ...
3. Reduce Parasitics with `wireWidth` and `wireSpacing`: ...
4. Prevent Crosstalk with `wireSpacing`: ...
5. Improve Routing with `netPriority` and `netTopology`: ...
6. ...

Following this, we select the ‘Enhance Symmetry’ option and provide LayoutCopilot with the netlist, asking for concrete implementation steps. LayoutCopilot analyzes the netlist and identifies key circuit components that should have symmetry constraints applied:

### Designer:

Okay, I prefer to start with the Enhance Symmetry optimization since the current symmetry looks terrible. Here is the circuit netlist: [Netlist]. Which devices should I add symmetry to? Please help me with the corresponding commands.

### LayoutCopilot:

Let’s proceed with analyzing the netlist to identify critical devices...

*Devices for Symmetry:*

1. Differential Input Pair: M34 (net0130 VIM PTAIL VDD) and M35 (net0132 VIP PTAIL VDD) handle the input signals ...
2. Output Stage Devices: M71 (VOP VO1M VDD VDD) and M70 (VOM VO1P VDD VDD) are used in the output stage ...
3. Tail Current Source: M1 (NTAIL NBIAS\_TAIL GND GND) functions as a tail current source...
4. ...

*Command Sequence:*

```
symAdd M34 M35 # Differential input stage.
symAdd M71 M70 # Output stage.
symAdd M1 M1 # Self-symmetry for tail.
...
```

After executing these commands, the resultant layout is shown in ②. Observing layout ②, we note that large capacitors were not symmetrically constrained, leading to a loose and cluttered arrangement. Upon receiving more concrete requests from us, LayoutCopilot applies symmetry constraints to all capacitors based on sizing results and connectivity, resulting in layout ③. For the sake of simplicity, the subsequent replies are not shown specifically.

Further, we direct LayoutCopilot to apply symmetry to all possible components, including resistors that were previously unconsidered. After identifying suitable components in the netlist, LayoutCopilot generates and executes the corresponding commands, yielding layout ④. With the placement appearing optimally refined visually, we proceed with a basic routing command to produce layout ⑤. Subsequent post-layout simulation reveals excessive parasitics, leading us to seek further solutions from LayoutCopilot. Among its




Figure 8: Interactive LLM-powered layout adjustment on OTA and COMP.

Table 3: Placement area statistics.

Benchmark	Technology Node	Placement Area	Area Ratio
OTA-1	TSMC40	$83.4 \times 124.2 \mu\text{m}^2$	1.00
OTA-2		$85.0 \times 148.9 \mu\text{m}^2$	1.22
OTA-3		$80.6 \times 94.3 \mu\text{m}^2$	0.73
OTA-4		$85.4 \times 80.4 \mu\text{m}^2$	0.66
COMP-1	TSMC28	$38.3 \times 39.7 \mu\text{m}^2$	1.00
COMP-2		$24.0 \times 46.9 \mu\text{m}^2$	0.74

Table 4: Comparison between LayoutCopilot and MAGICAL [18–20] without constraints.

Benchmark		Schematic	MAGICAL [18–20] w/o Constraints	LayoutCopilot
OTA	Gain (dB)	38.63	-8.75	<b>38.26</b>
	UGB (MHz)	6.85	–	<b>4.42</b>
	CMRR (dB)	–	27.3	<b>58.7</b>
	PM (degree)	70.98	–	<b>76.28</b>
COMP	CMP_Delay (ns)	3.3	6.3	<b>6.7</b>
	Noise (uV)	50.3	30.9	<b>13.9</b>
	RST_Delay (ps)	89.8	165.8	<b>538.7</b>
	Power (uW)	19.9	32.0	<b>31.71</b>

suggestions—increasing power and ground wire widths, adjusting wire spacing to minimize crosstalk, and prioritizing critical nets for rerouting—we choose to increase the wire widths of power and ground lines, resulting in layout ⑥. With the post-layout results now meeting our specifications as shown in Table 4, we terminated the iterative optimization process.

We conduct the optimization process under TSMC 40nm technology to verify the circuit performance after modifications, utilizing Cadence Virtuoso and Mentor Graphics Calibre for post-layout simulation. As we progressed through the interactive layout adjustment process with LayoutCopilot, the layout area initially increased during the placement phase but eventually reduced to 66% of its original size, as depicted in Table 3 and Figure 8. Given the complex relationship between placement & routing in analog circuits and their post-layout performance, improvements do not follow a linear progression from ① to ⑤, as described earlier for changes in the layout

area. For simplicity, we compare the post-layout performance results between the initial layouts (without constraints) and the final layouts adjusted through interaction with LayoutCopilot, summarized in Table 4.

In the initial layouts, due to excessive parasitics, the Gain was negative, the unity-gain bandwidth (UGB) and phase margin (PM) are substantially poor, and the common-mode rejection ratio (CMRR) is significantly low, showing a large discrepancy with the pre-layout schematic results which do not account for parasitic extractions. After adjustments made using LayoutCopilot, while there remains a disparity in UGB compared to the schematic results, both Gain and PM have closely approached the schematic levels, with CMRR showing substantial improvement over the initial layout. These results underscore the efficacy of LayoutCopilot in facilitating layout optimization through natural language interaction and reducing both the learning and coding time for designers, demonstrating its potential to serve as a powerful assistant for analog layout designers.

**4.2.2 Comparator (COMP)**. A similar process for the COMP adjustments is employed, now utilizing the TSMC 28nm technology as depicted in Figure 8 (b). We optimize the symmetry for transistors and capacitors through interactions with LayoutCopilot, transforming an initial layout in ① into the improved layout in ②. As summarized in the lower half of Table 4, the post-layout simulation result shows that we have significantly improved noise performance at the cost of delay and enhanced power efficiency compared to the initial layout. This adjustment process for both the OTA and CMP exemplifies how LayoutCopilot leverages its comprehensive knowledge base to provide actionable recommendations, effectively optimizing the layout of circuits with varying topologies and improving their post-simulation performance.

## 5 CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a multi-agent collaborative framework powered by LLMs for interactive analog layout design. LayoutCopilot can not only convert natural language instructions into executable script commands but also interpret high-level design intents into actionable suggestions for implementation. Technically, LayoutCopilot



employs a multi-agent methodology alongside prompt engineering. Validated in both TSMC28 and TSMC40, the experimental results demonstrate the robustness and benefits of LayoutCopilot. Specifically, LayoutCopilot achieves high accuracy in handling concrete requests for layout adjustments and effectively improves layout performance in addressing abstract layout optimization requests. We believe this work can provide new insights into solving usability issues of interactive EDA tools and facilitate the development of automation tools for analog circuits.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Cadence Design Systems, *Virtuoso Layout Suite*, Cadence Design Systems, Inc., San Jose, CA, USA, 2023.
- [2] K. Lampaert *et al.*, "A performance-driven placement tool for analog integrated circuits," *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 30, pp. 773–780, 1995.
- [3] K. Lampaert *et al.*, "Analog routing for manufacturability," in *Proceedings of Custom Integrated Circuits Conference*, 1996, pp. 175–178.
- [4] E. Malavasi *et al.*, "A routing methodology for analog integrated circuits," in *ICCAD*. Citeseer, 1990, pp. 202–205.
- [5] L. Xiao *et al.*, "Practical placement and routing techniques for analog circuit designs," in *2010 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 675–679.
- [6] B. Xu *et al.*, "Hierarchical and analytical placement techniques for high-performance analog circuits," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on International Symposium on Physical Design*, 2017, pp. 55–62.
- [7] B. Basaran *et al.*, "Latchup-aware placement and parasitic-bounded routing of custom analog cells," in *Proceedings of 1993 International Conference on Computer Aided Design (ICCAD)*. IEEE, 1993, pp. 415–421.
- [8] H.-C. Ou *et al.*, "Simultaneous analog placement and routing with current flow and current density considerations," in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Design Automation Conference*, 2013, pp. 1–6.
- [9] R. Martins *et al.*, "Current-flow and current-density-aware multi-objective optimization of analog ic placement," *Integration*, vol. 55, pp. 295–306, 2016.
- [10] B. Xu *et al.*, "Device layer-aware analytical placement for analog circuits," in *Proceedings of the 2019 International Symposium on Physical Design*, 2019, pp. 19–26.
- [11] K.-H. Ho *et al.*, "Coupling-aware length-ratio-matching routing for capacitor arrays in analog integrated circuits," in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Design Automation Conference*, 2013, pp. 1–6.
- [12] Y. Li *et al.*, "Exploring a machine learning approach to performance driven analog ic placement," in *2020 IEEE computer society annual symposium on VLSI (ISVLSI)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 24–29.
- [13] Y. Li *et al.*, "A customized graph neural network model for guiding analog ic placement," in *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Computer-Aided Design*, 2020, pp. 1–9.
- [14] A. Gusmão *et al.*, "Semi-supervised artificial neural networks towards analog ic placement recommender," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (ISCAS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [15] K. Kunal *et al.*, "ALIGN: Open-Source Analog Layout Automation from the Ground Up," in *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Design Automation Conference 2019*. Las Vegas NV USA: ACM, Jun. 2019, pp. 1–4.
- [16] T. Dhar *et al.*, "ALIGN: A System for Automating Analog Layout," *IEEE Design & Test*, vol. 38, pp. 8–18, Apr. 2021.
- [17] S. S. Sapatnekar, "The ALIGN Automated Analog Layout Engine: Progress, Learnings, and Open Issues," in *Proceedings of the 2023 International Symposium on Physical Design*. Virtual Event USA: ACM, Mar. 2023, pp. 101–102.
- [18] B. Xu *et al.*, "MAGICAL: Toward Fully Automated Analog IC Layout Leveraging Human and Machine Intelligence: Invited Paper," in *2019 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*. Westminster, CO, USA: IEEE, Nov. 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [19] H. Chen *et al.*, "MAGICAL: An Open-Source Fully Automated Analog IC Layout System from Netlist to GDSII," *IEEE Design & Test*, vol. 38, pp. 19–26, 2021.
- [20] H. Chen *et al.*, "MAGICAL 1.0: An Open-Source Fully-Automated AMS Layout Synthesis Framework Verified With a 40-nm 1GS/s  $\Delta\Sigma$  ADC," in *2021 IEEE Custom Integrated Circuits Conference (CICC)*. Austin, TX, USA: IEEE, Apr. 2021, pp. 1–2.
- [21] X. Gao *et al.*, "Interactive analog layout editing with instant placement legalization," in *2021 58th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*, 2021, pp. 1249–1254.
- [22] X. Gao *et al.*, "Interactive Analog Layout Editing With Instant Placement and Routing Legalization," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 42, pp. 698–711, Mar. 2023.
- [23] T. B. Brown *et al.*, "Language models are few-shot learners," in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS '20. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2020.
- [24] H. Touvron *et al.*, "Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models," <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971>, 2023.
- [25] H. Touvron *et al.*, "Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models," <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>, 2023.
- [26] OpenAI *et al.*, "GPT-4 Technical Report," Mar. 2024, arXiv:2303.08774 [cs].
- [27] Anthropic, "Claude 2," <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-2>, 2023, accessed: 2023-04-10.
- [28] Anthropic, "Introducing the next generation of claude," <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family>, 2024, accessed: 2023-04-10.
- [29] P. Lewis *et al.*, "Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks."
- [30] Q. Wu *et al.*, "AutoGen: Enabling Next-Gen LLM Applications via Multi-Agent Conversation," Oct. 2023, arXiv:2308.08155 [cs].
- [31] S. Rasal, "LLM Harmony: Multi-Agent Communication for Problem Solving," Jan. 2024, arXiv:2401.01312 [cs].
- [32] S. Hong *et al.*, "MetaGPT: Meta Programming for A Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework," Nov. 2023, arXiv:2308.00352 [cs].
- [33] S. Liu *et al.*, "RTLcoder: Outperforming GPT-3.5 in Design RTL Generation with Our Open-Source Dataset and Lightweight Solution," Feb. 2024, arXiv:2312.08617 [cs].
- [34] S. Thakur *et al.*, "VeriGen: A Large Language Model for Verilog Code Generation," *ACM Transactions on Design Automation of Electronic Systems*, Feb. 2024, just Accepted.
- [35] Y. Lu *et al.*, "RTLlM: An Open-Source Benchmark for Design RTL Generation with Large Language Model," Nov. 2023, arXiv:2308.05345 [cs].
- [36] M. Liu *et al.*, "Invited Paper: VerilogEval: Evaluating Large Language Models for Verilog Code Generation," in *2023 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer Aided Design (ICCAD)*. San Francisco, CA, USA: IEEE, Oct. 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [37] Y.-D. Tsai *et al.*, "RTLfixer: Automatically Fixing RTL Syntax Errors with Large Language Models," Feb. 2024, arXiv:2311.16543 [cs].
- [38] M. Liu *et al.*, "ChipNeMo: Domain-Adapted LLMs for Chip Design," Apr. 2024, arXiv:2311.00176 [cs].
- [39] Z. He *et al.*, "ChatEDA: A Large Language Model Powered Autonomous Agent for EDA," Mar. 2024, arXiv:2308.10204 [cs].
- [40] J. Wang *et al.*, "Chatpattern: Layout pattern customization via natural language," <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.15434>, 2024.
- [41] P. Sahoo *et al.*, "A systematic survey of prompt engineering in large language models: Techniques and applications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07927*, 2024.
- [42] T. Brown *et al.*, "Language models are few-shot learners," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [43] J. Wei *et al.*, "Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 24 824–24 837, 2022.
- [44] D. Zhou *et al.*, "Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*, 2022.
- [45] A. Madaan *et al.*, "Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [46] P. Lewis *et al.*, "Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 9459–9474, 2020.
- [47] C. Zhang *et al.*, "Proagent: building proactive cooperative agents with large language models," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 16, 2024, pp. 17 591–17 599.
- [48] Z. Xi *et al.*, "The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864*, 2023.
- [49] G. Li *et al.*, "Camel: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large scale language model society," 2023.
- [50] Y. Talebirad and A. Nadiri, "Multi-agent collaboration: Harnessing the power of intelligent llm agents," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03314*, 2023.
- [51] S. Rasal, "Llm harmony: Multi-agent communication for problem solving," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01312*, 2024.
- [52] Q. Wu *et al.*, "Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155*, 2023.
- [53] W. Chen *et al.*, "Agentverse: Facilitating multi-agent collaboration and exploring emergent behaviors in agents," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10848*, 2023.
- [54] S. Hong *et al.*, "Metagpt: Meta programming for multi-agent collaborative framework," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00352*, 2023.