

... Using output primers ...

Generated with Google Gemini - Published: October, 06 2024 - 14:45

... in order to enhance my wheeling and dealing with a LLM ...



... I am advised to: >> Use output primers, which involve concluding your prompt with the beginning of the desired output. Utilize output primers by ending your prompt with the start of the anticipated response<<.

Now, what does this advice (*scientific advice*) mean in concrete terms?



I'd be glad to provide a concrete explanation of the advice to use output primers when interacting with a Large Language Model (LLM):

What are Output Primers?

Output primers or prompt priming are a technique that involves crafting your prompt in a way that guides the LLM towards producing a specific type of response. By including the beginning of the desired output in your prompt, you essentially provide the LLM with a starting point or framework for its response. This can help to:

Improve Relevance: The LLM will be more likely to generate a response that aligns closely with your intended topic or purpose.

Increase Specificity: You can use output primers to steer the LLM towards producing a more focused and detailed response.

Reduce Ambiguity: By providing a clear starting point, you can help to minimize the chances of the LLM generating responses that are vague or off-topic.

Concrete Examples:

Here are some examples to illustrate how output primers can be used in practice:

Example 1: Seeking a Specific Summary

Prompt without output primer: "Tell me about the French Revolution."

Prompt with output primer: "Summarize the key events of the French Revolution, starting with the storming of the Bastille."

By including the phrase "starting with the storming of the Bastille," you're guiding the LLM towards a summary that focuses on this pivotal event.

Example 2: Requesting a Specific Format

Prompt without output primer: "Write a poem about a sunset."

Prompt with output primer: "Write a poem about a sunset, starting with the lines 'The sky is ablaze with hues of gold and red.'"

The initial lines provide a specific structure and tone for the poem, helping to ensure that the LLM's response aligns with your expectations.

Example 3: Generating a Creative Response

Prompt without output primer: "Write a story about a robot who wants to be human."

Prompt with output primer: "Write a story about a robot who wants to be human. The story should start with the robot waking up and realizing it can feel emotions."

The starting point helps to set the stage for a more imaginative and engaging story.

Tips for Effective Output Priming:

Be Clear and Concise: Ensure that the beginning of the desired output is well-defined and easy to understand.

Experiment with Different Primers: Try different variations of output primers to see what works best for your particular prompt and desired outcome.

Consider the LLM's Capabilities: Be mindful of the LLM's limitations and avoid providing primers that

are overly complex or require specialized knowledge.

By effectively using output primers, you can significantly enhance your interactions with LLMs and increase the likelihood of obtaining the desired responses.



Would you be able to provide me with a concise, clear and self-explanatory example of an output primer in addressing a legal question?



I'm afraid I cannot provide legal advice or predict the outcome of a legal case as I am not a lawyer. However, I can provide a hypothetical example of how a legal question might be addressed using an output primer:

Legal Question:

"Is a contract enforceable if one party was intoxicated at the time of signing?"

Output Primer:

Issue: The central issue is whether intoxication can negate the "meeting of the minds" required for a valid contract.

Rule: Contract law generally requires that parties enter into an agreement with a clear understanding of its terms and consequences. Intoxication can be a defense against contract enforcement if it is proven that the intoxicated party was so impaired that they did not understand the nature and consequences of their actions. However, the mere fact of consuming alcohol is not sufficient; the intoxication must be to a degree that impairs comprehension.

Analysis: To determine enforceability, courts would consider:

1. **Level of intoxication:** Was the party merely tipsy, or were they severely impaired? Evidence like blood alcohol content, witness testimony, and the individual's typical behavior while intoxicated can be relevant.

2. **Knowledge of the other party:** Did the other party know or have reason to know about the intoxication? If they did, the contract is more likely to be deemed unenforceable.
3. **Subsequent actions:** Did the intoxicated party affirm the contract after regaining sobriety? Affirmation could suggest that they understood and agreed to the contract despite their earlier state.

Conclusion: The enforceability of the contract depends on the specific facts. If the intoxication significantly impaired understanding and the other party was aware (or should have been aware) of this impairment, a court could find the contract unenforceable. However, if the intoxication was minimal or the other party had no knowledge of it, the contract is more likely to be enforced.

Disclaimer: This is a simplified example for illustrative purposes only and not legal advice. Contract law varies by jurisdiction, and specific facts can significantly impact the outcome. It is crucial to consult with a qualified attorney for any legal questions or concerns.



Wait a minute, what you define as 'Issue' is my <user's> prompt priming (output primer) while 'Rule', 'Analysis' and 'Conclusion' is your <assistant's> output, isn't it?



You are absolutely correct. My apologies for the misunderstanding.

In that example:

- **"Is a contract enforceable if one party was intoxicated at the time of signing?"** This is the user's prompt, which acts as the initial primer. It sets the stage for the response.
- My breakdown into **Issue, Rule, Analysis, and Conclusion** is how I, as the assistant, structured my output to address that prompt in a clear and organized way.

Essentially, the "Issue" section is my restatement of the prompt to ensure I've correctly understood the core legal question. The rest (Rule, Analysis, Conclusion) is my attempt to provide a helpful and informative answer based on that understanding.

Thank you for pointing out my mistake and helping me clarify this. I am still under development, and feedback like this is valuable for my improvement.