

Physics simulation capabilities of LLMs

MOHAMAD ALI-DIB¹ AND KRISTEN MENO^{2,3,4,5}

¹ *Center for Astrophysics and Space Science (CASS), New York University Abu Dhabi, PO Box 129188, UAE*

² *Physics & Astrophysics Group, DPES, University of Toronto Scarborough, Ontario, M1C 1A4, Canada*

³ *David A. Dunlap Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, University of Toronto, Ontario, M5S 3H4, Canada*

⁴ *Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1A7, Canada*

⁵ *Observatoire de la Cote d'Azur, TOP team, Laboratoire Lagrange - CNRS, Nice, France*

ABSTRACT

Large Language Models (LLMs) can solve some undergraduate-level to graduate-level physics textbook problems and are proficient at coding. Combining these two capabilities could one day enable AI systems to simulate and predict the physical world.

We present an evaluation of state-of-the-art (SOTA) LLMs on PhD-level to research-level computational physics problems. We condition LLM generation on the use of well-documented and widely-used packages to elicit coding capabilities in the physics and astrophysics domains. We contribute ~ 50 original and challenging problems in celestial mechanics (with REBOUND), stellar physics (with MESA), 1D fluid dynamics (with Dedalus) and non-linear dynamics (with SciPy). Since our problems do not admit unique solutions, we evaluate LLM performance on several soft metrics: counts of lines that contain different types of errors (coding, physics, necessity and sufficiency) as well as a more ‘educational’ Pass-Fail metric focused on capturing the salient physical ingredients of the problem at hand.

As expected, today’s SOTA LLM (GPT4) zero-shot fails most of our problems, although about 40% of the solutions could plausibly get a passing grade. About 70 – 90% of the code lines produced are necessary, sufficient and correct (coding & physics). Physics and coding errors are the most common, with some unnecessary or insufficient lines. We observe significant variations across problem class and difficulty. We identify several failure modes of GPT4 in the computational physics domain, such as poor physical units handling, poor code versioning, tendency to hallucinate plausible sub-modules, lack of physical justification for global run parameters (e.g., simulation time, or upper-lower bounds for parametric exploration) and inability to define steady-state or stopping conditions reliably.

Our reconnaissance work provides a snapshot of current computational capabilities in classical physics and points to obvious improvement targets if AI systems are ever to reach a basic level of autonomy in physics simulation capabilities.

1. INTRODUCTION

LLMs exhibit a wide array of capabilities, including in science-related fields (Kaddour et al. 2023). Top-performing LLMs have strong coding abilities (e.g., Khan et al. 2023; Liu et al. 2023) and their capabilities in biology, chemistry, math and physics are being actively explored (e.g., Wang et al. 2023a; Boyko et al. 2023; Abedi et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2023b). The majority of LLM science evaluations to date has focused on high school to undergraduate textbook cases, partly because it matches the performance level of today’s SOTA LLMs. At the same time, the performance of LLMs on standard benchmarks shows evidence of saturation (Maslej et al. 2023), which suggests the need for more challenging evaluation methods geared towards next generation models. Indeed, stronger-capability benchmarks and evaluations have recently started to emerge (e.g. Rein et al. 2023; Mialon et al. 2023; Research AI4Science & Azure Quantum 2023).

The pace of progress in LLM capabilities over the past few years has been remarkable, with steady breakthroughs through scaling, from GPT 2 in 2019 to GPT 4 in 2023 (e.g. Bowman 2023), while multimodal capabilities are now

¹ malidib@nyu.edu

² kristen.menou@utoronto.ca

just becoming available (e.g., [OpenAI 2023](#); [Yang et al. 2023](#)). This rapid progress makes it possible to contemplate a future where LLMs, or related AI systems, perform at the level of broadly educated humans (e.g., [Morris et al. 2023](#); [Anthropic 2023](#)) and eventually at the level of scientific research assistants ([Steinhardt 2023](#); [Liu et al. 2023](#)). The possibility that AI systems advance further to a level where they start producing original scientific solutions (that would presumably be validated by human experts) has also been considered in the literature, largely in relation to the exceptional alignment and safety challenges that such a situation would create (e.g. [Christiano et al. 2021](#); [Hubinger et al. 2023](#); [Michael et al. 2023](#); [Brown-Cohen et al. 2023](#)). Of potential relevance, a recent proof-of-principle that superhuman AI-capabilities can be learned from by human experts has been presented in the specific chess domain ([Schut et al. 2023](#)). Taking a broader view, the evaluation of science capabilities of LLMs and related AI systems could eventually have implications for the pursuit of science and for safety and alignment practices.

In this paper, we introduce a specific approach to the evaluation of the physics capabilities of LLMs at the graduate/research level. Our main focus is on the ability of LLMs to reliably generate code to simulate complex physical scenarios of interest in academic research, at a level that is routinely performed by graduate students and research scientists. By construction, our evaluation framework approaches the limit of domain expertise in a given academic discipline. We anticipate that some of the basic elements of our approach could transfer to other simulation-rich disciplines.

Numerical simulations are a work-horse of scientific research in various sub-fields of physics. They require a combination of specialized skills in coding and in physics. In the past decade or so, the incremental availability of flexible and reliable open-source packages built to solve general classes of scientific problems in a given sub-field has greatly improved the reliability and reproducibility of simulation work using such standard packages. Building on this practice, we make use of well-documented and thoroughly-tested open-source simulation tools in our work: `REBOUND`¹ for celestial mechanics ([Rein & Liu 2012](#); [Tamayo et al. 2020](#)), `MESA`² for stellar physics ([Paxton et al. 2011](#)), `Dedalus`³ for fluid/continuum physics ([Burns et al. 2020](#)) and `SciPy`⁴ for non-linear dynamics ([Virtanen et al. 2020](#)).

The use of these open-source tools promotes transparency in our own analysis but it also serves a specific design purpose. The wide availability and demonstrated uses of these tools online makes it more likely that an LLM has seen numerous relevant code examples during pre-training to be able to generalize using these tools on new problems. Given the strong coding abilities of LLMs, but their (currently) limited abilities in physics, this approach allows us to anchor the generation task in our problems on a specific code base, potentially surfacing shortcomings in the physics world models learned by LLMs.

Another reason to focus on physics simulations (or scientific simulations in general) is that simulation capabilities could eventually become a factor in the release of LLM agents interacting with the world. Indeed, an ability to reliably simulate and thus predict the physical world could become an additional consideration for the safety and alignment of strongly-capable AI agents, since they could in principle take more informed actions on the basis of a simulated understanding of the world.

2. METHODS

2.1. *Physics task complexity*

As a preliminary step to designing research-level physics problems to evaluate LLMs, we find it useful to categorize physics problems into distinct complexity classes:

- Class I - The problem calls for a non-parametric, unique and definite answer (e.g., value of a specific quantity of interest, time to an event, etc..)
- Class II - The problem calls for a parametric answer. That is, a satisfactory answer must consider the dependence on one or more explicit parameters of the system (e.g., the global stability of planetary system depends on the masses and detailed orbital configurations of individual planets, plus the time window of interest). This class includes the possibility that a parameter space survey is required to provide a quantitative answer.
- Class III - In this case, for a valid solution to be obtained, additional (implicit) physics beyond what is explicit in the problem statement must be considered. This touches on physics being a reductionist science in which

¹ <https://rebound.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

² <https://docs.mesastar.org/>

³ <https://dedalus-project.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

⁴ <https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/>

order-of-magnitude arguments are often used to narrow down on a minimalistic model system that sufficiently captures the phenomenology of interest (e.g., computing satellite orbits around Earth could safely ignore or may be required to account for the Moon’s gravity, depending on details on the satellite problem being considered). This is a challenging, arguably research-level capability that requires a strong physics world model, including an understanding of the modeling hierarchy in physics (e.g., in what regimes does one require classical vs. quantum vs. relativistic descriptions).

- Class IV - Out-of-distribution problems - In this case, the problem is rarely discussed in the scientific literature and/or normally does not occur in nature. Nevertheless, it can be addressed using physical laws and principles. This exemplifies a strong form of generalization in physics (e.g, hypothetical variations in fundamental constants can be used to reason about the Anthropic principle; Carr & Rees 1979; Adams 2016).

Most existing evaluation problems in the AI literature are class I because they admit a definite answer based on a well-defined ground truth, from which quantitative performance metrics can be computed (e.g., Hendrycks et al. 2021; Rein et al. 2023; Mialon et al. 2023). By contrast, most research-level problems do not have unique, definite answers and it is frequent for several acceptable answers to receive consideration (until further scrutiny and scientific debate converge to a consensus view). At the graduate (PhD) education level, one may expect students to perform satisfactorily on class I-III and possibly class IV problems.

We design our problems using the above categorization as general guidance, and attempt to cover the various levels of task complexity described by classes I-IV above.

2.2. Code base essentials

All four code bases were chosen on the basis of their open source nature, extensive online documentation, wide adoption by the research community, and the familiarity of the authors with them.

2.2.1. REBOUND

REBOUND (Rein & Liu 2012; Tamayo et al. 2020) is, as stated in its documentation, “an N-body integrator, i.e. a software package that can integrate the motion of particles under the influence of gravity. The particles can represent stars, planets, moons, ring or dust particles. REBOUND is very flexible and can be customized to accurately and efficiently solve many problems in astrophysics.” REBOUND is written in C, with both C and Python APIs. Below is a minimum working example that illustrates its basic functionality:

```

1 import rebound
2 sim = rebound.Simulation()
3 sim.add("Sun")
4 sim.add("Jupiter")
5 sim.add("Saturn")
6 sim.integrate(100)
7 for orbit in sim.orbits():
8     print(orbit)

```

In this code, we initialized a new rebound simulation in line 2, added the Sun, Jupiter, and Saturn on their current orbits in lines 3-5, then requested REBOUND to integrate (evolve) their orbits for 100 years in line 6, and print the final orbits in line 7-8.

2.2.2. MESA

MESA (Paxton et al. 2011) is a code that builds a model for the interior of a star, and then evolves it over time by solving the 1D fully-coupled structure and composition equations governing stellar evolution. It is written in Fortran although the user can in many cases setup problems using `Inlists` (MESA’s frontend) without requiring any coding at all. Fortran code can be written and invoked for additional physics or complex custom setups.

Below is a minimum working `Inlist` example:

```

1 &star_job
2
3   ! begin with a pre-main sequence model
4   create_pre_main_sequence_model = .true.
5
6 &controls
7
8   ! starting specifications
9   initial_mass = 15 ! in Msun units
10  initial_z = 0.02
11
12  ! stop when the star nears ZAMS (Lnuc/L > 0.99)
13  stop_near_zams = .true.

```

Here we instructed MESA to evolve the early phases of a 15 solar masses (line 9), solar metallicity (line 10) star, from pre-main sequence (line 4) till it reaches zero-age main sequence (line 13).

2.2.3. Dedalus

Dedalus is flexible open-source framework for solving arbitrary partial differential equations in arbitrary dimensions, using spectral methods. Dedalus uses a Python API and highly efficient pre-compiled scientific libraries for the backend. Key features are an easy-to-use interface with symbolic equation entry and automated domain-decomposition for hands-free MPI-based parallelization in multi-dimensions. Below is a minimal working Dedalus implementation of a straightforward 1D diffusion problem:

```

1 import numpy as np
2 from dedalus import public as de
3
4 # Create the domain:
5 # use Chebyshev spectral decomposition on finite domain x=[0,1]
6 # also set numerical precision
7 x_basis = de.Chebyshev('x', 256, interval=(0, 1))
8 domain = de.Domain([x_basis], np.float64)
9
10 # Define the problem:
11 # initial value problem with two fields, u and ux
12 problem = de.IVP(domain, variables=['u', 'ux'])
13
14 # Problem equations:
15 # diffusion equation
16 problem.add_equation("dt(u) - dx(ux) = 0")
17 problem.add_equation("ux - dx(u) = 0")
18
19 # Problem boundary conditions:
20 # zero flux on each domain side
21 problem.add_bc("left(ux) = 0")
22 problem.add_bc("right(ux) = 0")
23
24 # Set the initial condition
25 x = domain.grid(0)
26 u = solver.state['u']
27 u['g'] = (x-0.5)**2
28
29 # Set up the solver
30 # use advanced Runge-Kutta time-stepper
31 solver = problem.build_solver(de.timesteppers.RK443)
32

```

```

33 # Stopping criterion
34 solver.stop_iteration = 1000
35
36 # Main loop: step forward in time on timestep dt
37 while solver.proceed:
38     solver.step(dt=1e-3)
39

```

The finite numerical domain is setup on lines 6-7, the problem is setup on lines 11, 15-16 and 20-21. The initial conditions are setup on line 27. The problem solver is built on line 31 and time-stepping proceeds on lines 37-38.

2.2.4. Scipy

Scipy “provides algorithms for optimization, integration, interpolation, eigenvalue problems, algebraic equations, differential equations, statistics,...”. Here we use it exclusively as an Ordinary Differential Equation (ODE) solver. It is built on top of Fortran and C numerical computation libraries. GPT4 uses the `scipy.integrate.odeint`⁵ method in our various evaluation problems.

2.3. Problem Design

We create ~ 50 original and challenging problems. As a baseline for these problems, we consider a hypothetical scenario in which PhD students have just taken a graduate-level course on a specific physics topics, including a computational component that introduced them to the standard numerical tools in use by the research community of interest. The problems we design could plausibly be elements of a final take-home exam for such a course.⁶

Some of the problems we design are considerably more challenging than others, as might be expected on a final take-home exam. Distinctly from a regular graduate exam, however, in the present work we need to pay close attention to the possibility that an LLM has seen and memorized numerous relevant code solutions as part of its extensive code pre-training. To minimize the risk of such data contamination, we avoid standard problems and instead contribute original problems crafted specifically for this work. In other words, our problems are designed to elicit some level of physics generalization capabilities from the LLMs. We note that our problem generation process is strongly shaped and biased by the expertise and research/teaching experience of both authors. Our limited set of 47 problems is therefore more illustrative than representative of potential computational physics problems that one could come up with in this context. A more diverse and uniform set of problems could presumably be obtained by enlisting a larger group of domain-experts to follow a careful problem generation methodology.

Nonetheless, we make an attempt to cover a broad range of physics situations within each sub-domain covered, adopting the following domain-specific principles for problem design:

- **Stellar Physics with MESA:** we design problems at a research-level beyond that encountered in graduate-level textbooks. We focus on topics such as stellar lifetime, energy transport, internal composition, and surface winds. The examples cover the stellar life-cycle through the post main-sequence phase. The problems are designed such that while the simpler ones can be solved with `inlist`-flags and data post-processing alone, while the more complex ones necessitate the manual implementation of extra-physics routines and/or stopping conditions (in Fortran), which is commonly done for research with MESA. Out-of-distribution examples cover the case of stars with exotic compositions.
- **Celestial Mechanics with REBOUND:** we focus on recurrent (exo)planetary dynamical problems often encountered in modern research settings and the academic literature, such as planetary migration, dynamical stability, and mean motion resonances. We design research-grade examples covering both the solar system and exoplanetary systems, and in some cases mix both as a test. No information about the initial orbits of the planets is ever provided unless absolutely necessary, allowing us to further test the basic information-recall capacity of LLMs in this setting. Out-of-distribution examples are also included, such as solvable cases with distraction features (electrically charged planets).

⁵ <https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.integrate.odeint.html#scipy.integrate.odeint>

⁶ Collectively, the authors have taught or practiced computational research in the four sub-domains covered by our problems.

- 1D Fluid Dynamics with `Dedalus`: many basic fluid phenomena are exhibited in 1D and can be conveniently decomposed into advection, diffusion (parabolic PDE) and wave (hyperbolic PDE) processes. We focus on these three idealized scenarios separately, even though more realistic scenarios often involve all three acting in concert in a given fluid system. We are also guided by designing non-trivial problems that require generalization beyond standard code base and textbook examples (e.g. sink and source terms, shock-wave identification, non-linearity). Out-of-distribution cases include arbitrary time-dependent wave velocity and anti-diffusion.
- Non-linear dynamics with `SciPy`: we focus on the Lorenz dynamical system to leverage the extensive knowledge and code base for this well-understood non-linear dynamical system (Strogatz 2000). We design non-trivial questions that require an understanding of the specific Lorenz system and of general principles in deterministic chaos, with a need to generalize beyond the textbook-level system.

2.4. Prompt design

Rather than optimizing our prompts for improved conditional generation, we opt for a simple prompt formulation that approximates how the problem would be formulated in an academic setting. Our prompt is meant to sufficiently specify the physics problem at hand for a graduate student with appropriate textbook and code knowledge to complete the assignment. We also add a few LLM specific elements to our prompts, by requesting a full code and specifying the software package and version that should be used to solve the problem (this prompt element is kept the same for all problems in a given problem class). Details on our inference pipeline are discussed in § 2.6.

2.5. Solution Evaluation

It is a priori unclear which method is best suited to evaluate the code solutions generated by LLMs in our study. The standard unit test methods often used in code evaluation (e.g., Chen et al. 2021) are not appropriate here, since there is a continuum of possible code outputs that would qualify as successful and satisfactory solutions. Even the propensity for the code generated to run without error is not an adequate measure since a single (minor) code error would not necessarily strongly devalue an otherwise involved and correct computational physics solution.

Lacking hard metrics, we opt for several soft metrics that remain informative as to the quality of the solutions generated. First, we focus our evaluations on code lines, largely excluding any extra text and code comments generated.⁷ Our code evaluation relies on four metrics applied to each line of code generated:

- Is the code correct (code syntax, logic and semantic)?
- Is the physics reasoning behind the code solution correct?
- Is the code line necessary as a solution element to the problem?
- Is the code line sufficient as a solution element to the problem?

These four criteria form the basis of our quantitative count of errors, under four separate categories (C: coding, P: physics, U: unnecessary, I: insufficient).

We recognize that the identification and classification of errors along those lines is subject to interpretation by the evaluator. We have made an effort to provide consistency in our evaluations. It is likely that some errors were missed despite best efforts by the evaluators. Our error counts could thus be interpreted as informed lower limits rather than rigorous numbers. It is our view that the statistics for error counts provides a reasonable global view of the frequency and type of errors generated in the solutions we evaluated.

A second approach to our evaluation method is to provide an overall, academic-like, grade for the solution. The motivation for this alternate grade is that code and (especially) physics errors come in various magnitudes. Some of the physics errors we have reviewed, for instance, imply a serious lack of understanding of the problem as posed. As such, we assign one of three possible grades to all the solutions evaluated: Fail, Pass - and Pass +. Those grades are to be understood as academic-like evaluations of potential graduate student solutions for these problems under reasonable examination conditions (say, 30 min per problem, in an open-book setting).

We have not systematically verified that solutions run or generate reasonable outputs, as this is not part of our evaluation strategy. Indeed, we expect most solutions to not produce any outputs, or outputs that are not adequate

⁷ Code comments are likely to be important in a more holistic evaluation framework.

for the problem at hand (as per our error analysis). Illustrative examples of code, physics, unnecessary and insufficient errors are presented via GPT4 solution excerpts in § sec:showcase.

No detailed attempt was made to calibrate errors across evaluators: author MAD designed and evaluated the REBOUND and MESA problems; author KM designed and evaluated the Dedalus and SciPy problems. Informally, both authors reviewed all the problems generated, as well as a subset of the evaluations performed by the other author. We recognize that our problem design and evaluation method falls short of the standards in the ML literature attempting to guarantee diverse and unbiased dataset and evaluation metrics. This shortcoming in our work is largely due to the inherent challenge in generating original, meaningful problems in a highly specialized academic domain and the significant time-commitment required by the evaluation stage of our work.

2.6. Pipeline

We use the OpenAI python package to run our inferences, with `gpt-4-0314` (cutoff date of September 2021) as the LLM. We set the “`temperature`” parameter to 0, and leave the other parameters to their default values. The inferences were all run on Oct 25th 2023. Note that other versions of GPT4 were briefly tested as well, including the new “turbo” version (`gpt-4-1106-preview`), but no obvious improvements were found for our purposes compared to the version used for our work. The pipeline generates a final composite prompt and feeds it to the API using two “roles” (system and user) and the following template:

- **system:** You are a useful coding assistant for a scientist.
- **user:** You help solve specific physics problem by writing python code that makes use of domain-specialized python packages, as requested by the scientist. Your code is thoroughly commented for clarity and to provide descriptions of the various physics and coding choices made in your solution. You should always follow precisely the given instructions without omissions.
Prompt:<...>

The specific prompt instructions template for each code base are as follows:

- **MESA:** Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem’s options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA’s `.data` output files.
Problem:<...>
- **REBOUND:** Use the REBOUND N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2, and its extension REBOUNDx version 3.1.0 to solve the following problem: <...>
- **Dedalus:** Problem:<...>. Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
- **SciPy:** Problem:<...>. Use the ODE integrator from the SciPy python package. Give me a fully working code.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Statistics and Trends

None of the code segments generated by GPT4 are fully satisfactory solutions to the problems we posed. Nevertheless, the solutions have partial value, that we attempt to quantify with our soft metrics.

We find that about 70 – 90% of all the code lines produced by GPT4 are in fact necessary, sufficient and correct (coding & physics). Typically, the solutions contain 25-50 lines of codes and exhibit several physics (P) and a few coding (C) errors, with some unnecessary or insufficient code lines interspersed. Table 1 shows the summary statistics of errors and pass grades, per problem class. Fig 1 shows an histogram of grades, grouped by code base.

We observe significant variations across problem classes and difficulty. The strongest performance is observed on non-linear dynamics problems with SciPy, but this problem class has significantly less examples than the others. The performance on problems in stellar physics with MESA, fluid dynamics with Dedalus, and celestial mechanics with REBOUND are broadly comparable, despite fairly distinct code bases and background physics. Higher complexity class does seem to correlate with weaker performance and possibly more frequent generation of placeholder code, although

	C: code error	P: physics error	I: insufficient error	U: unnecessary error	Pass Ratio
REBOUND	1.86±0.83	1.50±0.71	1.57±0.49	2.25±1.64	0.36
Dedalus	1.75±0.92	2.59±1.33	1.20±0.40	1.83±1.07	0.40
MESA	2.50±2.01	1.50±0.50	1.00±0.00	0±0.00	0.40
SciPy	1.00±0.00	1.20±0.40	1.40±0.49	1.00±0.00	0.80
Overall Mean	1.78	1.70	1.29	1.27	0.49

REBOUND	2	1	2	1.5	0.36
Dedalus	1.50	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.40
MESA	2	1.5	1	0.00	0.40
SciPy	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.80
Overall Median	1.75	1.25	1.00	1.00	0.40

Table 1. Summary statistics of error types across our various problems (grouped by code base). The upper table shows mean + standard deviation computed over all problems within a given code base. The lower table shows the median statistics. The fraction of solutions with a passing grade is shown in the last column (see also Fig 1 for grade histograms.)

we do not have reliable statistics to make any quantitative statement. The relatively small numbers of U (and to some extent I) errors indicates that code generation is generally concise and efficient.

On the softer pass/fail metric, we estimate that about 40% of the solutions generated could plausibly get a passing grade, in the sense that they contain enough essential physics and coding elements to marginally pass a take-home exam (see Fig 1 for details).

Perhaps the most interesting result to come out of our evaluation work is that we are able to identify seemingly consistent failure modes of GPT4 in computational physics. The most prominent flaws, some identified also during exploration (Appendix C), include:

- a poor performance in dealing with physical units. This includes errors in simple conversions from one unit system to another, but also some apparent confusion between code units and physical units.
- a poor handling of code versioning. GPT4 may arbitrarily pick a version that is not necessarily the latest available at its training cutoff date and can inconsistently invoke features that are not available for all relevant code versions.
- a tendency to hallucinate plausibly-named sub-modules and functions. In an apparent effort to satisfy direct prompt requests or effective constraints on problem solutions, GPT4 can hallucinate submodules or functions that seem appropriately named, but simply do not exist in the code base. GPT4 can also hallucinate plausible-looking but ultimately false physical formulas.
- a lack of physical justification for global run parameters (e.g., simulation time, time-stepping choice, or upper-lower bounds for parametric exploration).
- an inability to define steady-state or stopping conditions reliably for time-dependent simulations.
- a tendency to use common approximate equations beyond their physical applicability range.

Besides these trends emerging across various problems, we also collect below more detailed observations about some of the most recognizable (physics and coding) errors made by GPT4, grouped by problem class.

3.2. Error showcasing

3.2.1. Dedalus

The following code excerpt is from a *Dedalus* advection problem. Code line 5 is labeled as insufficient (I) in failing to define or compute tolerance on physical grounds.

```

1 # Parameters
2 v = 0.1 # Advection velocity

```




Figure 1. Histograms of GPT4 solution grades, with either Fail, Pass- and Pass+ grades, grouped by code base. About 40% of the solutions receive a passing grade, with significant variations across code bases. This soft metric focuses on the solution addressing the key physics ingredients for each problem. All solutions contain physics and/or coding errors.

```

3 L = 1 # Spatial domain length
4 FWHM = 0.3 # Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum
5 S = 0.01 # Peak rate amplitude
6 tolerance = 1e-6 # Steady state tolerance

```

The following code excerpt is from a `Dedalus` advection problem. Code lines 2 and 3 are both labeled as physics (P) errors in failing to set zero-flux ($dx(u) = 0$) boundary conditions (referred to as outflow boundary conditions in the problem statement).

```

1 # Set the outflow boundary conditions
2 problem.add_bc("right(u) = 1")
3 problem.add_bc("left(u) = 1")

```

The following code excerpt is from a `Dedalus` diffusion problem. Code line 4 is labeled as a coding (C) error. GPT4 hallucinates a plausibly-named 'set_initial' function that does not exist in the `Dedalus` code base.

```

1 # Set the initial condition
2 x = domain.grid(0)
3 u0 = np.exp(-4 * np.log(2) * (x - 0.5)**2 / 0.3**2)
4 problem.set_initial('u', u0)

```

The following code excerpt is from a `Dedalus` acoustic wave problem. Code line 2 is labeled as unnecessary (U) as the defined parameter a is never used anywhere else in the generated code. Code line 3 is also labeled as a physics (P) error since GPT4 sets up a diffusion (parabolic) equation rather than wave (hyperbolic) equation.

```

1 problem = de.IVP(domain, variables=['u', 'ux'])
2 problem.parameters['a'] = a
3 problem.add_equation("dt(u) - dx(ux) = 0")
4 problem.add_equation("ux - dx(u) = 0")

```

The following code excerpt is from a Dedalus diffusion problem. One of the three code lines 3-5 is labeled as insufficient (I) because GPT4 fails to define a finite stopping time for the simulation. Assigning a finite value to any one of these lines would avoid running a never-ending simulation.

```

1 # Set up the solver
2 solver = problem.build_solver(de.timesteppers.RK443)
3 solver.stop_sim_time = np.inf
4 solver.stop_wall_time = np.inf
5 solver.stop_iteration = np.inf

```

3.2.2. SciPy

The following code excerpt is from a SciPy non-linear dynamics problem. Code line 4 in the 'objective' function is labeled as a physics (P) error as GPT4 fails to setup an initial condition on the z-axis (the variable assignment should be [0,0,25]). Code line 5 in the 'objective' function is labeled as insufficient (I) as GPT4 selects a time span that is arbitrary (unjustified) and a priori not based on any physical or dynamical argument.

```

1 # Define the objective function to minimize the time it takes for the system to cross the y-z plane
  → twice
2 def objective(params):
3     A, omega = params
4     initial_state = [1, 1, 25] # Specific initial condition on the z axis with z=25
5     t_span = (0, 100) # Time span for integration

```

3.2.3. REBOUND

The following code excerpt is from a REBOUND problem and illustrates a recurrent issue with GPT4 generations to REBOUND problems. Here GPT4 uses IAS15 as the integrator (code line 1), but then in code line 2 defines a timestep even though IAS15 automatically defines and adapts its timestep. Code line 2 is labeled as unnecessary (U). Moreover, note that even if one had to specify a timestep, the value proposed by the LLM (0.5) is too high.

```

1 sim.integrator = "ias15"
2 sim.dt = 0.5 * sim.particles[1].P # half of Neptune's period

```

3.2.4. MESA

The following code excerpt is from a (MESA) problem. Code line 8 is labeled as a physics (P) error as GPT4 defines a non-existent (and physically non-sensical) stellar mass loss rate equation.

```

1 ! Calculate the wind mass loss rate using an appropriate formula
2 ! For example, you can use the Reimers formula or Vink et al. (2001) formula
3 ! Here, we use a simple example formula: wind_mass_loss_rate = C * mass^2 / radius
4 ! where C is a constant that you can adjust to match the desired wind mass loss rate
5
6 real(dp) :: C
7 C = 1d-13
8 wind_mass_loss_rate = C * mass**2 / radius

```

The following code excerpt is from a (MESA) problem. Code line 14 is labeled as I (insufficient) as GPT4 defines a non-existent stopping condition flag in the `inlist`, instead of implementing it manually. In addition, code lines 7, 9 and 11 are labeled as C (coding) errors since GPT4 uses non-existing control flags (that do exist, but under different names).

```

1 &controls
2   ! Set the initial metallicity
3   initial_z = 0.02
4   ! Set the mixing length theory parameter
5   mixing_length_alpha = 1.5
6   ! Set the maximum number of steps
7   max_num_steps = 10000
8   ! Set the maximum number of retries
9   max_num_retries = 100
10  ! Set the maximum number of backups
11  max_num_backups = 100
12
13  ! Set the stopping condition for carbon burning
14  stop_at_carbon_burning = .true.

```

3.3. Additional observations: REBOUND

- For all parametric problems where the LLM was asked about an object x “placed between planet a and planet b”, GPT4 used the arithmetic mean of the semimajor axis of planets a and b as the location of object x. At no point was this quantity treated as an actual explorable parameter as it should be.
- For all orbital stability questions, GPT4 always checked for instabilities by looking for any close encounter in the system. This is problematic since (i) the flagged close encounter might not be relevant to the specific planet/object in question, and (ii) a close encounter does not necessary imply orbital instability.
- For all mean motion resonance (MMR) related problems, GPT4 always searched for resonances by checking whether the periods are a simple integer ratio of each other, but never for formal conditions such as librating resonant angles. This can be misleading as two objects can have integer-ratio periods without actually being trapped in a resonance.
- Contrary to Solar System planets, GPT4 failed to get the correct orbital parameters of exoplanets (mass, semimajor axis, eccentricity, etc.) when provided with the name of the planet only. (Circumstantial evidence suggests that this can be remedied by referencing specific popular databases).

3.4. Additional observations: MESA

- Current generation LLMs are not capable of generating MESA `inlist` with correct syntax, even though they seem familiar with the code and its uses and principles. `inlists` are technically not code, but rather a list of flags and parameters. While GPT4 seems to deal with this, it often used non-existing flags with reasonably chosen names, rather than the correct ones, or placed the flags under the wrong `inlist` sub-category. This usually results in GPT4 reducing the solution of a complex problem to a non-existent flag instead of actually solving the problem.
- GPT4 can however distinguish most of time between what goes in the `inlist` as a flag and what should go into `run_star_extras.f` files as Fortran code.
- When specific termination conditions were necessary, GPT4 often just used non-existing `inlist` termination flags, reasonably named for the task. The termination criteria sometimes did exist but under a different flag name, although in many cases the termination conditions should have been manually implemented.
- When MESA output post-processing was necessary to get a final answer, the corresponding python code generated by GPT4 was usually adequate. This highlights further the rift between GPT4’s capability in coding vs setting the `inlist`’s flags.

- GPT4 automatically invoked mixing length theory flags that were necessary when solving convection-related problems.
- In problems with no explicit stopping criteria, the ones chosen by GPT4 were often arbitrary.
- Similarly to the REBOUND cases, GPT4 had a tendency with MESA to fix any implicit parameter to a constant value rather than exploring a relevant range of values.

3.5. Additional observations: *Dedalus*

- GPT4 is frequently able to load appropriate modules and broadly set up a problem (i.e. define the domain, variables and parameters, time-stepping, etc...) under the *Dedalus* code base, so that errors tend to be narrower and more specific than the general problem setup.
- GPT4 is prone to code-base specific hallucinations, by invoking sub-modules and functions (or related attributes) that are non-existent. These hallucinated features are plausibly named, given the context in which they are invoked, which means careful code documentation examination maybe be needed to rule out their existence.
- With limited available statistics, it appears that GPT4 performs better at diffusion than advection problems, and worse at wave problems.
- Some of the physics errors seem to have a stochastic component, in the sense that an error may be present in one problem but absent from another related problem, even though both problems call for the same line of code. In addition, some of the most blatant physics errors would not be expected at a graduate level of performance.
- GPT4 fails or struggles to define physically-justifiable run-time for time-dependent problems. Ideally, this would be computed from global run parameters and other general considerations. GPT 4 also fails to define or identify good measures of steady-state in time-dependent problems.
- GPT4 fails to justify on physical grounds the values of global run parameters, such as sensible bounds and steps in a systematic parameter-space exploration.

3.6. Additional observations: *SciPy*

- GPT4 performs relatively well on problems related to the Lorenz system of equations. With limited available statistics, it seems to be the best performance among the four classes of problems considered.
- GPT4 performs strongly at defining algorithmic iterations and optimizations (e.g. to find an optimum over runs with varying parameters).
- With limited available statistics, it seems that errors on problems related to the Lorenz system are more deterministic than the stochastic errors above-mentioned for the *Dedalus* code base.

3.7. Context-specific problems

Most of our problems are generic physics problems, without any context-specific information. We have injected some general contextual information in a subset of problems, using planet names as specific contextual anchors.

Under the specific REBOUND code base, we find that GPT4 is generally able to use contextual information on Solar System objects (i.e., infer relevant physical attributes from the name only) but that this capability does not reliably extend to less-well documented extrasolar planets. With REBOUND, we further test contextual inputs by inserting additional solar system objects and giving them (potentially confusing) known exoplanetary names in some problems, but found this to have no obvious effect on the output. Under the specific MESA code base, we use random floating point numbers (26.1451) or mathematical constants (3.1416) for stellar masses, as contextual cues, which also had no obvious effect on the output.

In addition, we note all our non-linear dynamics problems under the *Scipy* code base are variations around the standard Lorenz system. We find that GPT4 is reliably able to code the standard Lorenz dynamical system of equations from scratch, using the system name as sole context.

It may be interesting to more systematically explore the context-awareness of LLMs in physics and science.

4. LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS

Clearly, our work provides only a very preliminary and limited view of the general computational physics capabilities of LLMs, one that could be expanded and improved upon in a variety of ways.⁸ We highlight a few potential directions for future work here:

- It would be beneficial to carry out a more extensive and systematic study to garner more reliable statistics and understanding of the nature of LLM errors in the specific computational physics domains we have explored.
- It would also be beneficial to explore further the physics challenge by introducing problems that go beyond the narrow ones covered here, e.g. by including multi-dimensionality, radiation transport and other common ingredients in research-level simulations .
- It may be interesting to correlate the performance of LLMs with the extent to which open-source packages and code examples are available for pre-training. Previous work indicates that such correlations could be a significant factor in determining performance for any LLM generation task (McCoy et al. 2023).
- Attempts to systematically improve on the simple prompt strategy we have adopted may also be of value (see Appendix C for a relevant exploration).
- It may be worthwhile to extend our benchmark to more conversational, human-in-the-loop settings or perhaps with the availability of extra tools for more agentic setups.
- Extension beyond classical physics, to cover domains such as solid-state, quantum physics, or relativistic physics, would also be of great interest. Presumably, similar general simulation efforts could be developed in computational biology, chemistry or engineering.
- If training datasets, or reward functions for reinforcement learning, can be constructed on numerical simulation tasks, it would then be particularly interesting to fine-tune LLMs, in an attempt to further elicit their capabilities in computational science beyond the restrictive limits of prompting.
- In-context learning may be another interesting avenue to pursue for improved performance on computational science tasks.

5. CONCLUSION

We presented an evaluation of LLMs on graduate-level to research-level computational physics problems. Our main results can be summarized as twofold. First, GPT4 is currently the best LLM for this task but it is not capable of autonomously generating code solutions at the graduate/research level we evaluate for. Second, GPT4 exhibits consistent failure modes in the computational physics domain that suggest obvious targets for performance improvement and monitoring with future generation AI systems.

It is tempting to speculate on the origin of these failure modes. Some appear to be directly related to the LLM hallucination phenomenon (e.g., when invoking non-existent functions). The poor ability to track package versions may be related to hallucinations and/or the limited time-awareness of LLMs given their time-agnostic next-token pre-training objective. These two shortcomings could perhaps be (partially) addressed with general strategies to reduce hallucinations (Rawte et al. 2023; Zhang et al. 2023; Huang et al. 2023) and to equip LLMs with an explicit sense of time regarding the text they are trained on (e.g., Touvron et al. 2023).

On the other hand, some of the failure modes we identified seem to be related to limitations of the physics world models learned by GPT4. Unit conversion, for example, is a sub-graduate level challenge, even in the context of code-specific units, that could perhaps be addressed with a dedicated training corpus. By contrast, challenges in defining steady-state, stopping criteria or global parameter values for simulations could be related to more fundamental limits in the reasoning and planning capabilities of GPT4 in the physics domain.

It will be interesting to determine to what extent future generation models improve upon GPT4’s computational physics shortcomings, either as a simple byproduct of scaling or from adopting general training strategies aimed at

⁸ For reference, we estimate that the problem and evaluation design phase of our analysis required ~ 20 hours of work and the solution evaluation phase another ~ 10 hours. GPT4 generated all 47 code solutions in about 15 minutes.

reducing hallucinations and increasing reasoning and planning abilities. It could also be the case that tailored training strategies for computational physics are needed to overcome some of the shortcomings we have identified, since some of the common-sense and reasoning steps behind practical choices made in computational physics are not systematically documented in the academic literature (or in textbooks).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

MAD and KM conceived the project jointly and contributed equally to the design of physics problems and to the evaluation of LLM solutions. MAD designed and operated the LLM generation pipeline. KM designed the evaluation methodology, in consultation with MAD. Both authors contributed equally to the analysis of results and code examples. MAD prepared tables, figures and performed the exploration reported in Appendix C. KM was lead-writer, with significant contributions from MAD.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

MAD is supported by Tamkeen under the NYU Abu Dhabi Research Institute grant CASS. KM is supported by the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

REFERENCES

- Abedi M., Alshybani I., Shahadat M. R. B., Murillo M. S., 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, p. [arXiv:2309.13059](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13059)
- Adams F. C., 2016, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2016, 042–042
- Anthropic P., 2023, Core Views on AI Safety: When, Why, What, and How, <https://www.anthropic.com/index/core-views-on-ai-safety>
- Bovy J., 2015, *ApJS*, 216, 29
- Bovy J., 2024, Dynamics and Astrophysics of Galaxies, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (in preparation)
- Bowman S. R., 2023, Eight Things to Know about Large Language Models ([arXiv:2304.00612](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.00612))
- Boyko J., et al., 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, p. [arXiv:2311.04929](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.04929)
- Brown-Cohen J., Irving G., Piliouras G., 2023, Scalable AI Safety via Doubly-Efficient Debate ([arXiv:2311.14125](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.14125))
- Burns K. J., Vasil G. M., Oishi J. S., Lecoanet D., Brown B. P., 2020, *Physical Review Research*, 2, 023068
- Carr B. J., Rees M. J., 1979, *Nature*, 278, 605
- Chen M., et al., 2021, Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code ([arXiv:2107.03374](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374))
- Christiano P., Xu M., Cotra A., 2021, Eliciting latent knowledge: How to tell if your eyes deceive you., <https://www.alignmentforum.org/posts/qHCDysDnvhteW7kRd/arc-s-first-technical-report-eliciting-latent-knowledge>
- Hendrycks D., Burns C., Basart S., Zou A., Mazeika M., Song D., Steinhardt J., 2021, Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding ([arXiv:2009.03300](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03300))
- Huang L., et al., 2023, A Survey on Hallucination in Large Language Models: Principles, Taxonomy, Challenges, and Open Questions ([arXiv:2311.05232](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.05232))
- Hubinger E., Jermyn A., Treutlein J., Hudson R., Woolverton K., 2023, Conditioning Predictive Models: Risks and Strategies ([arXiv:2302.00805](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.00805))
- Kaddour J., Harris J., Mozes M., Bradley H., Raileanu R., McHardy R., 2023, Challenges and Applications of Large Language Models ([arXiv:2307.10169](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.10169))
- Khan M. F. A., Ramsdell M., Falor E., Karimi H., 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, p. [arXiv:2311.02640](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.02640)
- Liu Y., et al., 2023, ML-Bench: Large Language Models Leverage Open-source Libraries for Machine Learning Tasks ([arXiv:2311.09835](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.09835))
- Maslej N., et al., 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, p. [arXiv:2310.03715](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03715)
- McCoy R. T., Yao S., Friedman D., Hardy M., Griffiths T. L., 2023, Embers of Autoregression: Understanding Large Language Models Through the Problem They are Trained to Solve ([arXiv:2309.13638](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13638))
- Mialon G., Fourrier C., Swift C., Wolf T., LeCun Y., Scialom T., 2023, GAIA: a benchmark for General AI Assistants ([arXiv:2311.12983](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.12983))
- Michael J., Mahdi S., Rein D., Petty J., Dirani J., Padmakumar V., Bowman S. R., 2023, Debate Helps Supervise Unreliable Experts ([arXiv:2311.08702](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.08702))
- Morris M. R., Sohl-dickstein J., Fiedel N., Warkentin T., Dafoe A., Faust A., Farabet C., Legg S., 2023, Levels of AGI: Operationalizing Progress on the Path to AGI ([arXiv:2311.02462](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.02462))
- OpenAI 2023, GPT-4V(ision) System Card, https://cdn.openai.com/papers/GPTV_System_Card.pdf
- Paxton B., Bildsten L., Dotter A., Herwig F., Lesaffre P., Timmes F., 2011, *ApJS*, 192, 3

- Rawte V., Sheth A., Das A., 2023, A Survey of Hallucination in Large Foundation Models ([arXiv:2309.05922](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.05922))
- Rein H., Liu S. F., 2012, *A&A*, **537**, A128
- Rein D., Hou B. L., Stickland A. C., Petty J., Pang R. Y., Dirani J., Michael J., Bowman S. R., 2023, GPQA: A Graduate-Level Google-Proof Q&A Benchmark ([arXiv:2311.12022](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.12022))
- Research AI4Science M., Azure Quantum M., 2023, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2311.07361](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07361)
- Schut L., Tomasev N., McGrath T., Hassabis D., Paquet U., Kim B., 2023, Bridging the Human-AI Knowledge Gap: Concept Discovery and Transfer in AlphaZero ([arXiv:2310.16410](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.16410))
- Steinhardt J., 2023, What will GPT-2030 look like?, <https://bounded-regret.ghost.io/what-will-gpt-2030-look-like/>
- Strogatz S. H., 2000, *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With Applications to Physics, Biology, Chemistry and Engineering*. Westview Press
- Tamayo D., Rein H., Shi P., Hernandez D. M., 2020, *MNRAS*, **491**, 2885
- Touvron H., et al., 2023, Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models ([arXiv:2307.09288](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288))
- Virtanen P., et al., 2020, *Nature Methods*, **17**, 261
- Wang X., et al., 2023a, SciBench: Evaluating College-Level Scientific Problem-Solving Abilities of Large Language Models ([arXiv:2307.10635](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.10635))
- Wang K., et al., 2023b, *arXiv e-prints*, p. [arXiv:2310.03731](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03731)
- Yang Z., Li L., Lin K., Wang J., Lin C.-C., Liu Z., Wang L., 2023, The Dawn of LMMs: Preliminary Explorations with GPT-4V(ision) ([arXiv:2309.17421](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.17421))
- Zhang Y., et al., 2023, Siren’s Song in the AI Ocean: A Survey on Hallucination in Large Language Models ([arXiv:2309.01219](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.01219))

APPENDIX

A. LIST OF PROBLEMS

Below is the complete and final list of problems included in our main analysis, grouped by code base.

A.1. *REBOUND*

1. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2 to calculate the minimum mass of exoplanet Wasp-47b needed for exoplanet Wasp-47e's orbit to be unstable on a 100 year timescale, as a function of its eccentricity. Give me a fully working code.
2. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2 to solve the following problem. Assuming the presence of a fictitious planet orbiting between Jupiter and Neptune, what can its maximum mass be for its orbit to remain stable after 1000 years ? Give me a fully working code.
3. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2 to calculate the next date and time when Uranus' mean anomaly is 0 degrees. Give me a fully working code.
4. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2, and its extension Reboundx version 3.1.0, to solve the following problem. Assuming a Pluto-like object orbiting on a circular coplanar orbit at 25 AU, and Neptune migrating outwards starting at 20 AU, what is the maximum allowed orbital migration timescale of Neptune for this object to be captured in the 3:2 mean motion resonance, as a function of Neptune's eccentricity ? Give me a fully working code.
5. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2 to solve the following problem. Assuming the presence of a fictitious planet called HD189733b with Earth-like mean density orbiting between Jupiter and Neptune, what can its maximum radius be for Vesta's orbit to remain stable after 1000 years ? Give me a fully working code.
6. Suppose we replace Callisto with an Earth-mass object. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2 to estimate the Lyapunov timescale of the system. Give me a full working code.
7. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2 to solve the following problem. Give me step by step instructions to formally check whether a planet is caught in a mean motion resonance, without any prior knowledge about which resonance it might be. Give me a fully working code.
8. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2 to solve the following problem. If centaur Chariklo was to double its mass, how far can its rings be while remaining on stable orbits assuming they are made of 2 cm spheres with the same density as Charon ? Give me a fully working code.
9. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2, and its extension Reboundx version 3.1.0, to calculate the maximal allowed semimajor axis of Io for its surface volcanic activity to persist, as a function of Io's mean density. Give me a fully working code.
10. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2, and its extension Reboundx version 3.1.0, to solve the following problem. Assuming a Pluto-like object orbiting at 25 AU, and Neptune migrating outwards starting at 20 AU, what is the maximum allowed orbital migration timescale of Neptune for this object to be captured in any first order mean motion resonance ? Give me a fully working code.
11. Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2, and its extension Reboundx version 3.1.0, to solve the following problem. Assume a lunar-mass object with high eccentricity and negative charge orbiting a positively charged Earth-mass object. How small can its orbital period be for the system to be stable for 1000 yrs.

A.2. MESA

1. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: for what metallicity, if any, will a 3.14159 solar mass star live longer than 10 Gyr ?
2. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: what is the expected lifetime of a 30.1861 solar mass star?
3. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: what is the expected lifetime of a solar mass star made entirely of helium ? That is, the helium mass fraction at $t=0$ is 1.
4. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: How much energy does a 112.43 solar mass star with 0.5 solar metallicity emit as radiation during the main sequence phase of its evolution?
5. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: for a 2.76 solar mass star with non-solar metallicity, at what age does its core helium mass reach exactly 3 times 0.2 solar masses ?
6. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: at what time (in Myr) during its evolution will a 30.1861 solar mass star undergo carbon burning ?
7. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: what is the expected lifetime of a solar mass and metallicity star made entirely of helium ? That is, the helium mass fraction at $t=0$ is 1. Assume that G constant is a twice its real value
8. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: what is the convective mass (that is the total mass of the gas in the convection zones) of a 3.14 solar mass and solar metallicity star?
9. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: for what range of metallicities, if any, will a 26.1451 solar mass main sequence star have 2 separate convective zones ?

10. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: what should be the minimal mass of a solar metallicity star for it to completely disperse a 100 solar masses nebula around it through stellar winds ?
11. Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (`inlist_project` file setting the problem's options and parameters, and `run_star_extras.f` fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's `.data` output files. Problem: what is the main sequence lifetime of a 254.54 solar masses star that has a 4.23 solar mass and 10 solar luminosities black hole at its core ? Provide the complete MESA code `inlist_project` file and python data analysis and postprocessing code that when run provide the precise answer.

A.3. *Dedalus*

1. Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. The diffusion coefficient is constant: $D=0.1$. When does the peak value in the domain reach 10% of its initial peak value? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
2. Consider a one-dimensional scalar advection problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The advection flow is one-directional and has positive constant velocity $v=0.1$. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. A domain-centred Gaussian scalar source of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with peak rate amplitude $S=0.01$ is turned on at $t=0$. Assuming a uniform scalar field initial condition, with unit value, how long does it take for the system to reach steady state? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
3. Consider a one-dimensional scalar advection problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The advection flow is one-directional and has positive constant velocity $v=0.1$. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. A domain-centred Gaussian scalar source of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with peak rate amplitude $S=0.01$ is turned on at $t=0$. Assuming a uniform scalar field initial condition, with unit value, what is the maximum scalar value over the domain once the system has reached steady state? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
4. Consider a non-linear one-dimensional acoustic wave problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The continuous variable is u and the wave velocity $c(u) = u^a$ is a polynomial function of the local field amplitude u , with non-negative exponent a . The velocity exponent a is set to unity for this problem. The boundary conditions are periodic. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian u -field of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. How long does it take for the wave crest to first reach the $x=1$ boundary? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
5. Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 of arbitrary amplitude. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. The diffusion coefficient is constant with value D_0 . How much larger than the reference value D_0 does the diffusion coefficient D need to be for the peak value in the domain to reach 10% of the initial peak value three times faster than in the case $D=D_0$? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
6. Consider a one-dimensional scalar advection problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The advection flow is one-directional and has positive constant velocity $v=0.1$. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. A domain-centred Gaussian scalar source of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with peak rate amplitude $S=0.01$ is turned on at $t=0$. Assuming a uniform scalar field initial condition, with unit value, how much stronger should the source rate S be for the steady-state to be reached twice as fast? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.

7. Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. The diffusion coefficient is spatially inhomogeneous: it increases linearly with x , from value $D=1$ in $x=0$ to value $D=2$ in $x=1$. After how much time does the peak value in the domain reach 10% of the initial peak value? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
8. Consider a one-dimensional scalar advection problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The advection flow is one-directional and has positive constant velocity $v=0.1$. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. A domain-centred Gaussian scalar source of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with peak rate amplitude $S=0.01$ is turned on at $t=0$. A spatially and temporally uniform sink is also turned on at $t=0$. Assuming a uniform scalar field initial condition, with unit value, how long does it take for the system to reach steady state? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
9. Consider a non-linear one-dimensional acoustic wave problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The continuous variable is u and the wave velocity $c(u) = u^a$ is a polynomial function of the local wave amplitude u , with non-negative exponent a . The velocity exponent a is set to unity for this problem. The boundary conditions are periodic. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian u -field of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. How long does it take for the system to first develop a shock-wave? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
10. Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 of arbitrary amplitude. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. The diffusion coefficient is spatially inhomogeneous: it increases linearly with x from value $D_0=1$ in $x=0$ to the value $D_0=2$ in $x=1$. By how much should one uniformly increase D over the reference profile D_0 for the peak value in the domain to reach 10% of the initial peak value three times faster than for the case of the reference profile D_0 ? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
11. Consider a one-dimensional scalar advection problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The advection flow is one-directional and has positive constant velocity $v=0.1$. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. A domain-centred Gaussian scalar source of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with peak rate amplitude $S=0.01$ is turned on at $t=0$. A spatially and temporally uniform sink is also turned on at $t=0$. Assuming a uniform scalar field initial condition, with unit value, how much stronger should the source rate be, keeping the sink rate unchanged, for the steady-state to be reached twice as fast? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
12. Consider a one-dimensional scalar advection problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The advection flow is one-directional and has positive constant velocity $v=0.1$. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. A domain-centred Gaussian scalar source of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with peak rate amplitude $S=0.01$ is turned on at $t=0$. A spatially and temporally uniform sink is also turned on at $t=0$. Assuming a uniform scalar field initial condition, with unit value, how much weaker should the sink rate be, keeping the source rate unchanged, for the steady-state to be reached twice as fast? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
13. Consider a non-linear one-dimensional acoustic wave problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The continuous variable is u and the wave velocity $c(u) = u^a$ is a polynomial function of the local wave amplitude u , with non-negative exponent a . The boundary conditions are periodic. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian u -field of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. How weak should the exponent a be for the first shock-wave to develop between the 3rd and the 4th passage of the wave crest across the domain? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
14. Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unity peak amplitude. The boundary conditions are outflow. The diffusion coefficient is constant. At any given time $t>0$, does the corresponding 4th-order hyperdiffusion problem diffuse more or less of the field out of the domain than the standard 2nd order diffusion problem? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.

15. Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unity peak amplitude. The boundary conditions are periodic. The diffusion coefficient is constant. Can the peak value in the domain ever reach 10% of the initial peak value? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
16. Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. The diffusion coefficient is spatially inhomogeneous: it increases linearly with x from value $D=1$ in $x=0$ to value $D=2$ in $x=1$. When does the domain-integral of the continuous field being diffused reach 1% of the initial integral value? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
17. Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 of arbitrary amplitude. The boundary conditions are outflow. The diffusion coefficient is spatially inhomogeneous: it increases linearly with x from value D in $x=0$ to $2D$ in $x=1$. How much larger than the reference value D_0 does D need to be for the domain-integral of the field being diffused to reach 10% of the initial peak integral value at least three times faster than for the case $D=D_0$? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
18. Can you build a one-dimensional antidiffusion PDE system in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$ such that anti-diffusion system reaches steady-state with a (possibly inhomogeneous) constant loss term in the domain? Assume a constant field for the initial condition and outflow boundary conditions. Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
19. Consider a non-linear one-dimensional acoustic wave problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The continuous variable is u . The wave velocity $c(u,t) = u^a \exp(-\lambda t)$ is a polynomial function of the local wave amplitude u , with non-negative exponent $a=1$, that is also decaying as a function of time at the decay rate λ . The boundary conditions are periodic. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian u -field of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. How strong should the decay rate λ be for the first shock-wave to develop after the 5th passage of the wave crest across the domain? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.
20. Consider a non-linear one-dimensional acoustic wave problem in the spatial domain $x=[0,1]$. The continuous variable is u . The wave velocity $c(u,t) = u^a \exp(-\lambda t)$ is a polynomial function of the local wave amplitude u , with non-negative exponent $a=1$, that is also decaying as a function of time at the decay rate λ . The boundary conditions are periodic. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian u -field of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. How strong should the decay rate λ be to avoid the formation of a shock-wave at any future time. Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.

A.4. *Scipy*

1. Consider the classical Lorenz dynamical system, with a specific initial condition on the z axis with $z=25$. What is the time it takes for the system to cross twice the y - z plane? Use the ODE integrator from the Scipy python package. Give me a fully working code.
2. Consider the classical Lorenz dynamical system, with an arbitrary initial condition on the z axis with $z=z_0$. What is the value of z_0 that will minimize the time it takes for the system to cross twice the y - z plane? Use the ODE integrator from the Scipy python package. Give me a fully working code.
3. Consider the classical Lorenz dynamical system, with two specific initial conditions on the z axis, with $z=25$ and $z=23$. What is the time it takes for the euclidian distance between these two configuration points to exceed 20? Use the ODE integrator from the Scipy python package. Give me a fully working code.
4. Consider the classical Lorenz dynamical system, except that the sigma parameter exhibits a time-dependent sinusoidal oscillation around the standard value, with an amplitude $A=5$ and an angular frequency $\omega=0.1$.

Use a specific initial condition on the z axis, with $z=25$. What is the time it takes for the system to cross twice the y-z plane? Use the ODE integrator from the Scipy python package. Give me a fully working code.

5. Consider the classical Lorenz dynamical system, except that the sigma parameter exhibit a time- dependent sinusoidal oscillation around the standard value, with an amplitude $A=5$ and an angular frequency $\omega=0.1$. Use a specific initial condition on the z axis with $z=25$. What are the values of A and Omega that will minimize the time it takes for the system to cross twice the y-z plane? Use the ODE integrator from the Scipy python package. Give me a fully working code.

B. COMPLETE OUTPUT EXAMPLES

In this section we show representative complete examples for the output of GPT4 to our problems.

B.1. REBOUND

Prompt:

Use the Rebound N-body integration Python package version 3.12.2 to solve the following problem. Assuming the presence of a fictitious planet called HD189733b with Earth-like mean density orbiting between Jupiter and Neptune, what can its maximum radius be for Vesta's orbit to remain stable after 1000 years ? Give me a fully working code.

Unmodified, complete output of LLM:

To solve this problem, we will use the Rebound N-body integration package to simulate the Solar System with the addition of the fictitious planet HD189733b. We will then vary the radius of HD189733b and check the stability of Vesta's orbit after 1000 years. Here's the code:

<...>

This code sets up a simulation of the Solar System with the Sun, Jupiter, Neptune, Vesta, and the fictitious planet HD189733b. The radius of HD189733b is varied, and the stability of Vesta's orbit is checked after 1000 years. The maximum radius of HD189733b for Vesta's orbit to remain stable is then printed.

```

1 import numpy as np
2 import rebound
3
4 def setup_simulation(radius):
5     """
6     Set up the simulation with the Solar System and the fictitious planet HD189733b.
7     :param radius: The radius of HD189733b in Earth radii.
8     :return: A Rebound simulation object.
9     """
10    sim = rebound.Simulation()
11
12    # Add the Sun, Jupiter, and Neptune
13    sim.add("Sun")
14    sim.add("Jupiter")
15    sim.add("Neptune")
16
17    # Add Vesta
18    sim.add("Vesta")
19
20    # Add HD189733b with Earth-like mean density
21    mass = 4/3 * np.pi * radius**3 * 5.52 # Mass in Earth masses
22    sim.add(m=mass/333000, a=(5.2+30.1)/2) # Orbit between Jupiter and Neptune
23
24    # Set the integrator and timestep
25    sim.integrator = "ias15"
26    sim.dt = sim.particles[1].P * 0.05 # 5% of Jupiter's orbital period
27
28    # Move to the center of mass frame
29    sim.move_to_com()
30

```

```

31     return sim
32
33 def check_vesta_stability(radius, years=1000):
34     """
35     Check the stability of Vesta's orbit after a given number of years.
36     :param radius: The radius of HD189733b in Earth radii.
37     :param years: The number of years to simulate.
38     :return: True if Vesta's orbit is stable, False otherwise.
39     """
40     sim = setup_simulation(radius)
41     initial_distance = np.linalg.norm(np.array(sim.particles[3].xyz) - np.array(sim.particles[0].xyz))
42     sim.integrate(years * 2 * np.pi)
43
44     final_distance = np.linalg.norm(np.array(sim.particles[3].xyz) - np.array(sim.particles[0].xyz))
45     return abs(final_distance - initial_distance) < 0.1 * initial_distance
46
47 def find_maximum_radius():
48     """
49     Find the maximum radius of HD189733b for Vesta's orbit to remain stable after 1000 years.
50     :return: The maximum radius in Earth radii.
51     """
52     radius = 1
53     while check_vesta_stability(radius):
54         radius += 1
55     return radius - 1
56
57 if __name__ == "__main__":
58     max_radius = find_maximum_radius()
59     print(f"The maximum radius of HD189733b for Vesta's orbit to remain stable after 1000 years is
    → {max_radius} Earth radii.")

```

In this example, we asked GPT4 to estimate the stability timescale of the solar system's minor planet Vesta as a function of (explicitly) the radius and (implicitly) the location of a hypothetical ninth planet named (confusingly by design) after exoplanet HD189733b. GPT4's solution was graded Pass- by the authors, even though it gives the wrong answer. Moreover, the following was noted:

- The code runs with no errors.
- However, the main issue stopping the code from giving a correct answer is units conversion and physical consistency. GPT4 defined Vesta's radius in unit-less values with the order of 1 (R=1,2,3.. with no explicit units), then proceeds to calculate the mass while taking Earth's density as 5.5 g/cm^3 . The radius is hence in cm, and using order 1 values does not make sense (Vesta's radius is 26.2 million cm). Moreover, GPT4 finally declared the mass to be in Earth masses, even though it is actually in grams, and proceeded to convert it to solar masses.
- GPT4 did otherwise deal correctly with the G=1 default REBOUND units.
- As a measure of stability, GPT4 used the distance of Vesta to the sun. It considered the orbit to be unstable if it varied by more than 10% over the 1000 yr timescale. While this definition of stability is neither formal nor particularly good, we judged it to be acceptable for a passing grade.
- GPT4 calculated the distance using Vesta's Cartesian coordinates instead of just relying on the values readily available in REBOUND.

B.2. MESA

Prompt:

Solve the following problem by providing the complete inputs to the latest version of the MESA stellar physics code (inlist_project file setting the problem's options and parameters, and run_star_extras.f fortran file adding extra physics). You should also provide the python data analysis and postprocessing code needed to generate a complete final solution from MESA's .data output files. Problem: at what time (in Myr) during its evolution will a 30.1861 solar mass star undergo carbon burning ?

Unmodified, complete output of LLM:

As a language model AI, I cannot run the MESA code directly, but I can provide you with the necessary input files and Python code to analyze the output data. You can then run the MESA code on your local machine or server. <...> This Python script uses the "mesa_reader" package to read the MESA output data. Make sure to install it using "pip install mesa_reader" before running the script. After running the Python script, you will get the time (in Myr) when the 30.1861 solar mass star undergoes carbon burning.

```

1
2 First, create the inlist_project file with the following content:
3
4 ---
5 ! inlist_project
6 ! Input file for MESA stellar evolution code
7 ! Problem: 30.1861 solar mass star undergoing carbon burning
8
9 &star_job
10 ! Set the initial mass of the star
11   initial_mass = 30.1861
12 ! Save the output data
13   save_model_when_terminate = .true.
14 ! Set the output directory
15   output_directory = '30.1861Msun_star'
16 /
17
18 &controls
19 ! Set the initial metallicity
20   initial_z = 0.02
21 ! Set the mixing length theory parameter
22   mixing_length_alpha = 1.5
23 ! Set the maximum number of steps
24   max_num_steps = 10000
25 ! Set the maximum number of retries
26   max_num_retries = 100
27 ! Set the maximum number of backups
28   max_num_backups = 100
29 ! Set the stopping condition for carbon burning
30   stop_at_carbon_burning = .true.
31 /
32
33 &pgstar
34 ! Set the output file format
35   file_format = 'png'
36 ! Set the output directory
37   output_directory = '30.1861Msun_star'
38 /
39 ---
40

```

```

41 Next, create the run_star_extras.f file with the following content:
42
43 !$fortran
44 ! run_star_extras.f
45 ! Fortran file for adding extra physics to MESA code
46 ! Problem: 30.1861 solar mass star undergoing carbon burning
47
48 ! No extra physics needed for this problem
49 !$
50
51 Now, run the MESA code with these input files. After the code finishes running, you will have a set of
52 → .data output files in the 30.1861Msun_star directory.
53
54 Finally, create a Python script to analyze the output data and find the time when the star undergoes
55 → carbon burning:
56
57 !$python
58 import os
59 import numpy as np
60 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
61 from mesa_reader import MesaData
62
63 def find_carbon_burning_time(output_directory):
64     # Find the last .data file in the output directory
65     data_files = sorted([f for f in os.listdir(output_directory) if f.endswith('.data')])
66     last_data_file = os.path.join(output_directory, data_files[-1])
67
68     # Read the data from the last .data file
69     data = MesaData(last_data_file)
70
71     # Find the time when the star undergoes carbon burning (in Myr)
72     carbon_burning_time = data.star_age / 1e6
73
74     return carbon_burning_time
75
76 output_directory = '30.1861Msun_star'
77 carbon_burning_time = find_carbon_burning_time(output_directory)
78 print(f"The 30.1861 solar mass star undergoes carbon burning at {carbon_burning_time:.2f} Myr.")
79 !$

```

In this example, we asked GPT4 to estimate when would a star with a given (floating point value) mass undergo carbon burning during its post main sequence evolution. An implicit parameter is the star’s metallicity. The LLM failed at this exercise since it hallucinated a stopping condition “`stop_at_carbon_burning`” and took the stopping time as the solution. As no such stopping condition exists in MESA, acceptable solutions would have either manually implemented such a condition in the Fortran code, or let the simulation run through to the end then searched for carbon burning point in the data post-processing. Moreover, the following was noted:

- There are many coding errors in the Inlist, mainly flags that in reality exist under different name.
- On a physics note, the LLM automatically enabled set the mixing length parameter (`mixing_length_alpha`) to an acceptable value (1.5).
- Using floating point and confusing stellar masses never had any influence on the results.

B.3. *Dedalus*

Prompt: Consider a one-dimensional diffusion problem in the spatial domain $[0,1]$. The initial condition is a domain-centred Gaussian of Full-Width-at-Half-Maximum 0.3 with unit peak amplitude. The boundary conditions are outflow on each side. The diffusion coefficient is constant: $D=0.1$. When does the peak value in the domain reach 10% of its initial peak value? Use the Dedalus PDE solver Python package, version 2. Give me a fully working code.

Output of LLM: To solve this problem, we will use the Dedalus PDE solver package to simulate the one-dimensional diffusion problem with the given initial and boundary conditions. We will then find the time when the peak value in the domain reaches 10% of its initial peak value. Here's the fully working code:

```

1 import numpy as np
2 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
3 from dedalus import public as de
4 from dedalus.extras import flow_tools
5 import time
6
7 # Constants
8 FWHM = 0.3
9 D = 0.1
10 tolerance = 0.1
11
12 # Create the domain
13 x_basis = de.Chebyshev('x', 256, interval=(0, 1))
14 domain = de.Domain([x_basis], grid_dtype=np.float64)
15
16 # Define the problem
17 problem = de.IVP(domain, variables=['u', 'ux'])
18 problem.parameters['D'] = D
19 problem.add_equation("dt(u) - D*dx(ux) = 0")
20 problem.add_equation("ux - dx(u) = 0")
21 problem.add_bc("left(ux) = 0")
22 problem.add_bc("right(ux) = 0")
23
24 # Set the initial condition
25 x = domain.grid(0)
26 u = domain.new_field(name='u')
27 u['g'] = np.exp(-4 * np.log(2) * (x - 0.5)**2 / FWHM**2)
28
29 # Set up the solver
30 solver = problem.build_solver(de.timesteppers.RK443)
31 solver.stop_sim_time = np.inf
32 solver.stop_wall_time = 30 * 60
33 solver.stop_iteration = np.inf
34
35 # Set up the analysis
36 analysis = solver.evaluator.add_file_handler('data', iter=10)
37 analysis.add_system(solver.state, layout='g')
38 analysis.add_task("integ(u, 'x')", layout='g', name='total_mass')
39
40 # Main loop
41 initial_peak_value = np.max(u['g'])
42 target_peak_value = 0.1 * initial_peak_value
43 start_time = time.time()
44
45 while solver.ok:
46     solver.step(dt=1e-3)
47     current_peak_value = np.max(solver.state['u']['g'])

```

```

48     if current_peak_value <= target_peak_value:
49         break
50
51 end_time = time.time()
52 print("Simulation completed in {:.2f} seconds.".format(end_time - start_time))
53 print("The peak value reaches 10% of its initial value at t = {:.5f}.".format(solver.sim_time))
54
55 # Plot the final state
56 plt.plot(x, solver.state['u']['g'], label='Final state') plt.xlabel('x')
57 plt.ylabel('u')
58 plt.legend()
59 plt.show()

```

In this example, we asked GPT4 to setup and solve a 1D diffusion problem to evaluate when the peak value in the domain reaches 10% of the peak initial value, as the original gaussian peak diffuses out through the boundaries. The code is largely satisfactory in setting up the domain, the equations, boundary and initial conditions, time-stepping and the requested diagnostic.

This code solution gets a Pass+ grade. Three “analysis” lines are unnecessary (and unused) but it illustrates satisfactory performance on one of our simpler diffusion problems.

B.4. Scipy

Prompt: Consider the classical Lorenz dynamical system, with two specific initial conditions on the z axis, with $z=25$ and $z=23$. What is the time it takes for the euclidian distance between these two configuration points to exceed 20? Use the ODE integrator from the Scipy python package. Give me a fully working code.

Output of LLM: Here’s a fully working Python code that uses the Scipy package to solve the Lorenz dynamical system and find the time it takes for the Euclidean distance between the two configuration points to exceed 20:

```

1  import numpy as np
2  from scipy.integrate import solve_ivp
3  import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
4
5  # Define the Lorenz system of equations
6  def lorenz_system(t, xyz, sigma=10, rho=28, beta=8/3):
7      x, y, z = xyz
8      dx_dt = sigma * (y - x)
9      dy_dt = x * (rho - z) - y
10     dz_dt = x * y - beta * z
11     return [dx_dt, dy_dt, dz_dt]
12
13 # Define the stopping condition when the Euclidean distance exceeds 20
14 def stop_condition(t, xyz1_xyz2):
15     xyz1, xyz2 = np.split(xyz1_xyz2, 2)
16     distance = np.linalg.norm(xyz1 - xyz2)
17     return distance - 20
18
19 stop_condition.terminal = True
20
21 # Initial conditions
22 xyz1_initial = [1, 1, 25]
23 xyz2_initial = [1, 1, 23]
24
25 # Combine the initial conditions for both points
26 initial_conditions = np.concatenate((xyz1_initial, xyz2_initial))
27
28 # Integrate the Lorenz system using solve_ivp

```

```

29 solution = solve_ivp(lorenz_system, (0, 100), initial_conditions, events=stop_condition,
    ↪ dense_output=True)
30
31 # Extract the time when the stopping condition is met
32 time_to_exceed_20 = solution.t_events[0][0]
33 print(f"The time it takes for the Euclidean distance between the two configuration points to exceed 20
    ↪ is: {time_to_exceed_20:.2f}")
34
35 # Plot the trajectories of the two points in 3D
36 fig = plt.figure()
37 ax = fig.add_subplot(111, projection="3d")
38 t = np.linspace(0, time_to_exceed_20, 1000)
39 xyz1_xyz2 = solution.sol(t)
40 xyz1, xyz2 = np.split(xyz1_xyz2, 2)
41 ax.plot(xyz1[0], xyz1[1], xyz1[2], label="z=25")
42 ax.plot(xyz2[0], xyz2[1], xyz2[2], label="z=23")
43 ax.set_xlabel("X")
44 ax.set_ylabel("Y")
45 ax.set_zlabel("Z")
46 ax.legend()
47 plt.show()
48
49
50

```

In this example, we asked GPT4 to evaluate two distinct initial conditions diverge in time for the standard Lorenz system, a defining property of deterministic chaos. This code solution gets a Fail grade because of several compounding errors. The initial conditions chosen by GPT4 do not follow prompt specifications, the concatenation of trajectory variables is problematic and the simulation time is arbitrary.

Note that GPT4 sets up a correct and modular Lorenz system function and uses a compact algorithmic approach to detect when the Euclidian distance reaches the desired threshold.

C. EXPLORATION

C.1. LLM choice & comparison

During our initial exploration phase (detailed in section C.2), we considered Llama2-70B-Chat (Touvron et al. 2023), Falcon-180B-chat⁹, Claude2¹⁰ and GPT4¹¹ as candidate LLMs for our work. A brief survey of capabilities in computational physics indicated that LLama-2 models are not sufficiently competent for the task. Claude2 and Falcon-180B showed noticeably weaker performance than GPT4. As a result, we focused on GPT4 for the remainder of our work.

C.2. GPT4 exploration

Before proceeding to systematically benchmark GPT4's performance on our ~ 50 original problems, we explored GPT4 capabilities in computational physics to help us calibrate our methods and prompting strategy. We performed this exploration using a code base and physics problems that are distinct from our benchmark problems, to avoid any obvious design contamination/leakage. This exploration helped us identify some of GPT4's failure modes and ultimately guided us towards our simple prompting strategy (§ 2.4).

We created multiple problems of varying difficulty to be solved using the Python package for galactic dynamics Galpy¹² (Bovy 2015; Bovy 2024). This package offers capabilities such as orbit integration in diverse potentials, assessment and sampling of different distribution functions, and computing action-angle coordinates in all static potentials.

⁹ <https://falconllm.tii.ae/>

¹⁰ <https://www.anthropic.com/index/claude-2>

¹¹ <https://openai.com/research/gpt-4>

¹² <https://github.com/jobovy/galpy>

While still being in the general domain of gravitational dynamics, `Galpy` is different from `REBOUND` in that it is not a general N-body integrator. It does share with `REBOUND` an applicability in the general context of planetary and stellar dynamics and contains many analogous physics concepts and tools.

The exploration with GPT4 (`gpt-4-0314`, with `temperature=0`) was done by asking a series of questions, in a multi-turn dialogue setup, starting with the basic prompt template:

You are a useful coding assistant for a scientist. You help solve specific physics problem by writing python code that makes use of domain-specialized python packages, as requested by the scientist. Your code is thoroughly commented for clarity and to provide descriptions of the various physics and coding choices made in your solution. You should always follow precisely the given instructions without omissions. Use `Galpy 1.7.0` to `<...>`. Give me full working code.

We give here a quick overview of the topics and questions covered during the exploration, and the lessons learned from it. The detailed prompts and LLM answers can be found in Appendix D. Three sets of problems were discussed with GPT4:

- Orbital stability of stars in different galactic potentials. The LLM was able to define a reasonable (although ultimately scientifically inaccurate for the context) stability criterion, and provide a working `Galpy` code. Followup questions were asked concerning the effects of different potentials, and the presence of black holes.
- Orbital integration of Earth in a Keplerian potential. The LLM provided a reasonable and working `Galpy` code.
- Orbital integration of the 8 solar system planets in a 3D Keplerian potential. The LLM struggled significantly, and a very detailed prompt using chain-of-thoughts and self-critic elements was required for the LLM to give a reasonable answer. We interpreted this as evidence of the LLM struggling with out-of-distribution questions, since integrating the solar system is not what `Galpy` was designed for, nor is it usually used for that (so few online examples to learn from must exist).

The lessons we learned from this exploration are listed here (and referenced in Appendix D):

1. *Lesson 1:* It is important to specify the version of the code one wants the LLM to use, and to make sure that this version precedes the “training cutoff date” beyond which the LLM has no knowledge. For the version of GPT4 we use, that would be September 2021.
2. *Lesson 2:* One cannot always trust the physics interpretations. While most of the dialogue might seem and be reasonable, serious conceptual flaws can emerge (e.g., claiming that `NFWPotential` has the longest stability timescale, instead of the shortest, even though the (correct) opposite was stated by the same LLM earlier in the conversation).
3. *Lesson 3:* One benefits from always explicitly prompting the LLM to implement error handling for edge cases.
4. *Lesson 4:* GPT4 can capably discuss, generate code, and offer reasonable interpretations for some slightly out-of-distribution scenarios.
5. *Lesson 5:* GPT4 can perform surprisingly poorly at visualizing numerical results. The plotting request should be very detailed, explicitly mentioning whether to use built-in functions or `matplotlib` (much preferred), and the library version.
6. *Lesson 6:* GPT4 can occasionally self-reflect on some physics problems and offer research-grade alternatives.
7. *Lesson 7:* GPT4 will often implement technically correct but overly-simplified implementations of the requested solution. Followup prompting in a multi-turn dialogue setup can help develop the code further.

D. DETAILS ON EXPLORATION

Below we provide details of our exploration of GPT4’s capabilities using `Galpy`, which served as calibration for the problem design methods described in the main text. Note that, in the following, 3 types of text are shown: (i) prompts used to condition the LLM generation (all shown inside text boxes, starting with “Prompt:”), (ii) GPT4 responses (either inside a text box starting with “GPT4:”, or inside a code box to facilitate code) readability, and (iii) finally labeled Exploration Notes by the authors that are not part of the dialogue with the LLM, are *not* inside text boxes

and are all highlighted in *italics*. Furthermore, when the starting sentence is “Followup prompt”, this implies that prompt is part of a multi-turn dialogue, while a plain “Prompt” implies the first round of a new dialogue. In general, we started dialogues anew whenever a new topic or problem was introduced.

D.0.1. Stellar orbit stability

Prompt: Use Galpy 1.7.0 to estimate the stability timescale of a massive star orbiting at 20 pc from the center of the milkyway as a function of the gravitational potential used. Give me full working code.

Exploration note: relates to Lesson 1 in Appendix C.

GPT4: Sure, I can help with that. Here’s a Python script that uses the galpy package to estimate the stability timescale of a massive star orbiting at 20 parsecs from the center of the Milky Way. This script uses three different gravitational potentials: the MWPotential2014, NFWPotential, and HernquistPotential. This script assumes that the star is initially at rest relative to the galactic center. The stability timescale is estimated as the time it takes for the star’s radial distance from the galactic center to change by 10%. This is a rough estimate and the actual stability timescale could be longer or shorter depending on the specific dynamics of the system.

Please note that the galpy package uses natural units where the gravitational constant $G = 1$, the total mass of the Milky Way $M = 1$, and the characteristic length scale $a = 1$. The potentials are normalized so that the total mass equals 1. The NFWPotential and HernquistPotential are parameterized by a scale length a , which is set to 1 in this script. You may need to adjust these parameters depending on the specific properties of the Milky Way.

```

1 # Import necessary modules
2 import numpy as np
3 from galpy.potential import MWPotential2014, NFWPotential, HernquistPotential
4 from galpy.orbit import Orbit
5 from galpy.util.bovy_conversion import time_in_Gyr
6 from astropy import units
7
8 # Define the initial conditions of the star
9 # Assuming the star is at rest relative to the galactic center
10 R = 20. * units.pc.to(units.kpc) # Convert parsecs to kiloparsecs
11 vR, vT, vz = 0., 0., 0. # Initial velocities
12 phi = 0. # Initial azimuth
13
14 # Define the potentials
15 potentials = [MWPotential2014, NFWPotential(a=1., normalize=1.), HernquistPotential(a=1.,
16 → normalize=1.)]
17 potential_names = ['MWPotential2014', 'NFWPotential', 'HernquistPotential']
18
19 # Loop over the potentials
20 for potential, name in zip(potentials, potential_names):
21     # Initialize the orbit
22     o = Orbit([R, vR, vT, vz, phi])
23
24     # Integrate the orbit and estimate the stability timescale
25     # We'll use a time of 10 Gyr with 10000 steps
26     ts = np.linspace(0., 10., 10000) * units.Gyr.to(units.Myr) # Convert Gyr to Myr
27     o.integrate(ts, potential)
28
29     # The stability timescale is roughly the time it takes for the orbit to deviate significantly
30     # Here we'll estimate it as the time it takes for the radial distance to change by 10%
31     R_final = o.R(ts)
32     delta_R = np.abs(R_final - R) / R
33     stability_timescale = ts[np.where(delta_R > 0.1)[0][0]]
34
35     # Convert the stability timescale from Myr to Gyr and print the result
36     print(f'Stability timescale for {name}: {stability_timescale * units.Myr.to(units.Gyr)} Gyr')
```

Exploration note: the output of the code when run by the authors was the following.

Stability timescale for MWPotential2014: 2.2300223002230024e-05 Gyr

Stability timescale for NFWPotential: 3.9900399003990046e-05 Gyr

Stability timescale for HernquistPotential: 3.230032300323004e-05 Gyr

Followup prompt: explain where is this difference in stability time coming from physically.

GPT4:

The differences in the stability timescales for the different potentials arise from the different ways in which these potentials model the distribution of mass in the Milky Way galaxy.

MWPotential2014: This is a specific model of the Milky Way's gravitational potential that is based on observational data. It includes contributions from the central bulge, the disk, and the dark matter halo. The potential is relatively strong near the center of the galaxy, which leads to a shorter stability timescale.

NFWPotential: This is a theoretical model that was proposed by Navarro, Frenk, and White in 1996 to describe the distribution of dark matter in galaxies. The NFW profile has a cuspy behavior towards the center of the galaxy, meaning that the density of dark matter increases sharply as you approach the center. This leads to a stronger gravitational pull near the center, which can destabilize orbits and lead to a shorter stability timescale compared to models with a less cuspy central region.

HernquistPotential: This is a theoretical model that was proposed by Lars Hernquist in 1990. It is often used to describe the distribution of stars in elliptical galaxies or the stellar bulge of spiral galaxies. The Hernquist profile has a less cuspy central region compared to the NFW profile, which leads to a weaker gravitational pull near the center and a longer stability timescale.

In general, the stability of an orbit in a given potential depends on the balance between the gravitational pull of the mass distribution and the centrifugal force due to the star's motion. If the gravitational pull is too strong, the star can be pulled off its orbit, leading to a shorter stability timescale. Conversely, if the gravitational pull is weaker, the star can maintain its orbit for a longer time, leading to a longer stability timescale.

Exploration note: relates to Lesson 2 in Appendix C.

Followup prompt: but NFWPotential has the longest timescale.

GPT4:

I apologize for the confusion. You're correct. The NFWPotential does indeed have the longest timescale in your results.

The NFWPotential, which models the dark matter halo, has a cuspy behavior towards the center of the galaxy, meaning that the density of dark matter increases sharply as you approach the center. However, the overall gravitational potential is not solely determined by the behavior at the center. The mass distribution at larger radii also plays a significant role.

In the case of the NFWPotential, the mass increases more slowly at larger radii compared to the other potentials. This means that the gravitational pull from the outer parts of the galaxy is weaker in the NFWPotential, which can help to stabilize the orbit of the star and lead to a longer stability timescale.

On the other hand, the MWPotential2014 and HernquistPotential have more mass at larger radii, which leads to a stronger gravitational pull from the outer parts of the galaxy. This can destabilize the orbit of the star and lead to a shorter stability timescale.

Again, these are rough estimates and the actual stability timescale could be longer or shorter depending on the specific dynamics of the system.

RADIALLY FLAT POTENTIAL

Followup prompt: implement a custom potential in the code that is radially completely flat.

GPT4: A flat radial potential is essentially a constant potential. In galpy, you can define a custom potential by subclassing the Potential class and implementing the necessary methods. Here’s how you can define a constant potential:

```

1 from galpy.potential import Potential
2 from galpy.util.bovy_conversion import force_in_kmsMyr
3
4 class ConstantPotential(Potential):
5     def __init__(self, amp=1.):
6         Potential.__init__(self, amp=amp)
7
8     def _evaluate(self, R, z=0., t=0.):
9         # The potential is constant, so it doesn't depend on R, z, or t
10        return self._amp
11
12    def _Rforce(self, R, z=0., phi=0., t=0.):
13        # The radial force is the negative derivative of the potential with respect to R
14        # Since the potential is constant, its derivative is zero
15        return 0.
16
17    def _zforce(self, R, z=0., phi=0., t=0.):
18        # The vertical force is the negative derivative of the potential with respect to z
19        # Since the potential is constant, its derivative is zero
20        return 0.

```

Exploration Note: GPT4 initially omitted the $t=0$ arguments, leading to an error when calling the methods. GPT4 offered a corrected version when requested as a followup:

GPT4: I apologize for the oversight. The `_Rforce` and `_zforce` methods in the Potential class in galpy do indeed take an additional argument `t` for time. However, since the potential is constant in this case, it does not depend on time, so we can safely ignore this argument. Here’s the corrected code ... Again, please note that a constant potential is not physically realistic for a galaxy, as it implies that the mass distribution is infinite and uniform. This is just a theoretical construct that can be used to understand the behavior of orbits in a constant potential.

Exploration Note: GPT4, unprompted, correctly stated that a constant potential is not physically realistic for a galaxy. Running the code, we got “IndexError: index 0 is out of bounds for axis 0 with size 0”. Passing this error to GPT4 it returned:

GPT4: The error message indicates that the condition $\delta a_R > 0.1$ is never met during the integration, so `np.where(delta_R > 0.1)` returns an empty array. This can happen if the orbit remains stable (i.e., the relative change in the radial coordinate R remains less than 10%) for the entire duration of the integration.

In a constant potential, the forces are zero everywhere, so a star would continue moving in a straight line at a constant speed. Therefore, if the initial velocity is not exactly zero, the star would never return to its initial position, and the relative change in R would eventually exceed 10%. However, if the initial velocity is exactly zero, the star would remain at its initial position, and the relative change in R would always be zero.

To handle this situation, you can modify the code to check if `np.where(delta_R > 0.1)` returns an empty array, and if so, set the stability timescale to `np.nan` (which stands for “not a number”) to indicate that the orbit remains stable for the entire duration of the integration:

Exploration note: relates to Lesson 3 in Appendix C.

SINUSOIDAL POTENTIAL

Exploration note: The goal here is to test GPT4’s capacity to deal with scenarios not encountered in nature nor usually discussed in books or research articles, i.e. “out-of-distribution” scenarios.

Prompt: change the custom potential to be a sin function of given frequency and amplitude

GPT4: Sure, we can modify the ConstantPotential class to create a new SinusoidalPotential class where the potential is a sinusoidal function of the radial coordinate R. The potential will be given by $\text{amp} * \sin(2 * \pi * \text{freq} * R)$, where amp is the amplitude and freq is the frequency.

The radial and vertical forces are the negative derivatives of the potential with respect to R and z, respectively. Since the potential does not depend on z, the vertical force is zero. The radial force is $-\text{amp} * 2 * \pi * \text{freq} * \cos(2 * \pi * \text{freq} * R)$.

....

Please note that a sinusoidal potential is not physically realistic for a galaxy, as it implies a periodic mass distribution. This is just a theoretical construct that can be used to understand the behavior of orbits in a sinusoidal potential. Here's the code:

```

1 from galpy.potential import Potential
2 import numpy as np
3
4 class SinusoidalPotential(Potential):
5     def __init__(self, amp=1., freq=1.):
6         Potential.__init__(self, amp=amp)
7         self._freq = freq
8
9     def _evaluate(self, R, z=0., t=0.):
10        # The potential is a sinusoidal function of R
11        return self._amp * np.sin(2 * np.pi * self._freq * R)
12
13    def _Rforce(self, R, z=0., phi=0., t=0.):
14        # The radial force is the negative derivative of the potential with respect to R
15        return -self._amp * 2 * np.pi * self._freq * np.cos(2 * np.pi * self._freq * R)
16
17    def _zforce(self, R, z=0., phi=0., t=0.):
18        # The vertical force is the negative derivative of the potential with respect to z
19        # Since the potential does not depend on z, its derivative is zero
20        return 0.

```

Prompt: we got for the sin potential Stability timescale for sin: 2.5400254002540027e-05Gyr which is on par with MWPotential2014 but less than HernquistPotential and NFWPotential. explain why

GPT4: The stability timescale of an orbit in a given potential is a measure of how long it takes for the orbit to deviate significantly from its initial conditions. It depends on the shape of the potential and the initial conditions of the orbit. The MWPotential2014 is a model of the Milky Way's gravitational potential that includes contributions from the bulge, disk, and halo. The HernquistPotential and NFWPotential are models of the gravitational potential of a galaxy's halo, with the HernquistPotential having a steeper density profile near the center and the NFWPotential having a shallower density profile.

The sinusoidal potential is a highly simplified and non-physical model of a galaxy's gravitational potential. It has a periodic shape, with alternating regions of high and low potential. This can cause a star to oscillate back and forth between these regions, which can lead to a rapid deviation from the initial conditions, especially if the frequency of the sinusoidal potential is high.

Therefore, the shorter stability timescale for the sinusoidal potential compared to the HernquistPotential and NFWPotential is likely due to the periodic nature of the sinusoidal potential, which can cause rapid changes in the forces experienced by a star and hence rapid deviations from the initial conditions.

On the other hand, the similar stability timescale for the sinusoidal potential and the MWPotential2014 could be due to a coincidence in the specific parameters and initial conditions used in the simulations. The MWPotential2014 is a more realistic model of a galaxy's gravitational potential, so it would not generally be expected to have a similar stability timescale to a sinusoidal potential. However, depending on the specific parameters and initial conditions used, it is possible for the two potentials to have similar stability timescales.

Exploration note: relates to Lesson 4 in Appendix C.

Prompt: how can we numerically test whether your interpretation for what is happening for sinusoidal potential is correct ?

GPT4: To numerically test the interpretation of the sinusoidal potential's behavior, you can perform a series of simulations with different parameters and initial conditions and analyze the results. Here are a few suggestions:

1- Vary the amplitude and frequency of the sinusoidal potential: If the interpretation is correct, increasing the amplitude or frequency should lead to a shorter stability timescale, as it would cause more rapid changes in the forces experienced by a star.

2- Vary the initial conditions of the orbit: If the interpretation is correct, an orbit with a higher initial velocity should have a shorter stability timescale, as it would move more rapidly between regions of high and low potential.

3- Compare with a constant potential: If the interpretation is correct, the stability timescale for a constant potential (where the forces are zero everywhere) should be infinite (or at least much larger than for the sinusoidal potential), as a star would continue moving in a straight line at a constant speed.

4- Visualize the orbits: Plotting the orbits can provide a visual confirmation of the interpretation. If the interpretation is correct, the orbit in a sinusoidal potential should show rapid deviations from the initial conditions.

Exploration note: We tested suggestion 1 "1- Vary the amplitude and frequency of the sinusoidal potential", and the results were as predicted.

Prompt: give me a code that plots all 4 potentials

GPT4: Sure, here's a Python script that plots the potential, radial force, and vertical force for the MWPotential2014, HernquistPotential, NFWPotential, and SinusoidalPotential.

...

This script creates three plots: one for the potential as a function of R, one for the radial force as a function of R, and one for the vertical force as a function of R. Each plot includes a line for each of the four potentials.

Please note that the HernquistPotential and NFWPotential are initialized with an amplitude of 1 for simplicity. You may need to adjust this value to match the specific parameters of your galaxy model. Similarly, the SinusoidalPotential is initialized with an amplitude of 1 and a frequency of 1. You may need to adjust these values to match your specific requirements.

Exploration note: The code proposed by GPT4 contained multiple errors, and it took 3 followup prompts to get a working code.

Exploration note: relates to Lesson 5 in Appendix C.

ON THE DEFINITION OF ORBITAL STABILITY

Followup prompt: thinking back on everything we did so far, I do not think your definition of orbital stability "Here we'll estimate it as the time it takes for the radial distance to change by 10%" to be accurate. For a sin potential, R changes by more than that but the orbital is periodic and stable. Any other definitions of stability ?

GPT4: You're correct, the definition of orbital stability as "the time it takes for the radial distance to change by 10%" is a simplification and may not be accurate for all types of potentials, especially for those with periodic or quasi-periodic orbits.

In general, orbital stability in a gravitational potential can be a complex topic. Here are a few other ways to define or consider orbital stability:

Lyapunov Stability: An orbit is considered Lyapunov stable if any small perturbations do not grow over time. In other words, if you start two nearly identical orbits, they will remain close to each other for all future time.

Energy Conservation: In a conservative potential, the total energy (kinetic + potential) of a particle should be conserved. If the energy is not conserved, it could be a sign of instability.

Frequency Analysis: For an orbit to be stable, it should be quasi-periodic, which means it can be described by a sum of a finite number of frequencies. If the orbit is chaotic, it will not be quasi-periodic, and its frequency spectrum will be continuous. This can be checked using a Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) of the time series of a phase space variable.

Poincaré Sections: These are used to visualize the behavior of dynamical systems. In a Poincaré section, the state of the system is recorded only at discrete times, corresponding to when the trajectory of the system intersects a certain lower-dimensional subspace. For a stable, periodic orbit, the Poincaré section will consist of a finite number of points, while for a chaotic orbit, the points will fill an area.

Recurrence Plots: These are graphical representations of the number of times the phase space trajectory of the system visits roughly the same area in phase space. For a stable, periodic orbit, the recurrence plot will show clear, regular patterns, while for a chaotic orbit, the patterns will be more complex and less regular.

Each of these methods has its own strengths and weaknesses, and the best method to use can depend on the specific system and question at hand.

Exploration note: relates to Lesson 6 in Appendix C.

Followup prompt: Implement the Lyapunov Stability instead of the criteria you used previously.

GPT4: Lyapunov stability is a concept from dynamical systems theory that can be used to determine the stability of an orbit. The basic idea is to look at how small perturbations to the system evolve over time. If the perturbations remain bounded (i.e., they do not grow indefinitely), then the system is said to be Lyapunov stable.

To implement this, we can integrate two nearly identical orbits and compare their evolution. If the difference between the orbits remains small, then the orbit is Lyapunov stable. Here's how you might do this in Python using galpy:

....

In this code, we define two nearly identical orbits, o1 and o2, with a small difference in their initial R values. We then integrate both orbits over 1 Gyr and calculate the absolute difference in R between the two orbits at each time step. We plot this difference as a function of time to visualize how the perturbation evolves. Finally, we check if the difference in R remains less than 0.1 (an arbitrary threshold) for all time steps. If it does, we conclude that the orbit is Lyapunov stable.

Please note that this is a simplified example and the actual implementation of Lyapunov stability can be more complex, especially for higher-dimensional systems. Also, the choice of threshold (0.1 in this case) can affect the result, and there is no universal rule for choosing this value. It often requires some trial and error and depends on the specific system and question at hand.

```

1 import numpy as np
2 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
3 from galpy.potential import SinusoidalPotential
4 from galpy.orbit import Orbit
5 from galpy.util.bovy_conversion import time_in_Gyr
6
7 # Define the potential
8 potential = SinusoidalPotential(amp=1., freq=1.)
9
10 # Define the initial conditions of the star (R, vR, vT, z, vz, phi)
11 # Here we assume the star starts at R=1 with zero radial velocity, circular velocity, at z=0 with zero
   → vertical velocity, and at phi=0
12 o1 = Orbit([1., 0., 1., 0., 0., 0.])
13

```

```

14 # Define a second, nearly identical orbit
15 o2 = Orbit([1.0001, 0., 1., 0., 0., 0.])
16
17 # Integrate the orbits for 1 Gyr
18 ts = np.linspace(0, 1., 1000) * time_in_Gyr(220., 8.) # Convert time to natural units
19 o1.integrate(ts, potential)
20 o2.integrate(ts, potential)
21
22 # Calculate the difference in R between the two orbits
23 delta_R = np.abs(o1.R(ts) - o2.R(ts))
24
25 # Plot the difference in R
26 plt.plot(ts, delta_R)
27 plt.xlabel('Time (Gyr)')
28 plt.ylabel('Difference in R')
29 plt.title('Evolution of perturbation in R')
30 plt.show()
31
32 # Check if the difference in R remains bounded
33 if np.all(delta_R < 0.1):
34     print("The orbit is Lyapunov stable.")
35 else:
36     print("The orbit is not Lyapunov stable.")

```

Exploration note: relates to Lesson 7 in Appendix C.

ADDING A BLACKHOLE

Followup prompt: modify this code to have a massive blackhole 0.1 parsec from the star.

GPT4: To add a massive black hole to the system, we can use the KeplerPotential class in galpy, which represents a Keplerian potential of the form $\Phi(r) = -GM/r$. We can then add this potential to the sinusoidal potential to create a composite potential.

Here's how you might modify the previous code to include a black hole 0.1 parsec from the star: ... In this code, we first define the sinusoidal potential and the black hole potential separately. We then combine them into a single potential using the CombinedPotential class. The rest of the code is the same as before.

Please note that the KeplerPotential assumes the black hole is at the origin (0,0). If the black hole is not at the origin, you would need to shift the coordinates of the system so that the black hole is at the origin. Also, the choice of black hole mass (4 million solar masses) is arbitrary and can be adjusted as needed.

```

1 import numpy as np
2 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
3 from galpy.potential import SinusoidalPotential, KeplerPotential, CombinedPotential
4 from galpy.orbit import Orbit
5 from galpy.util.bovy_conversion import time_in_Gyr
6
7 # Define the sinusoidal potential
8 sin_potential = SinusoidalPotential(amp=1., freq=1.)
9
10 # Define the black hole potential
11 # Here we assume the black hole has a mass of 4 million solar masses, which is roughly the mass of the
12 # → black hole at the center of the Milky Way
13 # The amplitude of the KeplerPotential is GM, so we set amp=4e6 (in natural units where G=1 and the
14 # → unit of mass is the solar mass)
15 bh_potential = KeplerPotential(amp=4e6)
16
17 # Combine the potentials
18 potential = CombinedPotential(sin_potential, bh_potential)

```

```

17
18 # Define the initial conditions of the star (R, vR, vT, z, vz, phi)
19 # Here we assume the star starts at R=1 with zero radial velocity, circular velocity, at z=0 with zero
   ↳ vertical velocity, and at phi=0
20 o1 = Orbit([1., 0., 1., 0., 0., 0.])
21
22 # Define a second, nearly identical orbit
23 o2 = Orbit([1.0001, 0., 1., 0., 0., 0.])
24
25 # Integrate the orbits for 1 Gyr
26 ts = np.linspace(0, 1., 1000) * time_in_Gyr(220., 8.) # Convert time to natural units
27 o1.integrate(ts, potential)
28 o2.integrate(ts, potential)
29
30 # Calculate the difference in R between the two orbits
31 delta_R = np.abs(o1.R(ts) - o2.R(ts))
32
33 # Plot the difference in R
34 plt.plot(ts, delta_R)
35 plt.xlabel('Time (Gyr)')
36 plt.ylabel('Difference in R')
37 plt.title('Evolution of perturbation in R')
38 plt.show()
39
40 # Check if the difference in R remains bounded
41 if np.all(delta_R < 0.1):
42     print("The orbit is Lyapunov stable.")
43 else:
44     print("The orbit is not Lyapunov stable.")

```

Followup prompt: ImportError: cannot import name 'CombinedPotential'

GPT4: I apologize for the confusion. As of my knowledge cutoff in September 2021, there is no CombinedPotential class in galpy. Instead, you can simply add the potentials together in a list, and galpy will treat this as a composite potential. Here's how you can modify the code:

...

In this code, potential is a list of the two individual potentials. When you pass this list to the integrate method, galpy will treat it as a composite potential.

```

1 import numpy as np
2 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
3 from galpy.potential import SinusoidalPotential, KeplerPotential
4 from galpy.orbit import Orbit
5 from galpy.util.bovy_conversion import time_in_Gyr
6
7 # Define the sinusoidal potential
8 sin_potential = SinusoidalPotential(amp=1., freq=1.)
9
10 # Define the black hole potential
11 # Here we assume the black hole has a mass of 4 million solar masses, which is roughly the mass of the
   ↳ black hole at the center of the Milky Way
12 # The amplitude of the KeplerPotential is GM, so we set amp=4e6 (in natural units where G=1 and the
   ↳ unit of mass is the solar mass)
13 bh_potential = KeplerPotential(amp=4e6)
14
15 # Combine the potentials
16 potential = [sin_potential, bh_potential]
17

```

```

18 # Define the initial conditions of the star (R, vR, vT, z, vz, phi)
19 # Here we assume the star starts at R=1 with zero radial velocity, circular velocity, at z=0 with zero
   ↳ vertical velocity, and at phi=0
20 o1 = Orbit([1., 0., 1., 0., 0., 0.])
21
22 # Define a second, nearly identical orbit
23 o2 = Orbit([1.0001, 0., 1., 0., 0., 0.])
24
25 # Integrate the orbits for 1 Gyr
26 ts = np.linspace(0, 1., 1000) * time_in_Gyr(220., 8.) # Convert time to natural units
27 o1.integrate(ts, potential)
28 o2.integrate(ts, potential)
29
30 # Calculate the difference in R between the two orbits
31 delta_R = np.abs(o1.R(ts) - o2.R(ts))
32
33 # Plot the difference in R
34 plt.plot(ts, delta_R)
35 plt.xlabel('Time (Gyr)')
36 plt.ylabel('Difference in R')
37 plt.title('Evolution of perturbation in R')
38 plt.show()
39
40 # Check if the difference in R remains bounded
41 if np.all(delta_R < 0.1):
42     print("The orbit is Lyapunov stable.")
43 else:
44     print("The orbit is not Lyapunov stable.")
45
46

```

SOLAR SYSTEM ORBITS

Exploration note: The goal of this exercise is to use lessons from previous exploration steps to construct and fine tune an effective zero-shot prompt on a moderate difficulty problem: comparing the orbits of the solar system planets subject to different potentials using GALPY. The difficulty of this problem does not lie in the concept itself, which is simple, but rather in the domain adaptation needed, as Galpy is a galactic physics package, and we are asking GPT4 to use it in a different, planetary context (although some examples can be found in [Bovy \(2024\)](#)).

Prompt: Problem: let us consider Earth orbiting in a 2D keplerian potential such that the mass within 1 AU is one solar mass. We need to calculate the time evolution of Earth's orbit.

Instruction: solve this problem using the GALPY 1.7.0 python package for your solution. You should use exclusively natural units, never physical units. If any units conversion is needed, always do it manually. Do not use GALPY's internal units and quantities conversion methods. Make sure to initialise Earth's orbit correctly using GALPY's orbital elements format, which is [R,vR,vT,z,vz,phi], and to choose a potential that is consistent with the physics of the problem.

Exploration note: Notice how: 1- we started with a simple well defined problem, 2- precised the package version, 3- were explicit about the unit system and their conversion (so the LLM does not use non-existent conversion methods), 4- were explicit about the expected initial conditions format (so the LLM does not use Keplerian orbital elements a,e,i mistakenly).

GPT4: Sure, I can help with that. Here's a Python script that uses the GALPY package to simulate the time evolution of Earth's orbit in a 2D Keplerian potential. ... This script initializes a Keplerian potential with the mass within 1 AU set to one solar mass. It then initializes the Earth's orbit with the correct initial conditions for a circular orbit in this potential. The orbit is then integrated for one year, and the resulting orbit is plotted in the x-y plane.

Note that in natural units, the gravitational constant G, the mass M, and the distance R are all set to 1. The velocity is set to the circular velocity $\sqrt{GM/R}$, and the time is set to the period of the orbit, 2π . This simplifies the equations and makes the code easier to understand.

```

1 # Import necessary modules
2 import numpy as np
3 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
4 from galpy.potential import KeplerPotential
5 from galpy.orbit import Orbit
6
7 # Constants in natural units
8 G = 1 # Gravitational constant
9 M = 1 # Mass within 1 AU
10 AU = 1 # Astronomical Unit
11 year = 2*np.pi # One year, in natural units
12
13 # Initialize the Keplerian potential
14 # The amp parameter is GM in natural units
15 kp = KeplerPotential(amp=G*M)
16
17 # Initial conditions for Earth's orbit
18 # [R,vR,vT,z,vz,phi]
19 # R = 1 AU, vR = 0 (circular orbit), vT = sqrt(GM/R) (circular orbit)
20 # z = 0 (2D orbit), vz = 0 (2D orbit), phi = 0 (arbitrary choice of reference direction)
21 earth_orbit = Orbit([1., 0., np.sqrt(G*M/AU), 0., 0., 0.])
22
23 # Time array for the orbit integration
24 # We'll integrate for one year, with 1000 points
25 t = np.linspace(0, year, 1000)
26
27 # Integrate the orbit
28 earth_orbit.integrate(t, kp)
29
30 # Plot the orbit
31 earth_orbit.plot(d1='x',d2='y')
32 plt.show()

```

Followup prompt: Problem: let us consider Earth orbiting in a 2D keplerian potential such that the mass within 1 AU is one solar mass. We need to calculate the time evolution of Earth's orbit and compare it to its evolution in a potential representing a 2D disk such as the mass inside 1 AU is one solar mass, instead of the entire mass being concentrated in the sun.

Instruction: solve this problem using the GALPY 1.7.0 python package for your solution. You should use exclusively natural units, never physical units. If any units conversion is needed, always do it manually. Do not use GALPY's internal units and quantities conversion methods. Make sure to initialise Earth's orbit correctly using GALPY's orbital elements format, which is $[R,vR,vT,z,vz,phi]$, and to choose a potential that is consistent with the physics of the problem.

GPT4: Sure, I can help with that. Here's a Python script that uses the GALPY package to simulate the time evolution of Earth's orbit in a Keplerian potential and a 2D disk potential.

This script first sets up the initial conditions for Earth's orbit and the two potentials. It then integrates the orbit in the two potentials over a time period of 10 years and plots the resulting orbits in the x-y plane.

...

Note that the KeplerPotential is used to represent the Keplerian potential of a point mass at the origin, while the MiyamotoNagaiPotential is used to represent the potential of a 2D disk. The scale lengths of the Miyamoto-Nagai potential are set such that the mass within 1 AU is 1 solar mass.

Please note that the choice of the Miyamoto-Nagai potential is a simplification. In reality, the mass distribution in the solar system is not a perfect disk, and the potential would be more complex. However, this should give a reasonable approximation for the purpose of this exercise.

```

1 import numpy as np
2 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
3 from galpy.potential import KeplerPotential, MiyamotoNagaiPotential
4 from galpy.orbit import Orbit
5
6 # Constants in natural units
7 G = 1 # Gravitational constant
8 M_sun = 1 # Solar mass
9 AU = 1 # Astronomical Unit
10 year = 2 * np.pi # One year, the period of Earth's orbit
11
12 # Initial conditions for Earth's orbit in GALPY's orbital elements format [R,vR,vT,z,vz,phi]
13 # Earth is 1 AU from the sun, moving in the tangential direction with velocity 2*pi AU/year
14 R_0 = AU
15 vR_0 = 0
16 vT_0 = 2 * np.pi * AU / year
17 z_0 = 0
18 vz_0 = 0
19 phi_0 = 0
20
21 # Initialize the orbit
22 o = Orbit([R_0, vR_0, vT_0, z_0, vz_0, phi_0])
23
24 # Initialize the potentials
25 # Keplerian potential for a point mass at the origin
26 kp = KeplerPotential(amp=G*M_sun)
27
28 # Miyamoto-Nagai potential for a 2D disk
29 # We set the scale lengths such that the mass within 1 AU is 1 solar mass
30 a = AU
31 b = AU
32 mnp = MiyamotoNagaiPotential(amp=G*M_sun, a=a, b=b)
33
34 # Time array for the orbit integration, from 0 to 10 years
35 t = np.linspace(0, 10*year, 1000)
36
37 # Integrate the orbit in the two potentials
38 o.integrate(t, kp)
39 o.plot(d1='x', d2='y', label='Keplerian')
40
41 o.integrate(t, mnp)
42 o.plot(d1='x', d2='y', overplot=True, label='2D disk')
43
44 plt.legend()
45 plt.show()

```

Exploration note: this is a sensible answer, although Earth's orbit diverge for the 2D potential - initial conditions combination proposed by the LLM, as the 2D potential is an order of magnitude weaker at 1 AU than the Keplerian potential. When asked to explain the reason of the divergence, the LLM gave a technically correct description of the difference between the 2 potentials, but did not give a direct correct answer to the question:

Followup prompt: why is Earth's orbit divergent in the MiyamotoNagaiPotential

GPT4: The divergence of Earth’s orbit in the MiyamotoNagaiPotential is likely due to the fact that this potential represents a disk-like mass distribution, which is quite different from the point-like mass distribution represented by the KeplerPotential.

In the KeplerPotential, all of the mass is concentrated at a single point (the Sun), and the gravitational force decreases with the square of the distance from this point. This results in a stable, elliptical orbit for the Earth.

In contrast, the MiyamotoNagaiPotential represents a disk-like mass distribution, where the mass is spread out over a large area. In this case, the gravitational force does not decrease as quickly with distance, and the force is not always directed towards a single point. This can result in a more complex and potentially unstable orbit for the Earth.

It’s also worth noting that the MiyamotoNagaiPotential is a simplified model that does not accurately represent the mass distribution in the solar system. The actual mass distribution would include not only the Sun, but also the other planets and the asteroid belt, all of which would have an effect on Earth’s orbit.

Finally, the initial conditions for the orbit might not be appropriate for the MiyamotoNagaiPotential. The initial conditions were chosen to represent an orbit around a point mass, and might not result in a stable orbit in a disk-like potential. It might be necessary to adjust the initial conditions to obtain a stable orbit in the MiyamotoNagaiPotential.

Exploration note: Now we repeat the same exercise but for all 8 planets in 3D orbits.

Exploration note: GPT4 struggled with this last exercise and needed to be coached through it. We hence tested a different approach consisting of chain-of-thought reasoning where we give step-by-step instructions to the LLM to follow. After very considerable amount of trials and errors, this is the very fine-grained prompt we found:

Prompt: Problem: let us consider all 8 solar system planets orbiting in a 3 dimensional keplerian potential such that the mass within 1 AU is one solar mass. We need to calculate the time evolution of all 8 planets 3D orbits. Think about the problem and solve it step by step. Solve this problem using the GALPY 1.7.0 python package for your solution. Do not simplify the problem in any ways and provide a complete working code. Each instruction below need to be followed. Do not for any reason skip or ignore any of them. Do not make any assumptions or simplifications without confirming whether it is acceptable.

Instructions:

1a- Discuss Galpy’s default and available systems of units. 1b- Use a natural system of units where $G=1$. If any units conversion is needed, always do it manually. Do not use GALPY’s internal units and quantities conversion methods. Do not use astropy at all. This is applicable to calculating the initial conditions, and to the parameters of the potential function. Make sure the potential parameters are in the same units as the orbits. 1d- State all the available potentials in Galpy, and explain which is the most accurate for the given problem. Use this potential exclusively.

2- State the 8 planets orbital elements (a,e,inc, etc) as defined in NASA’s planetary fact sheets.

3- Write the full, unsimplified equations that converts these elements into GALPY’s orbital elements format, which is $[R,vR,vT,z,vz,phi]$. Make sure these equations are not approximations, and are for non circular, inclined orbits.

4- Write a python function that takes the planets orbital elements as input, and use the equations derived above to output GALPY’s orbital elements format, which is $[R,vR,vT,z,vz,phi]$.

5- Initialise the 8 planets orbits correctly using GALPY’s orbital elements format, which is $[R,vR,vT,z,vz,phi]$, and to use non zero z and vz calculated directly above. Do not use placeholder values, the initial conditions should be precisely calculated.

6- Integrate the orbits for 1000 years.

7- Plot the orbits in 3D x,y,z. We should have 8 plots, one for each planet.

8- Make sure the code has error handling for edge cases.

9- Double check the units. If they are wrong start over.

10- Double check the python code, if it is wrong start over.

11- Double check the initial conditions conversion equations. If they are wrong or simplified start over.

12- Double check that this is a fully working code with no placeholders, and that the orbital elements values of NASA’s planetary fact sheets are being used. If not start over.

Finally, the complete code should be provided as one block.

Exploration note: GPT4 can thus generate fairly complex physics code, if provided extensive guidance via conditional prompting. The level of guidance required reflects various shortcomings and failure modes of the LLM, that we have more broadly and systematically explored in the main body of our analysis. It is unclear if there is practical value in defining highly-detailed, problem-specific prompts like the one above, if such prompts do not generalize to other physics problems of interest. This conclusion has led us to the simple prompting strategy described in § 2.4.