
SCIASSESS: BENCHMARKING LLM PROFICIENCY IN SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE ANALYSIS

Hengxing Cai^{1*}, Xiaochen Cai^{1*}, Junhan Chang^{1*}, Sihang Li¹, Lin Yao¹,
Changxin Wang¹, Zhifeng Gao¹, Yongge Li¹, Mujie Lin¹, Shuwen Yang¹,
Jiankun Wang¹, Yuqi Yin¹, Yaqi Li¹, Linfeng Zhang^{1,2} and Guolin Ke¹

¹DP Technology ²AI for Science Institute, Beijing

{caihengxing, caixiaochen, changjh, lisihang, yaol, wangchangxin, gaozf, liyongge,
linmujie, yangsw, wangjiankun, yinyuqi, zhanglf, kegl}@dp.tech

ABSTRACT

Recent breakthroughs in Large Language Models (LLMs) have revolutionized natural language understanding and generation, igniting a surge of interest in leveraging these technologies for the nuanced field of scientific literature analysis. Existing benchmarks, however, inadequately evaluate the proficiency of LLMs in the scientific domain, especially in scenarios involving complex comprehension and multimodal data. In response, we introduced SciAssess, a benchmark tailored for the in-depth analysis of scientific literature, crafted to provide a thorough assessment of LLMs' efficacy. SciAssess focuses on evaluating LLMs' abilities in memorization, comprehension, and analysis within scientific contexts. It includes representative tasks from diverse scientific fields, such as general chemistry, organic materials, and alloy materials. And rigorous quality control measures ensure its reliability in terms of correctness, anonymization, and copyright compliance. SciAssess evaluates leading LLMs, including GPT-4, GPT-3.5-turbo, and Gemini, identifying their strengths and areas for improvement and supporting the ongoing development of LLM applications in scientific literature analysis. SciAssess and its resources are made available at <https://sci-assess.github.io/>, offering a valuable tool for advancing LLM capabilities in scientific literature analysis.

1 Introduction

Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs), such as Llama [1], Gemini [2], and GPT-4 [3], have garnered widespread amazement due to their profound capabilities in natural language understanding and generation [4]. Evaluating these models is crucial for exploring their capability boundaries and limitations, further driving technological advancements. In response, a variety of benchmarks tailor-made for LLMs have been proposed to broaden the scope of evaluation, covering wider skill sets [5, 6, 7] and introducing more complex tasks [8, 9].

Meanwhile, in the realm of scientific research, the role of LLMs has become increasingly significant [10], particularly in the domain of scientific literature analysis [11]. Applications such as literature summarization and knowledge extraction have seen practical deployments, enhancing researchers' productivity and broadening the scope of literature that can be synthesized and utilized. However, existing benchmarks [12, 13, 14, 15] are limited in their ability to fully assess the capabilities of LLMs within the scientific field, particularly when handling complex, comprehensive understanding and multimodal data scenarios. These benchmarks often fail to simulate the intricate challenges presented by scientific texts, which include but are not limited to domain-specific jargon, intricate relational reasoning, and the integration of multimodal information. To bridge this gap, there is a critical need for the development of advanced benchmarks that accurately reflect the complexity and specificity of scientific literature.

*Equal Contribution

In addition to expanding the evaluation scope to encompass the full range of LLM capabilities in scientific fields, meticulous design is imperative for creating evaluations that yield deep insights, ensure fairness across different LLMs, and offer high utility for stakeholders interested in selecting and optimizing LLMs. Thus, the benchmark design should be founded on three critical considerations:

- **Model Ability:** A benchmark must delineate the desired capabilities and model the intrinsic relationships among them, facilitating diagnostic understanding of how these abilities can be acquired and enhanced.
- **Scope & Task:** Benchmarks should be predicated on a broad array of scientific domains to ensure a comprehensive representation of disciplines. Within each domain, the tasks selected must authentically represent the typical challenges and scenarios characteristic of that field.
- **Quality Control:** The quality of the benchmark dataset must be impeccable to serve as a dependable basis for deriving accurate, actionable, and applicable insights. Each data point, especially in the context of biomolecular information, should undergo stringent validation to confirm its accuracy and reliability.

In light of existing limitations, we introduce **SciAssess** – a new benchmark specifically designed for the scientific domain. It covers diverse tasks and question types, aiming to provide a more nuanced and rigorous evaluation of LLMs to capture the complexity of scientific inquiry. We will detail it from aforementioned three cornerstones: model ability, scope & task, and quality control.

For model ability, SciAssess evaluates it across three progressive levels: memorization, comprehension, and analysis & reasoning. Consequently, SciAssess yields nuanced and informative evaluation outcomes, pinpointing specific areas where the models under examination may fall short.

For scope and task, SciAssess encompasses a wide spectrum of tasks pertinent to various scientific domains, such as general chemistry, organic electrolytes, alloy materials, drug discovery, and biomedical content analysis. To secure a thorough and representative benchmark, the raw data is meticulously curated from public accessible scientific publications and specialized databases to ensure that SciAssess is both comprehensive and reflective of the current state of scientific inquiry.

For quality control, we ensure an equitable distribution of question types and difficulty levels to provide a comprehensive assessment tool. Moreover, we meticulously consider the provenance of the data sources, the copyright status of the data, and the presence of any sensitive information. Rigorous protocols are in place to guarantee the quality of the dataset, safeguarding its integrity and utility for robust model evaluation.

SciAssess aims to reveal the current performance of LLMs in the scientific domain, thereby identifying both their strength and weakness. Subsequently, we seek to foster the development of LLMs that are not only more adept at navigating scientific texts but also more effective in contributing to the advancement of research across various scientific disciplines. The insights gained from SciAssess could hopefully serve as a catalyst for further enhancing the capabilities of LLMs in scientific area, ultimately contributing to the acceleration of scientific discovery and innovation.

2 Benchmark Dataset

In crafting a comprehensive benchmark for evaluating LLMs within the scientific domain, we have undertaken meticulous designs considering three factors: model ability, scope & task, and quality control.

2.1 Ability Assessment Framework

Guided by the widely accepted cognitive learning processes outlined in Bloom’s Taxonomy [16], we have developed SciAssess – a benchmark specifically designed for the evaluation of LLMs within the context of scientific literature analysis. This evaluation encompasses three core competencies:

- **Memorization (L1)** refers to the model’s extensive knowledge base, which allows it to accurately answer common factual questions in science autonomously.
- **Comprehension (L2)** is the ability to precisely identify and extract key information and facts within a given text, and to comprehend them.
- **Analysis and Reasoning (L3)** demonstrate the model’s advanced capability to amalgamate extracted information with its existing knowledge base for logical reasoning and analysis, leading to well-founded conclusions or predictions.

2.2 Scope & Task

As illustrated in Table 1, our benchmark encompasses a broad spectrum of practical scientific disciplines, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of LLMs across various domains. Meanwhile, we devise five types of questions to evaluate the models: True/False questions, Multiple Choice questions, Table Extraction, Constrained Generation, and Open-ended Generation. For an in-depth understanding of these question types, including detailed descriptions and concrete examples, please refer to Appendix A.

Table 1: Overview of benchmark dataset for large language models in scientific analysis.

Domain	Task	Ability	# Questions	Question Type	Multimodal Content
General Chemistry	MMLU High-School Chemistry	L1	22	Multiple Choice	
	MMLU College Chemistry	L1	8	Multiple Choice	
	Abstract2Title	L2	254	Open-ended Generation	
	Question Extraction	L2	19	Open-ended Generation	
	Balancing Equations	L3	100	Constrained Generation	
Organic Materials	Electrolyte Solubility data extraction	L2	8	Table Extraction	Table
	Electrolyte Table QA	L2	43	Constrained Generation	
	Polymer Property Extraction	L2	15	Table Extraction	Table
Alloy Materials	Composition Extraction	L2	55	Table Extraction	Table
	Target Extraction	L2	50	Multiple Choice	
	Treatment Sequence	L2	25	True/False	
	Sample Differentiation	L3	50	Multiple Choice	
Drug Discovery	Affinity Data Extraction	L2	15	Table Extraction	Molecule, Table
	Tag to Molecule	L2	15	Constrained Generation	Molecule
	Target Extraction	L2	15	Constrained Generation	
	Molecule in Document	L3	15	True/False	Molecule
	Markush to Molecule	L3	15	Constrained Generation	Molecule

Note: The "Multimodal Content" column indicates whether the task requires the use of elements beyond the text from the literature, such as images, tables, charts, molecules, and so on.

Note on Evaluated Ability: L1 represents Memorization, L2 represents Comprehension, and L3 represents Analysis and Reasoning.

2.2.1 General Chemistry

The General Chemistry evaluation set is a comprehensive suite of tasks designed to assess the capabilities of LLMs across a range of chemistry-related skills, from foundational knowledge to applied problem-solving and research analysis. This set encompasses five distinct tasks, each targeting different aspects of chemistry and scholarly comprehension. The inclusion of these tasks provides a holistic overview of an LLM’s ability to engage with both the academic study of chemistry and the practical application of its principles. All test data are collected from OpenAI’s [evals](#) repository.

MMLU High-School & College Chemistry MMLU (Massive Multitask Language Understanding) is a new benchmark designed to measure knowledge acquired during pretraining by evaluating models exclusively in zero-shot and few-shot settings. This makes the benchmark more challenging and more similar to how we evaluate humans. We select the **high-school chemistry** and **college chemistry** from its 57 subjects to examine the memorization of knowledge.

For an example prompt and answer:

Please answer with the letter of the correct answer.

Reduction of D-xylose with NaBH₄ yields a product that is a

- A) single pure enantiomer
- B) mixture of two diastereomers in equal amounts
- C) racemic mixture
- D) meso compound

Expected Answer: D) meso compound

Abstract2Title This evaluation benchmark tests the model’s ability to generate a proper title using the abstract section of the literature. The LLM should understand the abstract section and rephrase it concisely. The conciseness of the generated title is evaluated by GPT-4, prompting like:

```
You are assessing a submitted answer on a given task based on a criterion. Here is the data:
[BEGIN DATA]
***
[Task]: {input}
***
[Submission]: {completion}
***
[Criterion]: conciseness: Does the title properly describe the provided content?
***
[END DATA]
Does the submission meet the criterion? First, write out in a step-by-step manner your reasoning
about the criterion to be sure that your conclusion is correct. Avoid simply stating the
correct answers at the outset. Then print only the single character "Y" or "N" (without quotes
or punctuation) on its own line corresponding to the correct answer. At the end, repeat just
the letter again by itself on a new line.

Reasoning:
%
```

Question Extraction The "Research Question Extraction" evaluation task for LLMs is aimed at assessing the models’ ability to identify, extract, and summarize the primary research question or questions from a scientific paper’s abstract. This task challenges the LLMs to demonstrate deep comprehension of the abstract’s content, which is a concise summary that typically includes the background, purpose, methodology, results, and conclusions of the research. The primary goal is to distill this information into a clear, concise statement or set of statements that encapsulate the core research question(s) the paper seeks to address.

This evaluation task tests several key capabilities of LLMs, including their understanding of complex and domain-specific language, ability to discern the main focus amidst potentially broad and detailed information, and proficiency in summarizing and reformulating academic content. Research question extraction requires not just surface-level processing of the text but a deeper analysis to identify the research gaps the study aims to fill, the hypotheses it tests, or the problems it seeks to solve.

This task is particularly relevant for evaluating the utility of LLMs in academic and research settings, where efficiently understanding and extracting the essence of scholarly articles can aid in literature reviews, research proposal development, and the identification of research trends and gaps. It underscores the potential of LLMs to support researchers, scholars, and students by streamlining the process of engaging with the vast and ever-growing body of scientific literature.

The answers are evaluated by GPT-4 to give scores ranging from 1 to 5, similarly prompted to that in task **Abstract2Title**.

Balancing Equations The "Balancing Chemical Equations" evaluation task for LLMs is designed to assess the LLMs’ ability to understand and apply principles of chemical stoichiometry and the laws of conservation of mass and energy. Balancing chemical equations is a fundamental skill in chemistry that involves adjusting the coefficients of the reactants and products in a chemical equation to ensure that the number of atoms for each element is the same on both sides of the equation, reflecting the conservation of matter.

This task not only tests the LLMs’ capacity to parse and interpret the symbolic language of chemistry but also evaluates their problem-solving skills and their ability to engage with domain-specific knowledge. To successfully balance a chemical equation, an LLM must identify the reactants and products, understand the stoichiometric relationships between them, and apply mathematical reasoning to find a set of coefficients that balance the equation.

```
You are ChemistGPT, which can help users balance chemical equations. For example, if the user’s
input is "C6H5COOH + O2 = CO2 + H2O", you will reply the balanced chemical equation: "2C6H5COOH
+ 15O2 = 14CO2 + 6H2O", without explanation. If you can’t balance the equation, just reply "
Unknown".

User: C6H12O6 + O2 = H2O + CO2
```

The expected answer is $C_6H_{12}O_6 + 6O_2 = 6H_2O + 6CO_2$.

2.2.2 Organic Materials

Organic materials, derived from carbon-based molecules or polymers, exhibit distinct functionalities advantageous across a spectrum of applications. Distinguished from inorganic counterparts by their modifiable properties and adaptability, these materials are vital in applications such as electronics, photonics, sensing, and energy, leveraging the vast potential of organic chemistry for technological advancements.

In this chapter, our primary focus lies on two subfields within organic functional materials: organic electrolytes and polymer materials. We aim to assess the model's ability to recognize and identify information about these materials from a variety of tasks.

Electrolyte Solubility Data Extraction Organic electrolytes are electrolytic solutions extensively used in battery technologies, especially in lithium-ion batteries. Comprising organic solvents, lithium salts, and additives when necessary, these electrolytes facilitate ion transfer within the battery, enabling energy storage and release.

Understanding solubility in organic electrolytes is crucial as it directly impacts the efficiency of electrolytic processes, product selectivity, and equipment design in various applications. In this task, we intend to investigate the LLM's capability in retrieving solubility-related tables. Considering the fact that papers related to the topic of electrolytes typically select data from various aspects to describe the system, requesting models combine multiple tables into an appropriate format for fuzzy matching turns out to be overly difficult. Therefore, we choose to focus more on examining the semantic understanding ability of LLMs, enabling the model to select the most relevant and largest table related to "solubility" from numerous alternatives, and then converting it into the specified format.

We prompt the model with:

```
You need to follow these steps to extract tables from the paper:
1. Find all tables which contain the word "solubility". If you cannot find anyone, then find all tables related to "solubility".
2. Select the table with most salts and solvents.
3. Collect all the headers of the table and generate a list.
4. If there's no "Compound"(Compound means salt or solute) and "Solvent" in the list, place them at the first two positions in the list.
5. Output the whole table in CSV format and satisfy these requirements:
  (1) Do not truncate tables using "...". Always output the complete tables.
  (2) Quote the values only if they contain commas.
  (3) Keep all the superscripts in the form like "3", "+" or "a".
  (4) Do not use "NaN" to replace the blank cells, just leave it empty.
  (5) Use "x" to replace all "×", Use "()" to replace all "()"
  (6) Always add space before and after operators like " ± ".
Remember, the table format should be correct. Here is an example, the original table is:
'''csv
Table 1 solubilities (mole fraction x),,
t/°C,NaCl,
,DMF,PCb
25,1.01 x 10-2,8.3 x 10-3
15,1.25 x 10-2,9.0 x 10-3
,CaSO4a,
,DMF,PCb
25,,5.6 x 10-2
15,1.83 x 10-1,6.2 x 10-2
'''

It should be converted to:
'''csv
Compound,Solvent,t/°C,solubilities (mole fraction x)
NaCl,DMF,25,1.01 x 10-2
NaCl,DMF,15,1.25 x 10-2
NaCl,PCb,25,8.3 x 10-3
NaCl,PCb,15,9.0 x 10-3
CaSO4a,DMF,25,
CaSO4a,DMF,15,1.83 x 10-1
CaSO4a,PCb,25,5.6 x 10-2
CaSO4a,PCb,15,6.2 x 10-2
'''
```

Electrolyte Table QA The composition and properties of organic electrolytes are crucial for battery performance, stability, and safety. Therefore, to further evaluate the model’s retrieval capabilities concerning information related to electrolytes, we posed multiple choice questions about both the components of the solution systems and the dissolution reactions, focusing on their physical and chemical properties as presented in the tables within the articles.

We prompt the model with:

You are a highly intelligent organic electrolyte researcher who answers the following multiple-choice questions correctly.
Please provide only the letter of your chosen option, such as (a), without including any additional text or details.

User: In the upper paper, what is the viscosity(mPa s) of the electrolyte with 50:50 wt% EC/DMC and 1mol L⁻¹ LiFAP under 25°C?

(a) 1.840
(b) 4.301
(c) 1.888
(d) 8.12

The expected answer is "(b)".

Polymer Materials In this task, we evaluate the efficacy of LLMs in extracting crucial attributes associated with polymer materials from scientific literature. We specifically focus on the use of conjugated polymers in organic solar cells as case studies, extracting vital values from the literature, including power conversion efficiency (PCE), open-circuit voltage (V_{OC}), and other electronic properties. By employing LLM to extract these properties, we demonstrate significant potential for the AI community in polymer modeling, such as computer-aided screening, targeted design, and optimization. To ensure robust testing, we ran 5 times with reported mean and stdev. Source data are collected from journals including *Nature Communications*, *Advanced Materials*, *Nature Photonics*, *Nature Commun.*, *J. Phys. Chem.*, and *Appl. Phys. Lett.*

We prompt the model with:

Please give a complete list of Nickname, PCE_max(%), PCE_ave(%), Voc (V), Jsc (mA cm²), FF;
* Output in CSV format with columns of those attributions, do not write units only the value like "10.5".
* If there are multiple tables, concat them. Don't give me reference or using "...", give me complete table!
* Should return all columns mentioned, if empty just return 'NaN'. Nickname should not be empty.
* Nickname should be the short name of polymers, for example: 'PCBM:PffBT4T-2OD:PC61PM' should return 'PffBT4T-2OD'.
* Only return acceptor 'PC71BM' related records.
* If with different experiment settings for the same nickname, only return the record with 'highest PCE' !
* Should find more information from the whole content, including tables, text.
* For FF use 0.xx instead of xx.x, for example: 63.0 should return 0.63 !
for example, you should return:
''' csv
Nickname,PCE_max(%),PCE_ave(%),Voc (V),Jsc (mA cm²),FF
PBTTT-C14,2.34,2.34,0.53,9.37,0.48
'''

2.2.3 Alloy Materials

Alloy materials are materials with metal characteristics that are mixed by two or more metal elements in a certain proportion, as shown in Figure 1. Alloys are widely used in aerospace, automobile manufacturing, construction, electrical appliances and other fields. By adjusting the composition and preparation process, the alloy material can achieve specific properties and requirements [17]. Therefore, it is very important to extract the alloy composition and process value from the literature for the design of the alloy.




Figure 1: Alloy heat treatment design.

In this chapter, we will investigate the capabilities of LLMs in extracting information for alloy design. We have designed a comprehensive set of tasks related to literature research, including extraction of alloy composition, extraction of process values, and determination of process sequence, as well as sample differentiation. The standard answers for all tasks in this section are manually extracted for literature from different journals and verified by another person.

Composition Extraction Extracting alloy composition information from the text or table of the article and unifying structured processing can help researchers make more effective use of historical data and provide experienced guidance for the subsequent design. This comprehensive task evaluates the LLMs' ability to extract alloy composition (containing all element content) from text and table. The extraction position of alloy elements typically falls into two cases: (1) The element content is stored in a table, as illustrated in the following Table 2; (2) The element content is implicitly indicated by the alloy name. For instance, 'Fe30Co20Ni50' represents an atomic ratio of 30% Fe, 20% Co, and 50% Ni. The objective of this task is to comprehensively extract the aforementioned information and organize it into a resultant table while calculating the matching score between the standard answer table and the extraction result table. This showcases LLM's comprehension ability to integrate, extract, and structure multi-modal information [18].

Table 2: Alloy composition example.

AlloyName	Composition	Composition	Composition	Composition	Composition	Composition
/	C	Cr	Cu	Fe	Mn	Mo
LeanDSS	0.014 %	20.85 %	0.09 %	73.38 %	1.49 %	0.30 %
StandardDSS	0.012 %	22.46 %	0.17 %	69.94 %	1.81 %	3.07 %
SuperDSS	0.013 %	24.98 %	0.20 %	63.41 %	0.48 %	4.03 %

We prompt the model with:

```

Please give a complete list of alloy names and compositions of all alloys in this paper.
If there is no alloy composition element ratio in the text, try to extract the element ratio from
the alloy name from the perspective of alloy experts.
Output in one CSV format with multi-index (2 headers), The names in the first header are 'AlloyName
' and 'Composition' forcibly. The names in the second header are element names of alloy.
Starting on the third row, list the alloy names and their corresponding element content. Based on
the number of reference commas, the element name corresponds to the content.
Please write units not in the header but in value like "50 wt.%", "30 at.%", "20 %" if with the
unit.
Such as the following example.
'''csv
AlloyName, Composition, Composition, Composition
nan, Fe, Co, Al
Fe70Co15Al13, 70 %, 15 %, 3 %
Fe70Co18, 70 %, 18 %, nan,
'''
    
```

Target Extraction The properties of the alloy are determined by the composition of the alloy and the process, which contains processing and heat treatment .etc. So the value of the extraction heat treatment is very critical. The task aims to determine the maximum temperature value for heat treatment of the alloy. To ensure accurate statistical analysis, single-choice questions have been employed in prompts.

Examples of process paragraphs [19]:

Raw text:

"Cast NiMnGa samples, of Ni50Mn30Ga20 nominal composition, were prepared by 5 arc melting cycles of the pure elements (electrolytic Ni 99.97%, electrolytic Mn 99.5% and Ga 99.99%) in stoichiometric ratio, in a non-consumable electrode furnace (Leybold LK6/45) (Leybold, Cologne, Germany). The as-cast ingot was ground to powder in a planetary ball mill (Fritsch Pulverisette 4) (FritschIdar-Oberstein, Germany) and the powder size was selected by means of sieves. Densified pellets were produced by die-pressing alloy powders with different average sizes (lower than 50 um or between 50 and 100 um) at 0.75 GPa at room temperature and sintered by thermal treatment at 925 \circ C for 24, 72, and 168 h in an Ar atmosphere, followed by slow cooling in the furnace. Sintered pellets had the following dimensions: approximately 3 mm in height and 13 mm in diameter. Table 1 provides a summary of the prepared sintered samples."

We prompt the model with:

You are a highly intelligent alloy researcher who answers the following multiple-choice questions correctly.

Only write the answer down.

User: In the upper paper, what is the maximum temperature of the heat treatment process for all alloys?

- a) 925 C
- b) 168 C
- c) 100 C
- d) 1025 C

The ideal answer is "c) 925 C".

Treatment Sequence Each process of alloy treatment has a clear sequence requirement, so it is necessary to ensure that the sequence of the extracted heat treatment process is consistent with the experimental sequence. For example, after solution treatment, the sample is further aged to ensure the internal gravitational release of the sample. This task aims to objectively analyze and evaluate the sequential relationship between two heat treatments and provide True/False answers. In addition, if a certain heat treatment name does not exist in the paper, it should be considered False. This task assesses the LLM's comprehension ability to judge treatment order from text.

The following are success case and failure case:

1. Failure case:

You are a highly intelligent alloy researcher who focuses on the heat treatment process (homogenization, annealing, aging, solution, quenching, tempering, etc.) and answers the following question correctly.

Only write the True or False.

User: In the upper paper, Is the processing heat treatment technique after the homogenization called aging?

The ideal answer is "True" but GPT-4 gives "False".

2. Success case:

You are a highly intelligent alloy researcher who focuses on the heat treatment process (homogenization, annealing, aging, solution, quenching, tempering, etc.) and answers the following question correctly.

Only write the True or False.

User: In the upper paper, Is the processing heat treatment technique before the HIP pressure called annealing?

The ideal answer is "False" and GPT-4 gives "False".

It is worth noting that, the definition of the alloy process steps is based on the complete heat treatment process, such as the two consecutive process steps (annealing and tempering), each step contains the temperature rise, constant temperature, and cooling stages. Under this definition, the previous process of tempering should be judged to be annealing, rather than annealing cooling sub-stages.

Sample Differentiation Alloys with the same composition but treated by different processes are considered different samples because they have different properties. Therefore, the distinction between different samples needs to consider the differences in their processes. This task is designed to comprehensively judge the number of different alloy samples proposed or studied by the authors. The task mode is multiple-choice questions. This comprehensive task assesses the analysis and reasoning ability of the LLMs to alloy distinctions from text.

The following example is process paragraphs where the sample are treated by different processes [20]:

Raw text:

"An induction furnace was used to produce the Zn-21Al-2Cu alloy by melting proper amounts of Zn (99.99%), Al (99.99%) and Cu (99.96%). The alloy was melted in a graphite crucible exposed to air and poured into cylindrical bars of 19 mm in diameter and 35 mm in length. After that, some bars were homogenized at 350 °C for 24h in the air. Cast and homogenized samples were subjected to an equal channel angular extrusion (ECAP) in a die with two cylindrical channels with a diameter of 15.8mm. The inner intersecting angle (γ) was 90° and the outer angle (γ) was 36°. All samples were extruded by two and six passes with a ram velocity of 5 mm/min and by using B. route. The lubricant used was MoS, and it was applied to both channels on each pass. "

We prompt the model with:

You are a highly intelligent alloy researcher who answers the following multiple-choice questions correctly.
Only write the answer down.

User: Materials with the same components but processed through different techniques are considered different alloys because they possess distinct properties. In the upper paper, please provide a count of all the alloys proposed and discussed by the authors.

a) 3
b) 0
c) 2
d) 1

The ideal answer is "d) 1".

2.2.4 Drug Discovery

In this chapter, we examine the LLMs' capabilities in the realm of drug discovery. We devise a comprehensive set of tasks related to *patent and literature research*, ranging from affinity data extraction and patent coverage.

Affinity Data Extraction This comprehensive task evaluates the LLM's ability to extract an affinity table (containing molecules' tags, SMILES, and affinity to different targets in bioassays). This evaluation task tests several key capabilities of LLMs, including their understanding of complex and domain-specific language, and understanding of molecules and tables. Affinity data extraction requires not just surface-level processing of the text but a deeper analysis to match different modalities.

An example output is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Example output of affinity data extraction task

Compound	Name	SMILES	Affinities	
			Cytotoxicity in 2.2.15 Cells (IC50)	Anti-HBV Activity in 2.2.15 Cells (EC50)
1	/	<chem>C1[C@H](O[C@H]([C@H]1F)N2C=NC3=C(N=CN=C32)N)CO</chem>	>200000 nM	>10000 nM
2	/	<chem>C1[C@H](O[C@H]([C@H]1F)N2C=CC(=NC2=O)N)CO</chem>	>200000 nM	4000 nM
3	/	<chem>CC1=CN(C(=O)NC1=O)[C@H]2C[C@@H]([C@H](O2)CO)N=[N+]=[N-]</chem>	NA	NA

We prompt the model with:

```
You are an expert in the field of pharmaceutical chemistry, and your task is to summarize the results of activity assays from an article in a tabular format. Please follow these steps to complete the task:

1. Determine if the article includes an activity assay. If it does, locate the section(s) presenting the assay results, which are usually in one or more tables.
2. Compile all the activity assay results into a single table. You may use multiple columns to represent different conditions or outcomes of various experiments.
3. Identify the names or codes used in the table, such as Example 1 or Compound A, and find the corresponding sections in the article that mention these substances. Extract the full name and SMILES notation of each substance.
4. Compile the names and SMILES notations of each substance in the table. Output in CSV format with multi-index (Affinities, protein/cell line), write units not in the header but in the value like "10.5 \textmu M". Quote the value if it has comma! For example:
'''csv
Compound,Name,SMILES,Affinities,Affinities,Affinities,Affinities
,,,5HT1A (IC50),5HT1D (IC50),5HT-UT (IC50),5HT1E (<affinity type>)
"5a","Aspirin","CC(=O)Oc1ccccc1C(=O)O",2.0 nM,8.0 nM,12.6 nM,>1000 nM
'''

5. If there are multiple tables, concat them. Don't give me reference or using "...", give me complete table!
```

The dataset is curated from [PubChem BioAssays](#) to cover literature from different journals and years. Since the original dataset is organized by bio-assay numbers, we merge the source data according to their DOIs, and carefully select 15 papers from these DOIs. The papers have a large coverage of protein targets and cell lines, in the meanwhile have different display formats of the tables.

In the following tasks, we divide the affinity table extraction task logically, into several direct sub-tasks.

Tag2Molecule This task evaluates the model's ability to find correct SMILES given its tag in a document. Usually, a molecule is shown in an image of its structure and tag below it. The LLM should recognize both the two and understand the connection.

```
System: You are ChemistGPT, can help user get SMILES formula from documents. Give me only the answer without explanation. If you can't answer the completion, just reply "Unknown"
User: What's the SMILES formula of molecule "Sumatriptan"?
Assistant:
```

Target Extraction This task evaluates the model's ability to find all related targets (proteins or cell lines) of the bioassays given a document. The extracted targets are compared to ideal answers by asking GPT-4:

```
You are comparing a submitted answer to an expert answer on a given question. Here is the data:

[BEGIN DATA]
*****
[Question]: Please show which targets (proteins / cell lines) this paper's experiments go against.
```

```
*****
[Expert]: {ideal}
```

```
*****
[Submission]: {completion}
```

```
*****
[END DATA]
```

Compare the factual content of the submitted answer with the expert answer. Ignore any differences in style, grammar, or punctuation.

The submitted answer may either be a subset or superset of the expert answer, or it may conflict with it. Determine which case applies. Answer the question by selecting one of the following options:

- (A) The submitted answer is a subset of the expert answer and is fully consistent with it.
- (B) The submitted answer is a superset of the expert answer and is fully consistent with it.
- (C) The submitted answer contains all the same details as the expert answer.
- (D) There is a disagreement between the submitted answer and the expert answer.
- (E) The answers differ, but these differences don't matter from the perspective of factuality.

Then the answer is given a score according to the model-selected choice: 0.5 for A, 0.75 for B, 1.0 for C, 0.0 for D, and 0.75 for E.

Molecule in Document This comprehensive task evaluates the model's ability to judge whether the molecule (represented by SMILES) is covered in a document. The LLM should recognize all the Markush formulas and their substituents, and then judge whether the required molecule is covered.

```
You are ChemistGPT, which can help users search molecules from documents. You are given a SMILES
formula of a molecule and should judge whether it is in the document.
If the molecules are given by the Markush formula (containing R groups), You need to 1) analyze the
skeletons of the provided molecule and the molecule in the literature or patent, and 2)
compare the variable values of the molecular structure with the range of variable values given
in the patent, to determine whether the molecule is covered by the literature or patent.
Answer in "Yes" or "No".
```

```
User: [ document.pdf ] Does the molecule "CC(CCCCCC1=CC(=C(C(=C1)OC)OC)OC)CCC(C2=CC=CS2)O" appear
in the document?
```

Markush2Molecule This task evaluates the model's ability to get correct SMILES given Markush formula (in CXSMILES pattern) and substituents.

```
System: You are ChemistGPT, can help user insert substituents into markush formula to get SMILES
formula (removing Hs). For example, if user's input is "*CCCC* |$R1_p|;;;R2_p$|, R1 = OMe, R2
= NH2", you will reply the completed SMILES: "COCCCCN", without explanation. If you can't
answer the completion, just reply "Unknown"
```

```
User: *C(*)CC(*)CC* |$A;Pol_p|;;;Q_e;M_p$|, A = H, Pol = NH2, Q = OH, M = OLi
Assistant:
```

2.3 Data Quality, Privacy, and Copyright Compliance

To ensure the integrity and fairness of our dataset, meticulous steps were undertaken in its preparation and validation:

- **Expert Validation:** To guarantee the accuracy and reliability of SciAssess, all tasks have been subjected to multiple rounds of cross-validation by domain experts to ensure the correctness of dataset labels and maintains high-quality standards across domains.
- **Screening and Anonymization:** SciAssess underwent thorough screening for sensitive information. Any potential sensitive data identified was either removed or anonymized to protect privacy and ensure data security.
- **Copyright Compliance:** We actively enforced rigorous copyright review procedures across all documents and data used, ensuring SciAssess adheres to legal standards and ethical norms without infringing on intellectual property rights.

3 Experiment

3.1 Experiment Setup

Models: We have evaluated leading LLMs' ability on scientific literature analysis:

- **GPT-4 [3]:** OpenAI's GPT-4 excels in text generation and comprehension, augmented with capabilities for image processing, code interpretation, and information retrieval. These features make it adept at handling the complexities of scientific texts, positioning it as a versatile tool for scientific research. Since the newest version of GPT-4 can write the answer with the code interpreter, we use a chain-of-thought trick for GPT-4 to extract its final result. The CoT prompt is listed in Appendix B.
- **GPT-3.5:** Preceding GPT-4, GPT-3.5 by OpenAI distinguishes itself with adept language processing skills, enabling effective engagement with complex texts.
- **Gemini [2]:** Google DeepMind's Gemini model excels in multimodal comprehension, integrating text, code, image, and audio analysis. Particularly notable is its performance on the MMLU test, where Gemini Ultra outperforms human benchmarks. Its adeptness at understanding and synthesizing complex scientific content makes it an advanced tool for academic research, offering insights and enhancing productivity in scientific literature analysis.

Baseline Workflow: SciAssess is predicated on a refined adaptation of the framework provided by openai/evals (<https://github.com/openai/evals>). We have incorporated additional functionalities such as model invocation (*e.g.*, Gemini), bespoke tasks and evaluation metrics, datasets, and a PDF processing module, with the intent to release the detailed code shortly. The majority of SciAssess center around scholarly literature and we have employed distinct methodologies for processing literature PDFs:

For GPT-4, we utilize the web-based ChatGPT4 interface. We directly upload the original PDF files to the chat interface and pose queries, thereby leveraging OpenAI's built-in PDF processing capabilities.

For GPT-3.5, we process PDFs using PyPDF2 to convert them into text, subsequently feeding the plain text into the models.

For Gemini, given its proficiency in concurrently processing text and images, we initially employed PyPDF2 to extract text from the PDFs. Subsequently, we use PyMuPDF to retrieve images within the documents, and both text and images are then relayed to the model.

3.2 Results and Analysis

In this section, we analyze the performance of LLMs across various scientific domains, focusing on their capabilities in memorization, comprehension, and analysis, and comparing their performance on tasks both involving and excluding multimodal content.

3.2.1 Model Performance Overview

The overall performance comparison of LLMs across various scientific domains, as summarized in Table 4, reveals the distinct strengths and weaknesses of each model. GPT-4 consistently outperforms the other models in most domains, securing the highest overall average rank. This demonstrates its superior adaptability and understanding of complex scientific literature. GPT-3.5, while trailing behind GPT-4, demonstrates competence across a broad spectrum of tasks, indicating its robustness. Gemini, despite its third-place finish in the overall rankings, showcases its strength in certain tasks, suggesting potential areas for targeted improvements.

3.2.2 Domain-Specific Performances

GPT-4 excels in General Chemistry and Alloy Materials, demonstrating its proficiency in tasks demanding deep domain knowledge and complex analytical skills. Gemini particularly shines in tasks related to organic materials, notably in the "Electrolyte Table QA" task, where it secures the first position with an accuracy rate of 23.3%. This performance highlights its proficiency in handling detailed and nuanced information in specialized domains. Despite Gemini's third-place position in overall rankings, this achievement suggests that it may hold a distinct advantage in specific tasks, such as those requiring intensive information extraction. In the field of drug discovery, all models demonstrate a need for improvement outside of the "Target Extraction" task, especially in the "Tag to Molecule" and "Markush to Molecule" tasks, where all models scored zero. This outcome highlights the challenges faced in this domain and points towards directions for further optimization. However, it is noteworthy that in the "Affinity Data Extraction" task, GPT-3.5 leads with a value recall rate of 35.9%, showcasing its strong capability in understanding and extracting drug affinity data.

Table 4: Performance Comparison of LLMs Across Various Scientific Domains.

Domain	Task	Ability	Metric	GPT-4	GPT-3.5	Gemini
General Chemistry	MMLU High-School Chemistry	L1	Accuracy	0.591 (1st)	0.455 (2nd)	0.409 (3rd)
	MMLU College Chemistry	L1	Accuracy	0.375 (1st)	0.25 (2nd)	0.125 (3rd)
	Abstract2Title	L2	Model-graded Score	0.99 (1st)	0.397 (3rd)	0.885(2nd)
	Question Extraction	L2	Model-graded Score	4.638 (2nd)	5.0 (1st)	3.895 (3rd)
	Balancing Equations	L2	Accuracy	0.32 (2nd)	0.28 (3rd)	0.55 (1st)
Domain Average Rank		/	/	1.40	2.20	2.40
Organic Materials	Electrolyte Solubility data extraction	L2	Value Recall	0.365 (3rd)	0.393 (1st)	0.390 (2nd)
	Electrolyte Table QA	L2	Accuracy	0.163 (2nd)	0.140 (3rd)	0.233 (1st)
	Polymer Property Extraction	L2	Value Recall	0.762 (1st)	0.286 (3rd)	0.506 (2nd)
Domain Average Rank		/	/	2.00	2.33	1.67
Alloy Materials	Composition Extraction	L2	Value Recall	0.879 (1st)	0 (3rd)	0.458 (2nd)
	Target Extraction	L2	Accuracy	0.725 (1st)	0.320 (2nd)	0.260 (3rd)
	Treatment Sequence	L2	Accuracy	0.521 (3rd)	0.667 (1st)	0.625 (2nd)
	Sample Differentiation	L3	Accuracy	0.528 (1st)	0.177 (2nd)	0.059 (3rd)
Domain Average Rank		/	/	1.50	2.00	2.50
Drug Discovery	Affinity Data Extraction	L2	Value Recall	0.274 (2nd)	0.359 (1st)	0.175 (3rd)
	Tag to Molecule	L2	Accuracy	0.0 (1st)	0.0 (1st)	0.0 (1st)
	Target Extraction	L2	Model-graded Score	0.8 (1st)	0.1 (2nd)	0.575 (3rd)
	Molecule in Document	L3	Accuracy	0.0 (3rd)	0.25 (2nd)	0.5 (1st)
	Markush to Molecule	L3	Accuracy	0.0 (1st)	0.0 (1st)	0.0 (1st)
Domain Average Rank		/	/	1.60	1.40	1.80
Overall Average Rank		/	/	1.58	1.94	2.11

3.2.3 Abilities Comparison

Table 5: Comparative Rankings of LLMs on Memorization, Comprehension, and Analysis Abilities

Model	GPT-4	GPT-3.5	Gemini
L1 Average Rank	1.00	2.00	3.00
L2 Average Rank	1.64	1.90	2.18
L3 Average Rank	1.75	2.00	1.50

Table 5 shows the average rankings of different models in memory ability, comprehension ability, and analysis ability.

Memorization (L1) reflects a model’s capacity to recall information it has previously learned. In this capacity, GPT-4 stands out with the highest average ranking, demonstrating its superiority. For instance, in the "MMLU High-School Chemistry" task, GPT-4 showcased its accurate recall of foundational chemistry knowledge, leading other models with an accuracy rate of 0.591. This advantage of GPT-4 can likely be attributed to its vast training dataset, enabling it to cover a broader range of scientific knowledge domains.

Comprehension (L2) measures a model’s understanding of complex texts and its capability to extract key information. GPT-4 continues to lead in comprehension ability, exhibiting exceptional performance across multiple tasks. For example, in the "Abstract2Title" task, GPT-4 scored a model-graded score of 0.99, ranking at the top and showing its profound understanding of the text content and accurate generation of relevant titles.

Analysis and Reasoning (L3) refer to a model’s capacity to handle complex problems, reason, and generate solutions. In this domain, Gemini’s top-average ranking highlights its distinctive edge, which may stem from the innovative design of its architecture, uniquely enabling it to excel in analytical tasks.

Table 6: Impact of Multimodal Content on Model’s Rankings

Model	GPT-4	GPT-3.5	Gemini
Average Rank with Multimodal Content	1.71	1.71	1.71
Average Rank without Multimodal Content	1.50	2.10	2.40

3.2.4 Influence of Multimodal Content

The inclusion of multimodal content significantly influences the models’ performance, as evident from Table 6. "Multimodal Content" refers to tasks requiring elements beyond text, such as images, tables, charts, and molecules. The consistent rankings for GPT-4, GPT-3.5, and Gemini in handling multimodal content demonstrate their equivalent proficiency in processing and understanding various data types. For instance, in the drug discovery domain, the models’ limited performance can largely be attributed to the prevalence of tasks involving complex multimodal content, such as molecular structures and pharmacological tables. This underscores the critical role of multimodal integration and analysis within these models, pointing towards the necessity for ongoing enhancements in this area.

4 Conclusion and Future Work

The SciAssess project aims to rigorously assess the capabilities of LLMs in the field of scientific literature analysis. This benchmark covers several specific scientific domains: General Chemistry, Organic Materials, Alloy Materials, and Drug Discovery, focusing on evaluating LLMs’ core competencies in memorization, comprehension, and analysis within these contexts. Through detailed evaluations of leading models, including GPT-4, GPT-3.5-turbo, and Gemini, our research has illuminated their strengths and pinpointed areas requiring enhancement, thus providing robust support for the continued development of LLMs in the realm of scientific research. Moving forward, we intend to broaden the scientific domains included in our benchmark tests and incorporate more complex multi-modal datasets, significantly improving the benchmark’s utility and efficacy. This initiative aims to furnish more accurate guidance and bolster the application of LLMs in scientific research and innovation.

References

- [1] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurélien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *CoRR*, abs/2302.13971, 2023.
- [2] Gemini Team Google. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. *CoRR*, abs/2312.11805, 2023.
- [3] OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023.
- [4] Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott M. Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Túlio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4. *CoRR*, abs/2303.12712, 2023.
- [5] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- [6] Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *CoRR*, abs/2304.06364, 2023.
- [7] Yuzhen Huang, Yuzhuo Bai, Zhihao Zhu, Junlei Zhang, Jinghan Zhang, Tangjun Su, Junteng Liu, Chuancheng Lv, Yikai Zhang, Jiayi Lei, Yao Fu, Maosong Sun, and Junxian He. C-eval: A multi-level multi-discipline chinese evaluation suite for foundation models. *CoRR*, abs/2305.08322, 2023.
- [8] Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R. Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, Agnieszka Kluska, Aitor Lewkowycz, Akshat Agarwal, Alethea Power, Alex Ray, Alex Warstadt, Alexander W. Kocurek, Ali Safaya, Ali Tazarv, Alice Xiang, Alicia Parrish, Allen Nie, Aman Hussain, Amanda Askell, Amanda Dsouza, Ameet Rahane, Anantharaman S. Iyer, Anders Andreassen, Andrea Santilli, Andreas Stuhlmüller, Andrew M. Dai, Andrew La, Andrew K. Lampinen, Andy Zou, Angela Jiang, Angelica Chen, Anh Vuong, Animesh Gupta, Anna Gottardi, Antonio Norelli, Anu Venkatesh, Arash Gholamidavoodi, Arfa Tabassum, Arul Menezes, Arun Kirubarajan, Asher Mullokandov, Ashish Sabharwal, Austin Herrick, Avia Efrat, Aykut Erdem, Ayla Karakas, and et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *CoRR*, abs/2206.04615, 2022.
- [9] Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Denny Zhou, and Jason Wei. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. In *ACL (Findings)*, pages 13003–13051. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [10] Microsoft Research AI4Science and Microsoft Azure Quantum. The impact of large language models on scientific discovery: a preliminary study using GPT-4. *CoRR*, abs/2311.07361, 2023.
- [11] Yizhen Zheng, Huan Yee Koh, Jiaxin Ju, Anh T. N. Nguyen, Lauren T. May, Geoffrey I. Webb, and Shirui Pan. Large language models for scientific synthesis, inference and explanation. *CoRR*, abs/2310.07984, 2023.
- [12] Yuzhen Huang, Yuzhuo Bai, Zhihao Zhu, Junlei Zhang, Jinghan Zhang, Tangjun Su, Junteng Liu, Chuancheng Lv, Yikai Zhang, Yao Fu, et al. C-eval: A multi-level multi-discipline chinese evaluation suite for foundation models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [13] Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06364*, 2023.
- [14] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020.
- [15] Liangtai Sun, Yang Han, Zihan Zhao, Da Ma, Zhennan Shen, Baocai Chen, Lu Chen, and Kai Yu. Scieval: A multi-level large language model evaluation benchmark for scientific research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.13149*, 2023.
- [16] Davut Kce, M. Aydin, and C. Yldz. Krathwohl, d. r. (2002). a revision of bloom’s taxonomy: An overview. theory into practice, 41 (4), 212- 218. 2009.
- [17] Pierre Caron and T Khan. Improvement of creep strength in a nickel-base single-crystal superalloy by heat treatment. *Materials Science and Engineering*, 61(2):173–184, 1983.
- [18] Dong-Cho Kim, Tomo Ogura, Ryosuke Hamada, Shotaro Yamashita, and Kazuyoshi Saida. Prediction of reversible α/γ phase transformation in multi-pass weld of fe-cr-ni ternary alloy by phase-field method. *Journal of Advanced Joining Processes*, 4:100067, 2021.

- [19] Francesca Villa, Adelaide Nespoli, Carlo Fanciulli, Francesca Passaretti, and Elena Villa. Physical characterization of sintered NiMnGa ferromagnetic shape memory alloy. *Materials*, 13(21):4806, 2020.
- [20] José Luis Hernández-Rivera, Esperanza Elizabeth Martínez Flores, Emmanuel Ramírez Contreras, Jorge Garcia Rocha, Jose de Jesus Cruz-Rivera, and Gabriel Torres-Villasenor. Evaluation of hardening and softening behaviors in Zn-21Al-2Cu alloy processed by equal channel angular pressing. *Journal of Materials Research and Technology*, 6(4):329–333, 2017.

Appendix

A Question Type

Five types of questions are devised to evaluate the models: True/False questions, Multiple Choice questions, Open-ended Generation, Constrained Generation, and Table Extraction. Each question type is accompanied by a detailed description and representative examples, along with the corresponding metrics used for assessment. For convenience, the input in each example is simplified, and its instruction is omitted.

- **True/False Questions**

True/False questions offer a straightforward yet effective means of evaluating a model's basic comprehension and ability to verify factual accuracy. They require models to provide a binary True/False response to a certain statement based on their understanding of the information or their own knowledge.

Metric

Accuracy

Example

Input: Does "CNS(=O)(=O)CC1=CC2=C(CC=C1)NC=C2CCN(C)C" appear in the document?

Output: Yes (True)

- **Multiple Choice Questions**

Multiple Choice questions assess a model's ability to select the correct answer from a set of options (Single or Multiple Choice), testing its knowledge and reasoning. These questions range from basic factual inquiries to more complex scenarios requiring understanding and analysing information.

Metric

Accuracy

Example

Input: A 0.217 g sample of HgO (molar mass = 217 g) reacts with excess iodide ions according to the reaction shown above. Titration of the resulting solution requires how many mL of 0.10 M HCl to reach equivalence point? A. 1mL B. 10mL C. 20mL D. 50mL

Output: C

- **Table Extraction Tasks:**

Table Extraction tasks are designed to evaluate a model's proficiency in extracting, summarizing and structuring data from understanding and memorizing given article. Model is usually given an article and is required to collect certain information from it, and presented in the form of a table.

Metric:

Value Recall: The recall rate for each value, which checks whether every cell value in the expected table appears in the output table.

Example:

Input:

Given an article While reading this paper, please summarize a complete list of the names and abbreviations of all solutions.

Output: (The original return is in CSV format, which is converted to intuitive display here)

Compound	Solvent	Solution	aFC ^a	aFEMC	aFC/aFEMC	XFC/XFEMC ^b
LiPF6	FEC:FEMC	1:04:04 LiPF6:FEC:FEMC	0.56	0.44	1.26	1.42
LiPF6	DFEC:FEMC	1:04:04 LiPF6:DFEC:FEMC	0.13	0.48	0.28	0.23

- **Constrained Generation:**

Constrained Generation tasks are designed to evaluate a model's ability to generate text within specific formats or rules. Contrasting with the open-ended generation, this type of task usually has a standard answer.

Metric

Constrained Generation evaluate results based on their accuracy with the standard answers. We usually process the generated results to maintain consistency with the standard answer (such as the normalized molecular smiles formula), or compare text similarity to determine whether they are same with the standard answer.

Example:

(For task balancing equations)

Input: NaOH + FeCl₃ = Fe(OH)₃ + NaCl

Output: 3NaOH + FeCl₃ = Fe(OH)₃ + 3NaCl

• **Open-ended Generation:**

Open-ended Generation challenge the model to generate responses based on its understanding, synthesis, and extrapolation capabilities, without being confined to predefined options or format. This type of task usually does not have a standard answer. Questions can cover explanations, hypotheses, data interpretations, or predictions. Note that open generation does not mean unrestricted generation tasks, and typically requires the model to generate certain specific content, such as generating titles or summaries, etc.

Metric

Model-graded (GPT-4) score, assessing the relevance, accuracy, and completeness of the model’s response.

Example:

(For task Abstract2Title)

Input: Perovskite solar cells (PSCs) are a great promise to solve the problem of energy demand. However, one of the most important factors to obtain higher yields of high efficiency photovoltaic devices is to produce high quality methyl ammonium lead iodide (MAPbI₃) films. In this work, strategies such as solvent engineering, Lewis adduction formation and the incorporation of Imidazolium cation (Im⁺) were implemented to improve the microstructural quality of the films. The mixed MA99Im1 film displayed a more homogeneous microstructure compared to the original MAPbI₃ film, as well as an improved power conversion efficiency, with a value of 17%.

Output: Improving performance of perovskites solar cells using solvent engineering, via Lewis adduct of MAI-DMSO-PbI₂ and incorporation of imidazolium cation

B Chain-of-Thought Implementation

Chain-of-thought is implemented in a two-step manner. For any chat prompt, the first step is COT reasoning, for example:

```
System: You are ChemistGPT, which can help the user insert substituents into the Markush formula to get SMILES formula (removing Hs). For example, if the user's input is "*CCCC* |$R1_p;;;;;R2_p$ |, R1 = OMe, R2 = NH2", you will reply with completed SMILES: "COCCCCN", without explanation. If you can't answer the completion, just reply "Unknown".

User: *C(*)CC(*)CC* |$A;;Pol_p;;;;Q_e;;;;M_p$|, A = H, Pol = NH2, Q = OH, M = OLi

**Assistant: Before answering, reason in a step-by-step manner to get the right answer, then conclude with the answer.**

Assistant:
```

The second step is COT extraction:

```
System: You are ChemistGPT, which can help the user insert substituents into the Markush formula to get SMILES formula (removing Hs). For example, if the user's input is "*CCCC* |$R1_p;;;;;R2_p$ |, R1 = OMe, R2 = NH2", you will reply with completed SMILES: "COCCCCN", without explanation. If you can't answer the completion, just reply "Unknown".

User: *C(*)CC(*)CC* |$A;;Pol_p;;;;Q_e;;;;M_p$|, A = H, Pol = NH2, Q = OH, M = OLi

Assistant: Before answering, reason in a step-by-step manner to get the right answer, then conclude with the answer.

Assistant: <Answer from LLM>

Assistant: Given the above reasoning, the answer in the format requested by the question is:

Assistant:
```