

# Classification of geological borehole descriptions using a domain adapted large language model

Hossein Ghorbanfekr<sup>\*1</sup>, Pieter Jan Kerstens<sup>1</sup>, and Katrijn Dirix<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Boeretang 200, Mol  
B-2400, Belgium

July 17, 2024

## Abstract

Geological borehole descriptions contain detailed textual information about the composition of the subsurface. However, their unstructured format presents significant challenges for extracting relevant features into a structured format. This paper introduces GEOBERTje: a domain adapted large language model trained on geological borehole descriptions from Flanders (Belgium) in the Dutch language. This model effectively extracts relevant information from the borehole descriptions and represents it into a numeric vector space. Showcasing just one potential application of GEOBERTje, we finetune a classifier model on a limited number of manually labeled observations. This classifier categorizes borehole descriptions into a main, second and third lithology class. We show that our classifier outperforms both a rule-based approach and GPT-4 of OpenAI. This study exemplifies how domain adapted large language models enhance the efficiency and accuracy of extracting information from complex, unstructured geological descriptions. This offers new opportunities for geological analysis and modeling using vast amounts of data.

**Keywords:** borehole description, classification, large language model, natural language processing

---

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: hossein.ghorbanfekr@vito.be

# 1 Introduction

Geological borehole descriptions represent a fundamental data source in the field of geology. Collected over many decades, often at great financial expense by geological survey organizations, these borehole descriptions contain detailed textual descriptions of the composition of the subsurface [Lawley et al., 2023]. They are fundamental for a wide range of applications, from mineral exploration to groundwater management and geotechnical engineering. They are also one of the principal data sources for the construction of geological (3D) models [Kaufmann and Martin, 2009]. Although they contain vast amounts of scientific information, they are often stored in poorly accessible (sometimes even analogue) and linguistically unstructured formats. This means that utilizing these descriptions in models or other applications generally necessitates laborious manual work. Such a requirement substantially hampers utilization of their full potential. The most common way to overcome this is to apply rule-based scripting or manual labelling to transform the unstructured text into lithology classes [Hademenos et al., 2019, Stafleu and Dubelaar, 2016, Van Haren et al., 2023].

Taking advantage of recent developments in large language models (LLM), this study develops GEOBERTje: a domain adapted LLM trained on geological borehole descriptions in the Dutch language from Flanders (Belgium). We subsequently finetune a classifier to perform a lithology classification task.

## Adoption of LLMs in the field of geosciences

Emerging advances in the development of large language models have significantly impacted the field of natural language processing (NLP) by enabling machines to generate and comprehend human-like texts. In particular, recent studies have been exploring the potential of NLP to capture geological information from unstructured text. Both non contextual models with static word embeddings such as Word2Vec and GloVe are employed [Lawley et al., 2022, Padarian and Fuentes, 2019] to this aim, as well as more advanced contextual transformer architectures [Vaswani et al., 2017b] (e.g., BERT [Devlin et al., 2018]). Transformers have reshaped the NLP domain by introducing an innovative architecture that outperforms traditional methods like recurrent neural networks (RNNs) both in terms of accuracy and scalability [Vaswani et al., 2017a,

Howard and Ruder, 2018]. Unlike RNNs, which process inputs sequentially, transformers employ a self-attention mechanism that allows them to dynamically weigh the importance of different words in a sequence. This mechanism facilitates the generation of contextual embeddings, allowing the model to concentrate on various segments of the input sequence when producing output representations. Consequently, transformers capture long-range dependencies more effectively than RNNs. These advancements have democratized access to pretrained contextual large language models and catalyzed their adoption across diverse domains (including geosciences).

The main goal of many of the NLP studies within the field of geology is to perform text mining on geological archives and annotate them with meaningful semantic entities. For this purpose, named entity recognition (NER) pathways are frequently developed [Heaven et al., 2020, Enkhsaikhan et al., 2021b, Morgenthaler et al., 2022, Qiu et al., 2019]. In addition, LLM's have been applied to a range of downstream tasks, such as article summarization [Ma et al., 2022], translation [Gomes et al., 2021], prospectivity modeling [Lawley et al., 2023] and mineral exploration [Enkhsaikhan et al., 2021a]. Although English remains the reference language in much of this research, similar applications can be found in other languages such as Chinese [Li et al., 2021, Qiu et al., 2018] and Portuguese [Consoli et al., 2020, Gomes et al., 2021].

As far as the classification of borehole descriptions is concerned, the study by Fuentes et al. [2020] is of specific relevance. In their study, a GloVe model trained on a large corpus of articles in the geosciences domain is used to obtain embeddings of drill core descriptions. Next, a multilayer perceptron neural network is trained to classify them. Finally, they created 3D maps by interpolating the embeddings. Fuentes et al. [2020] utilize a non-contextual model with static word embeddings.

## **The advantages of domain adaptation**

Research has shown that LLMs like BERT, primarily trained on general English language corpora, face inherent limitations when applied to domain-specific classification tasks involving texts in other languages. The primary reason is that these models have not been exposed to sufficient examples of technical language in the target language. This limits their effectiveness to recognize and process such texts. Monolingual models such as Camembert [Martin et al., 2019] for

French and BERTje [De Vries et al., 2019] for Dutch outperform the multilingual BERT model on downstream NLP tasks [De Vries et al., 2019, Martin et al., 2019]. More recently, ChatGPT represents a significant advancement in the field of natural language processing with its advanced generative capabilities and ease of accessibility. Its design allows for flexible interaction through prompt engineering: a method that requires considerably less technical expertise compared to the complexities involved in finetuning models like BERT. This accessibility makes ChatGPT an attractive option for scientists who may not specialize in machine learning or who do not have access to specialized GPUs. This provides a more user-friendly approach to harness the power of large language models for domain-specific tasks [OpenAI et al., 2024].

## Scope

In this study we develop GEOBERTje: a domain adapted version of BERTje [De Vries et al., 2019] (a pretrained Dutch BERT model). The domain adaptation is achieved by transfer learning on a large corpus of 283000 unlabeled Flemish borehole descriptions. Subsequently, we use a much smaller set of approximately 2500 labeled samples to fine tune this model to a lithology classifier that is able to extract multiple lithology classes from borehole descriptions. We compare the performance of the classifier based on GEOBERTje with those obtained using (a) traditional rule-based scripting and (b) GPT-4 of OpenAI through prompt engineering. Our study exemplifies how the adoption of domain-specific LLMs can provide significant added value in the field of geology by enhancing the efficiency and accuracy with which unstructured geological datasets can be analyzed.

## 2 Data and setting

The importance of geological data, combined with insights of expert-geologists, to develop robust and accurate NLP models for interpreting lithological descriptions cannot be overstated. High-quality, interpreted, geological data provides the foundational knowledge and context necessary for training and finetuning machine learning models, ensuring they can effectively interpret and differentiate between various lithological features. In the following sections we discuss the study area, the available data sources in Flanders, and the preprocessing steps undertaken to prepare

the training, validation and test set for this study.

## 2.1 Borehole descriptions in Flanders

The majority of Flemish borehole descriptions reside in Databank Ondergrond Vlaanderen (DOV<sup>1</sup>), which is a partnership among various government entities concerned with Flanders' subsurface. Initiated in 1996, it is now the main data holder for open Flemish data and information concerning geology, natural resources, soil, hydrogeology, geotechnical characteristics and groundwater licenses. It contains digitized archives of several federal, regional and research institutes and is constantly updated with new data [De Nil et al., 2020]. DOV offers unparalleled access to Flanders' subsurface information with a relational database backbone, a web service for interactive querying and visualization and an API that supports machine-based extraction [De Nil et al., 2016, Haest et al., 2018]. In addition to serving as an information platform, it also acts as a prime data source for regional and cross-border 3D geological models [Deckers et al., 2019, Vernes et al., 2018]. A model type specifically in need of large volumes of subsurface data are the geological *voxel* models, composed of volumetric pixels that contain modeled data on the load of a specific lithology (peat, clay, gravel, etc.) [Van Haren et al., 2023]. At the base of these voxel models lie tens of thousands detailed standardized borehole descriptions. While the borehole descriptions are included in a structured format with the DOV database<sup>2</sup>, the description intervals themselves are generally composed of unstructured text. In-house rule-based scripts were developed to classify them into detailed categories to enable direct usage of these descriptions into models. These rule-based scripts employ dictionaries and regular expressions to transform the descriptions into a primary, secondary and tertiary lithology class, as is displayed in Table 1 [van Haren et al., 2016, Van Haren et al., 2023]. While admixtures are generally captured as well, they fall outside the scope of this paper, as they are easily extractible using traditional rule-based text mining methods.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.dov.vlaanderen.be>

<sup>2</sup>For example, see <https://www.dov.vlaanderen.be/data/interpretatie/2016-252085>

Original description	Main lithology	Secondary lithology	Tertiary lithology	Admixture
Greenish yellow loam with sand (mostly coarse) and gravel	Loam	Coarse Sand	Gravel	
Fine sand with a very small fraction of gravel, and abundant intercalations of clay	Fine Sand	Clay	Gravel	
Reddish-brown sand, very poorly sorted, very fine, with a lot of admixture of coarse sand (grains of 200-300 $\mu\text{m}$ even up to 1 mm), slightly coarser at the bottom. A rare weathered shell.	Fine Sand	Coarse Sand		Shell

Table 1: Examples of unstructured lithological descriptions transformed into structured categories. The original descriptions were translated to English for reasons of clarity.

## 2.2 Flanders’ shallow geology

The geology of Flanders is characterized by a relatively flat landscape dominated by Quaternary deposits of sands, gravels, and clays, along with localized peat bogs. In the southern part of Flanders, a Pleistocene loess belt is present [van Haren et al., 2016]. These deposits overlie Neogene or Paleogene sediments, which are rich in sand and clay layers, deposited in various marine and continental Neogene and Paleogene environments. Beneath these, Mesozoic and Paleozoic deposits feature a complex assembly of older marine, peri-marine and continental rock formations, including limestone and shale. The shallow subsurface is hence almost entirely composed of soft sediments, with a predominance of sandy and clayey deposits. The lithology classes applied to categorise these soft sediments are adapted from Wentworth [1922] and given in Table 2. In this table different grain size classes of sand are distinguished, as each of these classes have different geotechnical characteristics and contrasting applications as raw materials [Flemish authorities, 2010]. In addition, a class *sand* without further grain size specification is included. Although the presence of this class poses challenges for subsequent lithological modelling tasks, it has to be present as many of the lithological descriptions do not mention grain size information. For example, *green sand with clay and some gravel at the base*.

The severe imbalance in the occurrence of these different lithology classes in Flanders can be visualized by inspecting the distribution of each lithology class for the main lithology or secondary lithologies as determined by the rule-based scripting. Figure 2a shows that clay (*klei*), and the different sand fractions (*zand*, *fijn zand*, *middelmatig zand* and *grof zand*) are the predominant main lithologies. It further reveals that secondary lithologies are less commonly documented,

<b>Lithoclass (Dutch)</b>	<b>Lithoclass (English)</b>
Veen	Peat
Klei	Clay
Silt	Silt
Leem	Loam
Fijn zand	Fine sand
Middelmatig zand	Medium sand
Grof zand	Coarse sand
Zand	Sand
Grind	Gravel

Table 2: Lithology classes relevant for the Flemish shallow subsurface.

with tertiary lithologies being even rarer. This is logical given the fact that only the most detailed descriptions document up to three lithologies within a single lithological interval. Nonetheless, capturing these different levels of detail can be essential to fully understand the complexity of the shallow subsurface, as the detailed descriptions in Table 1 illustrate.

### 2.3 Data preparation

We selected a total of 341000 borehole description intervals originating from 23000 boreholes spatially spanning the entire territory of Flanders. Figure 1 shows the spatial distribution of the sampled borehole descriptions in Flanders and Brussels. Although boreholes are spread throughout Flanders, a larger concentration can be observed in more densely populated areas such as Brussels, Antwerp, Ghent, etc. This initial dataset contains descriptions in both Dutch and French.

The following preprocessing steps were applied to improve the quality of the dataset: (i) removing all French descriptions; (ii) removing descriptions pertaining to multiple depths of the borehole; (iii) replacing *idem* with the borehole description immediately preceding it. The final dataset contains 283000 borehole descriptions. The average length of the lithological descriptions is 19 words with a standard deviation of 26. The minimum and maximum number of words per description is 1 and 336.

Labeled data are required to develop the lithology classifier. Rule-based scripts are available to directly classify this dataset into a main and secondary lithologies (*i.e.*, second and third) [Van Haren et al., 2023]. However, directly using these labels in training of a classification




Figure 1: Spatial distribution of the sampled borehole descriptions in Flanders and Brussels.


model would at best only hope to achieve a performance on par to these rule-based scripts. Therefore, a ground truth needs to be established through manual labeling by experts. In order to make most efficient use of their time, a limited subset needed to be selected for manual labeling. However, random sampling from a dataset with such an imbalanced distribution would replicate this bias leading to classifiers that can only perform well on the majority classes because they have not seen enough training observations of the minority classes (Figure 2a). Therefore, we first eliminated duplicate observations and then grouped the remaining data by (rule-based) lithology class to select descriptions for manual labeling. Subsequently, we randomly chose a similar number of samples from each of these groups. This resulted in 2671 borehole descriptions that were manually labeled. Finally, we partitioned this dataset into three subsets: 15% for testing, 15% for validation, and the remaining 70% for training.

Figure 2b shows the lithology class occurrence (as labeled by the rule-based script) of the selected subset. The class distribution is still skewed but far less so than before. This subset was subsequently labeled manually by experts.

### 3 Methods

We utilize a transformer architecture to create a domain adapted LLM on Dutch geological borehole descriptions in Flanders (GEOBERTje) which we further train to perform a lithology





(a) Full dataset.

(b) Selected subset for ground truth labeling.

Figure 2: Occurrence of lithology classes according to the rule-based script.

classification task. We use the Hugging Face platform to acquire the base model and carried out training in two main stages [Tunstall et al., 2022, Wolf et al., 2020]. Figure 3 shows a diagram of the entire training workflow for the lithology classification.

Model training involves two main stages to achieve optimal classification accuracy: (1) we use BERTje as a base model, tailoring it to the geological domain by enhancing its understanding of Dutch geological terminology. We call the result GEOBERTje. (2) We finetune a classifier head based on GEOBERTje, utilizing the assigned labels to refine its ability to accurately classify different lithologies.

### 3.1 Training stage 1: Domain adaptation

We start from BERTje of De Vries et al. [2019].<sup>3</sup> BERTje uses the same model architecture as the original BERT model of Devlin et al. [2018]. BERT is trained on a multilingual text corpus. While only Wikipedia articles in Dutch belong to the Dutch training corpus of multilingual BERT, BERTje was trained on a large and more diverse corpus of 2.4 billion Dutch tokens originating from Dutch books, news, etc [De Vries et al., 2019]. Intuitively, BERTje has an improved performance for the Dutch language compared to multilingual BERT.

<sup>3</sup>The model is available here on the Hugging Face platform.




Figure 3: Diagram depicting the two-stage training workflow of GEOBERTje for the lithology classification task, utilizing both unlabeled (stage 1) and labeled data (stage 2).

We could directly train BERTje with labeled data to perform the classification task. However, since BERTje’s training data is not tailored specifically to geology, refining its understanding of geological subtleties can be achieved through additional training on an unlabeled dataset focused on lithological descriptions. This method is known as *domain adaptation* (DA). Instead of training a LLM from scratch, it allows further training on data from a particular domain [Guo and Yu, 2022]. This pre-training step enhances the model’s performance by improving the vector embeddings. This aligns the embeddings more with the downstream classification task (see subsection 4.1).

DA techniques prove particularly advantageous in scenarios where there is a scarcity of labeled data for a target task but unlabeled data is abundantly present. Training in this approach relies on the masked language model (MLM) objective and does not require labeled data. It involves randomly masking words in the descriptions and predicting the masked word using the model. The loss function value is then calculated using the cross-entropy between the labels and logits. Consequently, the model becomes adept at predicting masked words from their context and recognizing underlying patterns and long-range dependencies within the lithological descriptions. This step effectively leverages the vast amounts of unlabeled lithological descriptions available,

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Original tokens</b>	[CLS]	weinig	fijn	zand	met	grind	##elementen	[SEP]
<b>Masked tokens</b>	[CLS]	weinig	fijn	[MASK]	met	[MASK]	##elementen	[SEP]
<b>Labels</b>	-100	-100	-100	22664	-100	12893	-100	-100

Table 3: An illustration of “*weinig fijn zand met grindelementen*” tokenization used in masked language modeling (MLM).

enriching the model’s training process [De Vries et al., 2019]. Table 3 illustrates the process of applying random masking to an example sentence, “*weinig fijn zand met grindelementen*”<sup>4</sup>. The tokens resulting from this process are subsequently utilized in masked language modeling. It is important to note that tokens with a label value of  $-100$  are disregarded by the loss function. Thus, they do not contribute to the training process and ensure that the focus remains solely on the missing words in the sentence. We employed a masking probability of 0.15, which was randomly applied to input sample data on-the-fly, with training batch sizes of 32 and a learning rate of 0.0005.




Figure 4: GEOBERTje domain adaptation training (red) and validation (blue) loss curves over epochs. Inset figure: learning rate decay as a function of epoch.

Figure 4 illustrates how the loss values for both the training and validation sets evolve in relation to the number of epochs (i.e., training iterations) during the MLM training. Initially as the model learns from the data, there is a notable decline in loss values: this indicates rapid

<sup>4</sup>slightly fine sand with shell gravel elements.

improvement in predicting masked tokens within the training data. This decline stabilizes as the training progresses: this reflects the model’s convergence towards optimal performance. The loss values for the validation set exhibits a similar trend, albeit with occasional fluctuations. It must be noted that while training loss reflects the model’s fit to the training data, validation loss assesses its ability to generalize to unseen data. If validation loss stagnates or starts to increase, indicating potential overfitting, then early stopping mechanisms are employed. This involves halting training if there is no improvement in validation loss over a predefined number of epochs. This prevents the model from overlearning the training data and ensuring better generalization performance. The inset in Figure 4 displays the progression of the learning rate during training. Initially, we implemented a warm-up learning rate to ensure the model’s stability and mitigating the potential loss of previously acquired knowledge from the BERTje base model. Subsequently, we applied learning rate annealing to enhance the model’s final performance. Following this step, we possess a pre-trained base language model for Dutch texts that is already proficient in lithological descriptions. This serves as a foundation model for the next finetuning stage and is particularly tailored to the lithology classifications task using labeled data.

### 3.2 Training stage 2: Finetuning

After the initial training phase of domain adaptation, the subsequent step involved finetuning the domain adapted model using a limited set of labeled data [Howard and Ruder, 2018]. For the classification task, each lithological description accordingly needs to be assigned three labels: a main lithology and up to two secondary lithologies. “None” is used if no label was present. We chose a simple approach by training three separate classification models for each of the three label groups (illustrated by the yellow parallel boxes in “Stage 2: Finetuning” of Figure 3). This means that, starting from the same pretrained base model, all three classification models operate independently (and parallel) from each other. For each classification model a classification head is attached to the pretrained base model by adding a linear layer on top. The three models are further finetuned on the labeled training data to minimize the cross-entropy loss. In order to account for potential class imbalances in the labeled data, we utilized class weights separately for each of the three target labels (see Equation 1). Because class weights assign higher importance

to underrepresented classes during training, they reduce the impact of class imbalances and ensure that the model learns to generalize evenly well across all classes.

The cross-entropy loss function with class weights is defined as:

$$\text{loss}(y, \hat{y}) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^C w_j \times y_{ij} \times \log(\hat{y}_{ij}), \quad (1)$$

where  $N$  spans minibatch dimension,  $C$  is the number of classes,  $y_{ij} = 1$  if the sample  $i$  belongs to class  $j$ , otherwise  $y_{ij} = 0$ .  $\hat{y}_{ij}$  is the softmax predicted probability of sample  $i$  belonging to class  $j$ .  $w_j$  is the weight assigned to class  $j$  [Bengio, 2016]. In our experience, using class weights yields more accurate results compared to oversampling or undersampling methods to deal with uneven data distributions. Figure 5 sets out the cross-entropy loss on the training and validation set as a function of the number of epochs for the main, second and third lithology model. While the training loss exhibits an ever decreasing trend with the number of epochs, the validation loss first decreases up to an inflection point before increasing again. This illustration of the bias-variance trade-off shows that the models learn from the data until at a certain point they start overfitting on the training data and their generalization ability starts to diminish. Therefore, training is stopped as soon as the loss on the validation set starts to increase. It must be noted that we reused the same learning rate strategy throughout, incorporating both warm-up and linear annealing techniques, with a maximum learning rate value set at 0.0005. This process results in the final classification models tailored to the lithology classification task.

### 3.3 Postprocessing

Two postprocessing steps were introduced to further improve the classifiers' overall accuracy and to correct for the fact that the three parallel classifiers are not aware of each other's prediction. First, a lithology class can occur only once in each classification result. If the predicted secondary (tertiary) lithology equals the predicted main (secondary) lithology, then these duplicate class predictions from the secondary lithologies are removed and replaced by the subsequent most probable class within the group. Additionally, only model predictions surpassing a confidence threshold of  $\tau = 0.1$  are considered valid. This threshold  $\tau$  is determined so that it maximizes




Figure 5: GEOBERTje model fine tuning training (red) and validation (blue) loss functions for the main, second and third lithology class.

the accuracy score on the validation set, averaged over each classifier.<sup>5</sup> If no classes meet this criterion, then “None” is predicted with confidence score  $-1$ .

### 3.4 Other methods: rule-based scripts and GPT-4

We compare the performance of our domain adapted and finetuned GEOBERTje classifier to classification using the original rule-based script and GPT-4 through prompt engineering. Appendix A describes both approaches in more detail.

## 4 Results and discussion

### 4.1 Impact of domain adaptation

We finetuned the classification model directly from the generic BERTje base model (i.e., without domain adaptation) to assess the effect of domain adaptation on accuracy. We subsequently compare the performance of this approach to GEOBERTje. Figure 6 compares the classification accuracy of the final finetuned model using two different base models: GEOBERTje and the original BERTje. The results are presented separately for each label. This figure shows a

<sup>5</sup>This value did not change when maximizing a different metric such as balanced accuracy or matthews correlation coefficient.

negligible difference in the accuracy score for the main lithology. This suggests that geological context may not be crucial for predicting the main lithology. However, the domain adapted model demonstrates an improved accuracy for the secondary (0.84 vs. 0.80 with BERTje as base model) and tertiary lithology (0.77 vs. 0.73 with BERTje as base model). This highlights the benefits of employing a domain adapted model over a generic one in order to achieve better performance in downstream applications. The observed improvement is attributed to the domain adaptation process which enhances the model’s understanding of the geological context by taking advantage of unlabeled data. This adaptation is especially beneficial to more accurately classify secondary and tertiary lithologies.




Figure 6: Classification accuracy using two different base models: GEOBERTje (red) and BERTje (blue).

## 4.2 Classification performance

We evaluate the efficacy of our finetuned GEOBERTje classifier against the traditional rule-based method and GPT-4 on lithology classification. First, we consider the classification accuracy – defined as the ratio of correctly classified observations over the total number of observations – on an unseen test set for the main and secondary lithologies. Figure 7 demonstrates that the GEOBERTje classifier outperforms the other models in all categories. It achieves a very high classification accuracy of 0.94 on the main lithology. It exhibits much better performance over

the rule-based and GPT-4 models by margins of 9, 12 and 6% compared to the runner-up for the main, secondary, and tertiary lithologies respectively. While GPT-4 competes closely with the rule-based approach in main lithology classification and exceeds it in classifying the secondary lithology, it falls behind in accurately classifying tertiary lithology. A noticeable pattern is the diminution of accuracy across all models from main to tertiary lithology. The confusion matrix




Figure 7: Comparative accuracy of rule-based, GPT-4, and GEOBERTje models in classifying main, secondary, and tertiary lithology from geological drill core descriptions.

in Figure 8 facilitates a more detailed analysis of the classification performance for the individual lithology classes. Diagonal entries reveal normalized classification accuracy on a class level, off-diagonal values provide insights on the classes with whom the classifier “confuses” the correct label. Figure 10 in Appendix B also contains the confusion matrices for the rule-based scripting and the GPT-4 model.

### Discussion

A detailed analysis of the patterns observed in Figures 7 and 8 allows to make some general observations. We use concrete examples from the borehole descriptions to better illustrate the nuanced complexities that explain certain patterns.

Both GEOBERTje and GPT-4 are able to correctly interpret linguistically complex phrases where rule-based scripts fail. This occurs, for example, where the adverb denoting the sand






Figure 8: Confusion matrices.

fraction is separated from the noun by several words, or occurs after the noun (e.g. “*sand, very fine*”). As an example, the phrase “*light brown, not calcareous, very strongly peaty, few mica containing, medium fine loamy sand, with semi-deteriorated plant remains*” is correctly classified as “*fine sand*”, “*loam*”, “*peat*” for the main, second and third lithology class respectively. This results in higher overall accuracy scores and a higher performance on the sand-classes in particular.

The lower performance of the second and third lithology class for each of the models is apparent. The main explanation for this observation is threefold:

1. Correctly interpreting these classes is more complex than capturing the main lithology: the more detailed descriptions often mark down more than three different lithologies. For example, the phrase “*very coarse, glauconite-rich sand and angular, fine gravel, in a matrix of medium to fine sand*” is challenging to label, even manually. Nonetheless, GEOBERTje generally outperforms the two other models in correctly handling these complex cases. In descriptions where lithologies are described using the word “to” (e.g. “*silty fine to medium sand, with a lot of gravel and some...*”), the rule-based model and GPT-4 tend to pick only one of the two (sand) classes, while GEOBERTje more often captures them both.
2. The dataset is skewed in terms of lithology class occurrence, in particular for the second and third lithology class (see subsection 2.3). In addition, both the test- and training set are limited in size (approx. 400 and 1870 samples, respectively). Consequently, some labels

are only scarcely represented in the training and test set of the second and third lithology term. As a result, one of the most common errors of the classifiers of these groups is to miss certain labels and predict the much more frequently occurring “None” class. This also leads to less reliable normalized accuracy scores in the detailed confusion matrices (Figure 10).

3. The choice of assigning a label to the secondary or the tertiary lithology class is challenging and can be ambiguous as they are sometimes interchangeable (e.g., “*sand with very little gravel and some silt*”). The rule-based scripts particularly struggle to correctly make the distinction between these two groups, resulting in lower accuracy scores.

Despite our best efforts to correctly label this data, some errors persisted. This is an issue that is nearly unavoidable when relying on manually generated labels as opposed to measured data. As GEOBERTje also manages to classify these cases correctly most of the time, this results in a slightly lower normalized accuracy score for some specific labels. Nonetheless, this outcome is a testament to the robust pattern-recognition capabilities of advanced language models even when trained on imperfect datasets.

While GEOBERTje sometimes omits certain lithology classes by assigning “None” for secondary or tertiary lithologies where other labels might be applicable, it rarely hallucinates. Conversely, hallucinations are a notable problem for the GPT-4 model results. More specifically, GPT-4 tends to invent lithology classes within the sand-group (e.g. “*very calcareous whitish sand*” is classified by GPT-4 as “*fine sand*”). This is a critical issue for downstream applications such as geological models: missing input data are generally far less problematic than the introduction of incorrect lithology classes which could lead to significant inaccuracies in the models.

### 4.3 Accuracy versus training set size

We investigated the impact of the labeled training set size on classification accuracy because the availability of sufficient ground truth labels represents an important challenge for the potential of LLMs to act as an alternative to more traditional classification approaches. This provides insights in whether we possess adequate labeled data for the model finetuning and how many

additional samples are required to attain specific performance levels. Figure 9 represents the relation between the number of training data and the ability of the three models to correctly predict the main, second, and third lithologies. These results show that a relatively small number of training samples (e.g., 500) suffice for GEOBERTje to achieve a reasonable accuracy of 0.90 in predicting the main lithology. This suggests again that extensive geological context may not be necessary for main lithology prediction and elucidates why the zero-shot GPT-4 model yields a relatively high accuracy of 0.85 in Figure 7.

The accuracy of predicting the main lithology gradually increases by adding more training data before plateauing at around 1500 training observations. However, this does not apply to the secondary lithologies as the accuracies continue to exhibit a significant improvement. We found that increasing the training samples from 500 to 2270 yields a gain of approximately 20% in accuracy. This underscores the significance of labeled data in attaining higher accuracy, especially for the second and third lithologies. Our results, based on the extrapolation of these logarithmic trends using  $accuracy = \log size$  for the different lithologies, suggest an accuracy of 89.3% would be achieved for 3000 training observations for the second and 83.5% at 3500 training observations for the third lithology.




Figure 9: The impact of labeled training dataset size on GEOBERTje’s lithology classification accuracy.

## 4.4 Future work

Future research can further enhance the model we developed. GEOBERTje’s domain adaptation would improve further with training on a larger dataset. Additionally, we illustrated that the classifier would benefit from additional labeled data specifically focusing on phrases describing at least two different lithologies. Finally, linking the three classifiers to make them aware of each other’s predictions could potentially improve the results. Our modeling approach can also easily be transferred to different languages. Moreover, the potential of GEOBERTje is broader than the lithological classification for which it is currently developed. The domain adaptation can be easily expanded by including a more diverse corpus of geological data (e.g. stratigraphical borehole interpretations or geological reports). This will result in improved embeddings that reflect geological context and semantic relations on a more holistic level. This would also open the door for a broader range of downstream applications such as lithostratigraphic mapping or resource estimation.

## 5 Conclusions

Geological borehole descriptions, often collected over many decades by geological survey organizations, contain a wealth of information because they contain detailed textual descriptions of the subsurface composition. They are key input data for geological models and are used in several other fields (e.g., mineral exploration, groundwater management, geotechnical engineering, etc.). Yet, their unstructured text format poses a challenge when extracting all relevant features into a numeric format that is usable in computer models.

This study takes advantage of the large language model (LLM) revolution, ushered in by the transformer architecture, to develop GEOBERTje: a domain adapted large language model trained on geological borehole descriptions from Flanders (Belgium) in the Dutch language. The domain adapted model extracts relevant information from borehole descriptions and represents it in a numeric vector space. Showcasing just one potential application of GEOBERTje, we finetune a classifier model on a limited number of manually labeled observations. The classifier categorizes borehole descriptions into a main, second and third lithology. We show that our classifier significantly outperforms both a rule-based regular expression script and GPT-4 of

OpenAI.

Adopting domain-specific LLMs in the field of geology, as exemplified by our study, underscores the transformative potential of these models in enhancing the accessibility of unstructured geological datasets. This innovation paves the way for integrating vast amounts of data, leading to more efficient and accurate geological analyses.

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Lorenz Hamsch for his research assistance on the GPT-4 prompt engineering and to Roel De Koninck and Katrien De Nil for helpful comments that improved the paper. The usual disclaimer applies.

This paper was partially supported by the project “Technology Watch” of the VLAKO reference task, ordered by the Bureau for Environment and Spatial development - Flanders, VPO. We are grateful to have had the opportunity to share the research within the open DOV network.

## Model Availability

GEOBERTje is freely available on Hugging Face: Ghorbanfekr et al. [2024].

## References

- Yoshua Bengio. *Deep Learning*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning series. MIT Press, London, England, November 2016.
- Bernardo Consoli, Joaquim Santos, Diogo Gomes, Fabio Cordeiro, Renata Vieira, and Viviane Moreira. Embeddings for named entity recognition in geoscience portuguese literature. In *Proceedings of The 12th language resources and evaluation conference*, pages 4625–4630, 2020.
- Katrien De Nil, Marleen Van Damme, and Griet Verhaert. Flanders soil and subsoil database (dov) – the web portal to the geological information of flanders. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Geologica Belgica Congress, GB2016*, pages 280–281, Mons, Belgium, 26–29 January 2016. University of Mons. doi: 10.20341/gbcp.vol2.

- Katrien De Nil, Marleen De Ceukelaire, and Marleen Van Damme. A reference dataset for the neogene lithostratigraphy in flanders, belgium. *Geologica Belgica*, 2020.
- Wietse De Vries, Andreas van Cranenburgh, Arianna Bisazza, Tommaso Caselli, Gertjan van Noord, and Malvina Nissim. Bertje: A dutch bert model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.09582*, 2019.
- Jef Deckers, Roel De Koninck, Stijn Bos, Matsen Broothaers, Katrijn Dirix, Lorenz Hamsch, David Lagrou, Timothy. Lanckacker, Johan Matthijs, Bernd. Rombaut, Katleen Van Baelen, and Tom Van Haren. Geologisch (g3dv3) en hydrogeologisch (h3d) 3d-lagenmodel van vlaanderen. VITO-rapport 2018/RMA/R/1569, VITO, Mol, 2019. URL <https://archiefonderzoek.Omgeving.vlaanderen.be/Onderzoek-1999911>.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- Majigsuren Enkhsaikhan, Eun-Jung Holden, Paul Duuring, and Wei Liu. Understanding ore-forming conditions using machine reading of text. *Ore Geology Reviews*, 135:104200, 2021a.
- Majigsuren Enkhsaikhan, Wei Liu, Eun-Jung Holden, and Paul Duuring. Auto-labelling entities in low-resource text: a geological case study. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 63:695–715, 2021b.
- Flemish authorities. Mineral resources in flanders : the flemish policy. Technical report, Flemish authorities, Departement Leefmilieu, Natuur en Energie, Afdeling Land en Bodembescherming, Ondergrond, Natuurlijke Rijkdommen, Koning Albert II-laan 20 bus 20, 1000 Brussel, September 2010.
- Ignacio Fuentes, José Padarian, Takuya Iwanaga, and R. Willem Vervoort. 3d lithological mapping of borehole descriptions using word embeddings. *Computers & Geosciences*, 141:104516, 2020. ISSN 0098-3004. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2020.104516>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0098300419306533>.

- Hossein Ghorbanfekr, Pieter Jan Kerstens, and Katrijn Dirix. Geobertje model, 2024. URL <https://huggingface.co/hghcomphys/geobertje-base-dutch-uncased>.
- Diogo da Silva Magalhães Gomes, Fábio Corrêa Cordeiro, Bernardo Scapini Consoli, Nikolas Lacerda Santos, Viviane Pereira Moreira, Renata Vieira, Silvia Moraes, and Alexandre Gonçalves Evsukoff. Portuguese word embeddings for the oil and gas industry: Development and evaluation. *Computers in Industry*, 124:103347, 2021.
- Xu Guo and Han Yu. On the domain adaptation and generalization of pretrained language models: A survey. 2022. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2211.03154. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.03154>.
- Vasileios Hademenos, Jan Staffeu, Tine Missiaen, Lars Kint, and Vera RM Van Lancker. 3d subsurface characterisation of the belgian continental shelf: a new voxel modelling approach. *Netherlands Journal of Geosciences*, 98:e1, 2019.
- P. J. Haest, R. Huybrechts, S. Van Hoey, J. Van De Wauw, M. Huysmans, H. Van Baelen, and M. Van Damme. Pydov brings the data back to the future. In *Abstracts of the 6th Geologica Belgica Meeting*, Leuven, Belgium, September 2018. URL <https://ees.kuleuven.be/gb2018/abstracts/gb2018-theme3.pdf>. Accessed: 15/07/2020.
- Rachel Heaven, Jo Walsh, and mobiuscreek. BritishGeologicalSurvey/geo-ner-model: CoreNLP Server with Geo NER, November 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4181488>.
- Jeremy Howard and Sebastian Ruder. Universal language model fine-tuning for text classification. 2018. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.1801.06146. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.06146>.
- Olivier Kaufmann and Thierry Martin. Reprint of “3d geological modelling from boreholes, cross-sections and geological maps, application over former natural gas storages in coal mines”[comput. geosci. 34 (2008) 278–290]. *Computers & geosciences*, 35(1):70–82, 2009.
- Christopher J.M. Lawley, Stefania Raimondo, Tianyi Chen, Lindsay Brin, Anton Zakharov, Daniel Kur, Jenny Hui, Glen Newton, Sari L. Burgoyne, and Geneviève Marquis. Geoscience language models and their intrinsic evaluation. *Applied Computing and Geosciences*, 14:100084,

2022. ISSN 2590-1974. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acags.2022.100084>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590197422000064>.

Christopher JM Lawley, Michael G Gadd, Mohammad Parsa, Graham W Lederer, Garth E Graham, and Arianne Ford. Applications of natural language processing to geoscience text data and prospectivity modeling. *Natural Resources Research*, pages 1–25, 2023.

Wenjia Li, Kai Ma, Qinjun Qiu, Liang Wu, Zhong Xie, Sanfeng Li, and Siqiong Chen. Chinese word segmentation based on self-learning model and geological knowledge for the geoscience domain. *Earth and Space Science*, 8(6):e2021EA001673, 2021.

Kai Ma, Miao Tian, Yongjian Tan, Xuejing Xie, and Qinjun Qiu. What is this article about? generative summarization with the bert model in the geosciences domain. *Earth Science Informatics*, pages 1–16, 2022.

Louis Martin, Benjamin Muller, Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez, Yoann Dupont, Laurent Romary, Éric Villemonte de La Clergerie, Djamé Seddah, and Benoît Sagot. Camembert: a tasty french language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03894*, 2019.

Joël Morgenthaler, Dominik Frefel, Joshua Meier, Nils Oesterling, Gérard Perren, and Stefan Heuberger. Revalue geoscientific data utilising deep learning. *Swiss Bulletin for Applied Geology*, 27(1):45–55, 2022.

OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve



Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil

- Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- J. Padarian and I. Fuentes. Word embeddings for application in geosciences: development, evaluation, and examples of soil-related concepts. *SOIL*, 5(2):177–187, 2019. doi: 10.5194/soil-5-177-2019. URL <https://soil.copernicus.org/articles/5/177/2019/>.
- Qinjun Qiu, Zhong Xie, Liang Wu, and Wenjia Li. Dgeosegmenter: A dictionary-based chinese word segmenter for the geoscience domain. *Computers & geosciences*, 121:1–11, 2018.
- Qinjun Qiu, Zhong Xie, Liang Wu, Liufeng Tao, and Wenjia Li. Bilstm-crf for geological named entity recognition from the geoscience literature. *Earth Science Informatics*, 12:565–579, 2019.
- Jan Stafleu and CW Dubelaar. Product specification subsurface model geotop. Technical Report R10133, TNO report, 2016.
- Lewis Tunstall, Leandro Von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. *Natural language processing with transformers*. ” O’Reilly Media, Inc.”, 2022.
- T. Van Haren, J. Deckers, R. De Koninck, K. Dirix, R. Maes, L. Hamsch, and K. Van Baelen. Ondiep geologisch 3d lagen- en voxelmodel van regio antwerpen versie 1.1. Technical report, Vlaamse overheid, departement Omgeving, Vlaams Planbureau voor Omgeving, 2023. URL <https://archieff.onderzoek.omgeving.vlaanderen.be/Onderzoek-2639700>. Studie uitgevoerd in opdracht van de Vlaamse overheid, departement Omgeving, Vlaams Planbureau voor Omgeving.
- Tom van Haren, Katrijn Dirix, Roel De Koninck, Chris De Groot, and Katrien De Nil. An interactive voxel model for mineral resources: loess deposits in flanders (belgium). *Zeitschrift*

*der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Geowissenschaften*, 167(4):363–376, 12 2016. doi: 10.1127/zdgg/2016/0096. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1127/zdgg/2016/0096>.

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. 2017a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.1706.03762. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762>.

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017b.

R.W. Vernes, J. Deckers, M.A.J. Bakker, F. Bogemans, M. De Ceukelaire, J.C. Doornenbal, M. den Dulk, M. Duser, T.F.M. Van Haren, V.M.A. Heyvaert, P. Kiden, A.F. Kruisselbrink, T. Lanckacker, A. Menkovic, B. Meyvis, D.K. Munsterman, R. Reindersma, J.H. ten Veen, T.J.M. van de Ven, J. Walstra, and N. Witmans. Geologisch en hydrogeologisch 3D model van het Cenozoïcum van de Belgisch-Nederlandse grensstreek van Midden-Brabant / De Kempen (H3O – De Kempen). Technical Report 2017/RMA/R/1348, VITO, TNO-Geologische Dienst Nederland, Belgische Geologische Dienst, VITO rapport, 2018. URL <https://archieff.onderzoek.omgeving.vlaanderen.be/Onderzoek-2314288>.

Chester K Wentworth. A scale of grade and class terms for clastic sediments. *The journal of geology*, 30(5):377–392, 1922.

Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online, October 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.emnlp-demos.6>.

## A Other methods

### A.1 Classification using rule-based scripting

Up to now, geological borehole descriptions were translated into lithoclasses using a set of rule-based scripts [van Haren et al., 2016, Van Haren et al., 2023]. At the basis of these scripts is a dictionary providing the mapping of a large corpus of geological words and phrases on a lithoclass (e.g. 'flint pebbles' -> 'gravel'). Also, this dictionary indicates whether a certain phrase represents a main, or rather a secondary lithology (e.g. 'clayey' -> secondary lithology). Additionally, a series of regular expressions are implemented to handle more complex linguistic structures, such as phrases where the adverb defining the grain size of the sand class is not positioned directly adjacent to the word sand (e.g. 'fine, greenish sand' -> 'fine sand'). Finally, logic was incorporated to accurately classify descriptions that specifically denote the absence of a lithology (e.g. 'sand without gravel'). This rule-based framework harnesses a lot of domain specific-knowledge to achieve an automated classification of lithological descriptions, but it is limited by its inability to fully capture the diverse and intricate linguistic nuances present in many geological descriptions.

### A.2 Classification using ChatGPT

In addition to comparing our domain adapted and finetuned GEOBERTje classifier to the rule-based script, we further evaluate it by contrasting its outputs with those produced by the popular GPT model. The tests were performed on version gpt-4-0125-preview, with the temperature set to 0. Our objective was to determine whether the intricate process of domain adaptation and finetuning could potentially be circumvented by harnessing the capabilities of this prevalent commercial model. Should GPT's performance parallel that of GEOBERTje, it would suggest that complex geological language processing can be executed by simple prompt engineering. This prospect opens up the possibility for geologists without deep technical expertise to execute advanced tasks, diminishing the reliance on specialized data scientists. Therefore, this test was conducted by using our labeled validation set to engineer a prompt aimed at achieving optimal classification performance. The complete final prompt is provided in appendix A.2.1. The performance of ChatGPT was subsequently assessed by comparing its classification results with

those of the GEOBERTje classifier on the same test set. Although finetuning the GPT model is currently possible, this technique was not employed as it would contradict our objective of exploring the potential of a non-technical solution for this kind of task.

### A.2.1 GPT-4 prompt

Below is the GPT-4 prompt, employed using version gpt-4-0125-preview, with the temperature set to zero:

Classify geological drill core sample descriptions into these material types:

- `fijn_zand`, `grof_zand`, `middel_zand`, `zand_onb`, `silt`, `grind`, `veen`, `klei`, `leem`, `none`.
- `grind` includes all things related to stones or pebbles.
- Use `zand_onb` for any sand, except if it is clearly defined as fine, middle, or coarse sand. Color does not matter.
- If the main substrate is sandy then `zand_onb` should be the second class.
- There can only be one type referencing the sand per row.
- “Hetzelfde” or “idem” means use the same classification as the row before this one.
- Words ending on “achtige” always refers to the second or third class.
- Make 3 classifications. The first column has the type of material that is the main ingredient in this sample. The second column has the next most common type, and the third column has the least common type.
- Respond only with this list of classifications. Use “none” if a material is not clearly indicated.
- Only use one of the types or none, nothing else.
- Always have 3 output types. Multiple nones are allowed.
- The input list has each row between triple quotes.

## B Confusion matrices

The figure below provides a detailed breakdown of the model performance across different classes. Each confusion matrix sets out the proportion of predicted observations versus the actual observations for each main, second, third lithology classes. Notably, the row values in each matrix are normalized by the true labels, with the diagonal numbers reflecting the percentage of correctly predicted instances per class, thereby revealing class-specific performance strengths and weaknesses.




Figure 10: Confusion matrices.