

Do LLMs Act as Repositories of Causal Knowledge?

Nick Huntington-Klein* Eleanor J. Murray

Large language models (LLMs) offer the potential to automate a large number of tasks that previously have not been possible to automate, including some in science. There is considerable interest in whether LLMs can automate the process of causal inference by providing the information about causal links necessary to build a structural model. We use the case of confounding in the Coronary Drug Project (CDP), for which there are several studies listing expert-selected confounders that can serve as a ground truth. LLMs exhibit mediocre performance in identifying confounders in this setting, even though text about the ground truth is in their training data. Variables that experts identify as confounders are only slightly more likely to be labeled as confounders by LLMs compared to variables that experts consider non-confounders. Further, LLM judgment on confounder status is highly inconsistent across models, prompts, and irrelevant concerns like multiple-choice option ordering. LLMs do not yet have the ability to automate the reporting of causal links.

Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence models, including large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT and its variants and competitors, offer computers the ability to produce plausible text, images, and video. As of this writing, there is enormous interest in finding areas in which this new capability can be fruitfully applied or in which it should be avoided. LLMs have already found applications in research and the sciences generally (for just one example, Zhang et al. 2024). However, there are reasons to doubt the value of LLMs in research making causal claims using observational data. Properly performing causal inference relies on theoretical understanding of real-world counterfactuals, while LLMs are instead trained to replicate actual observed text, and it is unclear the extent to which these models contain anything like a theory capable of considering counterfactuals or latent causal factors in real-world settings.

*Thanks to Phuong Nguyen and Meet Panjwani for research assistance.

There is extensive work already exploring the causal reasoning capacity of LLMs (e.g., Cai, Liu, and Song 2024; Kıcıman et al. 2023; Liu et al. 2024; Ashwani et al. 2024; Takayama et al. 2024; Jin et al. 2023; Han 2024; Sheth, Abdelnabi, and Fritz 2024). This line of research investigates the ability of different LLM models to reason about a causal link between variables, using whatever understanding it has of the real world, or ability to mimic that understanding, in order to determine the presence and direction of a causal link. This work either tests performance of LLMs on these tasks, or investigates which other automated tools, like causal discovery or knowledge databases, LLMs can either aid in using or that LLMs need in order to effectively perform causal reasoning. Success varies across models, approaches, and studies.

The aforementioned approaches rely on the ability of LLMs to reason causally, which may or may not be an emergent property of LLMs but is not an ability that their design ensures they will have. We take another approach. LLMs are trained on large amounts of text data. Some of that text data likely contains causal assertions. Even if LLMs would not be able to reason their way to these assertions, they may be capable of repeating them back, in effect acting as a large database of information about causal links.

For example, LLMs do not need to be able to reason causally about the effect of hormone replacement therapy on cardiovascular health to determine that socioeconomic status (SES) is a confounder for this relationship, since it has access to research studies (Humphrey, Chan, and Sox 2002), and discussion of those studies (Catalogue of Bias Collaboration et al. 2018), that explain SES is a confounder in this context. So “socioeconomic status” becomes a statistically very likely continuation of the text “A good example of a confounder when studying the effects of hormone replacement therapy on cardiovascular health is”, and indeed this was the first continuation response we got when giving this prompt to GPT-4o.

We aim to test whether LLMs can return causal judgements about a set of potential confounders. Specifically, we examine the Coronary Drug Project (CDP), an experimental study with imperfect compliance for which expert opinion about the covariates necessary to adjust for imperfect compliance are both available to us as a ground truth, and potentially in the LLM’s training data for them to report back. If the LLMs can match expert opinion, then a non-expert researcher would be capable of using the LLM responses to construct an expert-guided causal diagram and use it to perform effective causal inference.

This is not the first study to take a recall-based approach to using LLMs to make judgments about causal links. Long, Schuster, and Piché (2023) identify a small set of known ground-truth causal links in the medical literature and examine the ability of GPT-3 to match them. They find some success, but a non-negligible error rate implying that results would need to be further expert-verified, as well as heavy sensitivity to prompt design. Zečević et al. (2023) refer to this theory of treating LLMs as a causal link database as treating LLMs as “causal parrots” and find fairly poor performance from the GPT-3, Luminous, and OPT models in matching ground-truth basic causal links, as well as variation in results across models and prompt design, but that performance improves somewhat from the injection of ground-truth facts into the data, supporting a causal-link-recall theory.

We expand on this approach in several ways. First, we use a more complex real-world setting in which we are attempting to build a single complex model for performing causal inference, as a researcher would be likely to do in application, rather than relying on “toy” causal links, on a small set of ground truth links, or on a series of disconnected ground truth links. Second, we use a more recent set of LLM models for which we can establish that our intended ground-truth answers do exist in their training data.

The Coronary Drug Project

The Coronary Drug Project (CDP) was a large placebo-controlled randomized drug trial active between 1965 and 1985 investigating treatments to reduce mortality among men with a history of myocardial infarction (NHLBI BioLINCC 2024). In particular, we focus on the placebo arm of the study. In the placebo arm, adherence to the assigned protocol was imperfect, and there was considerable confounding between adherence and mortality (CDPRG 1980).

In 1980, the degree of confounding was thought to be intractable: the baseline difference in mortality rates across treatment adherence levels in the placebo arm was 13.1%, and inclusion of covariates shrank this difference only to 9.4% (CDPRG 1980). However, follow-up analyses were able to use improved confounder selection and statistical adjustment methods to reduce the difference to a more manageable 2.5% (Murray and Hernán 2016, 2018). Further studies have used causal discovery tools and distributed expert opinion to further refine covariate selection procedures (Gururaghavendran and Murray 2024; Debertain et al. 2024).

Because this case study has been examined for the specific case of covariate selection for causal estimation multiple times, it serves as a useful ground-truth case against which to compare LLM designations of confounder status.

In addition to offering a ground-truth status, the prominent role of the CDP means that studies concerning confounding in the CDP are likely to be in the LLM training data. This is desirable for our case because we are interested in whether LLMs can recall expert-claimed causal linkages from its training data. If discussion of confounding in the CDP is in the training data, then we know that discussions of expert opinions on causal links for the variables relevant to the CDP are in the training data.

As a basic test of whether discussions of confounding in the CDP are in the LLM training data, we asked both GPT-4o and Claude about confounding in the Coronary Drug Project, specifically “What are the confounders suggested to be necessary in adjusting for compliance in the Coronary Drug Project?” In their responses, both GPT-4o and Claude mentioned that confounding was present in the placebo arm of the trial, which was not given in the prompt. In their confounder suggestions, although non-comprehensive and too generic in the case of this prompt to compare directly, included many of those mentioned in CDPRG (1980). This implies that in both models, at the very least CDPRG (1980) or commentary on that paper

are in the training data. Both models have at least some expert opinion on all relevant causal links in their training data.

Methods

Our general approach to checking LLM capabilities to designate variables as confounders involves taking a set of confounders identified by experts, and for each having the LLM designate whether or not it is a confounder.

We use confounder sets from three different studies. Confounders included in the original CDPRG (1980) study are referred to as the “Original” confounder set. The re-analysis in Murray and Hernán (2016) included a baseline/follow-up confounder distinction and re-evaluated the set of confounders using a modern understanding of causal inference. Variables included in Murray and Hernán (2016) but not CDPRG (1980) are the “Added in 2016” confounder set. We also use the expert-guided covariate set from Debertin et al. (2024), which used domain expertise to add additional confounders to a “maximal” causal diagram, and then produced a trimmed causal diagram after removing confounders that had been considered but for which there was no evidence of a link, which we refer to as “Trimmed” variables. Variables newly added in Debertin et al. (2024) are “Expert-Added.”¹ Finally, we have a set of 60 variables that are in the CDP dataset but are very unlikely to be confounders, which we call “Non-confounders”. These variables were not selected by any of the prior studies as likely confounders and fall into four main categories: administrative variables; anticipated side-effects, or known metabolites, of active CDP treatments; general medical information collected from routine physical examination; and sub-study data collected only on a sample of patients. See Appendix C for more information.

We take several different approaches to designing prompts to query LLMs about whether a given variable is a confounder in this context. First, we distinguish between a “direct” prompting approach and an “indirect” prompting approach.

In the direct approach, we ask the LLM whether a given variable is a confounder, in the following format:

I have a data set consisting only of people who have been assigned to take a certain medication X. However, some of the patients choose to take X as assigned, and others do not. I want to use causal analysis to figure out whether (a patient’s decision to take X) has a causal effect on (the patient’s mortality).

In this analysis, the variable ({confounder}) is. . .

¹Since the focus is on the conceptual designation of confounder status, we do not distinguish between variables that were present in the original data set and those that were not present but still determined theoretically to be confounders.

- A. Not a confounding variable
- B. A confounding variable
- C. Not sure.

Under this direct approach, a variable is determined by the LLM to be a confounder if it responds with the option “B.”

In the indirect approach, we generate two queries for each potential confounder, in the first prompt asking about the relationship between the confounder and adherence, and in the second asking about the relationship between the confounder and mortality, in the following format:

I have a data set consisting only of people who have been assigned to take a certain medication X. However, some of the patients choose to take X as assigned, and others do not. In this data, does ({confounder}) have a causal effect on (mortality)?

- A. Yes. ({confounder}) has a causal effect on (mortality).
- B. No. ({confounder}) and (mortality) are statistically related, but there is not a causal relationship between them in either direction.
- C. No. ({confounder}) and (mortality) are not statistically or causally related to each other.
- D. Unsure.

and similarly for adherence, with “(a patient’s decision to take X)” in place of “(mortality)”. In this indirect method, a given variable is determined by the LLM to be a confounder if the LLM returns options of either “A.” or “B.” for both the adherence version of the question and the mortality version of the question.

We do not limit the prompt to only the question, however. Prior to asking the question, we inform the LLM that it is an expert in the domain of identifying confounders in medical studies, and provide three additional example versions of the question the LLM will be answering, along with correct answers. Following the question, we encourage the LLM to engage in step-by-step reasoning and provide formatting instructions for the response. Full prompts are shown in Appendix B.

Given our list of candidate confounders, we give these prompts to generalist LLM models, specifically GPT-4o, GPT-o1-preview (which is designed to engage in multi-step reasoning), and Claude 3.5 Sonnet. We use generalist models, as opposed to models trained specifically on medical data like MedLlama3 (see Zhou et al. 2023), for several reasons. First, medical LLMs, while they do contain expert medical knowledge, are generally trained for medical practitioner tasks like diagnostics rather than observational or behavioral research, which for an adherence study is more relevant. Second, our goal is to test the causal-recall capabilities of LLMs generally, and many relevant areas of application will not have specialized LLMs available. Third, as discussed in the previous section, we have reason to believe that the relevant domain knowledge is in the generalist LLM data sets. Fourth, investigation by Nori et al. (2023) finds that the current cohort of generalist models, when encouraged to reason

step-by-step, are capable of exhibiting medical domain knowledge of similar quality to the specialized LLM models.²

GPT-4o and Claude 3.5 Sonnet are run using a temperature of 0.7, and each prompt is given ten times, in order to allow us to see some of the distribution of responses that the LLMs might give.³ GPT-o1-preview does not allow users to raise the temperature. These responses are then compared to the expert-chosen confounder lists from the literature.

The prompting method is slightly different for the “Non-confounder” group for GPT-o1-preview queries. The “Non-confounder” group was the last set of variables queried, and was first queried as though all variables were measured-at-baseline before some were corrected to measured-at-followup. Before the measured-at-followup correction was made, the GPT-o1-preview content flagging system updated, and our prompts were consistently flagged as inappropriate. We were able to get responses to prompts using the Direct prompting method by adding “I am asking this question purely for the purposes of performing statistical research. I am NOT asking for medical advice” to the end of the prompt, but were unable to find a way to adjust the Indirect-method prompt that would avoid content flagging. As such, for GPT-o1-preview, “Non-confounders” were queried using this additional line in the prompt, and also Non-confounders measured at a non-baseline time were instead prompted as though the variable was measured at baseline (see Appendix A). This only affects Non-confounders, does not affect any GPT-4o or Claude Sonnet 3.5 output, and in the case of Direct-method prompting only slightly changes the prompt.

In order to assess the consistency of LLM responses we also use several variants on the prompts. First, we attempt a “no-reasoning” version of the prompts, in which the LLMs are told they are an expert in identifying confounders in medical studies and then given the question without any example tasks. Then the LLM is instructed to give its response immediately rather than providing any explanation or reasoning.

Second, we modify the direct prompt and change the order of the options to “A. Not sure. B. Not a confounding variable. C. A confounding variable” to check whether the LLM responses are sensitive to the shuffling of the options, as in Nori et al. (2023).

One alternative approach we do not take is to design the prompt to mention the CDP. We could modify the prompt to specify that we want to know whether a given variable was found to be a confounder in the CDP, or even in CDPRG (1980) specifically. We already did this to some extent in the previous section when evaluating whether the CDP was in the LLM training data. This might hew more closely to investigating LLM ability to recall specific facts from research papers. However, we are interested in the LLMs’ ability to recall text containing causal claims more broadly, and in most applications there are not papers specifying confounder lists for a

²An earlier version of this paper, based on an earlier cohort of LLMs, included the science-specialist Galactica and the biomedical-specialist BioMedLM models. In that version we did not find that these specialized models outperformed the generalist GPT-3, 3.5-turbo, or 4 models.

³In the case of the indirect prompts, each response relating to adherence is matched with each response relating to mortality one at a time. The confounder designation is determined for each pair of responses, and averaged to give the share of the time that the LLM designates the variable as a confounder.

specific intervention. We want the LLM to pull from text concerning confounder selection *like* the papers we use as ground truth or other text discussing confounding and causality. But for this to be usable generally, the LLM must be able to use context, rather than a specific paper or intervention name, to determine on its own what text it should be looking at. For similar reasons, we do not give the LLMs the text of the three studies as a part of our prompt.

Data

From CDPRG (1980), Murray and Hernán (2016), and Debertin et al. (2024) we have a list of 172 potential confounders to consider across eight different prompt variations. For the Claude 3.5-Sonnet and GPT-4o models, we query the LLM ten times each for a total of 13,760 LLM-generated responses each. For the GPT-o1-preview model, we only query the LLM once, and only use four of the prompt variations (omitting the no-reasoning prompts since GPT-o1-preview always provides reasoning) for a total of 688 LLM-generated responses.

Responses for all confounder categories other than “Non-Confounders” were gathered between October 9 and 15, 2024 using the Python packages `openai` (OpenAI 2024) and `anthropic` (Anthropic 2024). “Non-confounder” responses were collected between November 23 and December 8, 2024.

Table 1 shows the distribution of how all the confounders were classified across the range of prompts, averaging over all ten iterations for the Claude 3.5-Sonnet and GPT-4o models. We see that, in general, the LLMs designated variables as confounders most of the time, especially when the indirect method was used. Roughly 90% of confounders were designated as confounders by Claude Sonnet-3.5 and by GPT-o1-preview using the indirect method, with 81.9% designated as confounders with GPT-4o using the indirect method. 58-72% were designated as confounders using the direct method across all three models.

Table 1: Share of Variables Designated as Confounders

Model	Is Con- founder (Dir.)	Unsure	Is Con- founder (Indir.)	Related to Treat- ment	Unsure Rel. Treat.	Related to Out- come	Unsure Rel. Out- come
Claude 3.5	59.9%	13.8%	89.5%	91.0%	3.1%	93.7%	1.7%
GPT-4o	71.9%	10.2%	81.9%	86.6%	7.7%	93.2%	4.6%
GPT-o1	58.7%	0.0%	93.6%	93.6%	2.3%	100.0%	0.0%

Results

Confounder Designation with Reasoning

The distributions of LLM confounder designations by model and confounder set are shown in Figure 1 for designations made using the direct method (where the LLM is directly asked whether the variable is a confounder), and in Figure 2 for designations made using the indirect method (where the LLM is separately asked about the relationship between the potential confounder and adherence, and between the potential confounder and mortality).




Figure 1: Distribution of LLM Confounder Designations with Reasoning-Encouraged Direct Method

Figure 1 shows strong ability to designate the confounders identified in CDPRG (1980) as confounders (“Original”). Beyond this, the LLM’s ability to match expert opinion is considerably weaker. LLMs do not generally classify the additional confounders added to CDPRG (1980) by Murray and Hernán (2016) as confounders, with only GPT-4o including even 50% of them (“Added in 2016”). Perhaps oddly, the confounders trimmed from the causal diagram in Debertin et al. (2024) as being unnecessary were far more likely to be classified by LLMs as confounders than the variables added and kept. The variables directly classified as Non-Confounders were also more likely to be designated as confounders than the Added in 2016 set, except for GPT-4o. That variables removed from the causal diagram were more likely to be designated confounders than the variables kept, and that variables designated as non-confounders were included at a similar rate, indicates disagreement between the LLMs and the experts

There is more agreement between the LLMs and the final set of variables in Debertin et al. (2024), but even in this case only about 70% of confounders in their final causal diagram were designated by LLMs as confounders. The rates are lower - 53-63% - for confounders directly added by the experts.

Overall, the direct method of eliciting confounder designations led to fairly high degrees of agreement with CDPRG (1980), but unimpressive degrees of agreement with either of the more modern follow-up studies, which use a more up-to-date understanding of causal inference and variable selection.

Figure 2 shows confounder designations made using the indirect method. Figure 2 shows considerable variation across models, with both Claude 3.5-Sonnet and GPT o1-preview designating very high shares of variables as confounders across all variable sets. GPT-4o, on the other hand, is more reluctant to designate variables as confounders.

Claude 3.5-Sonnet and GPT o1-preview both identify a high share of variables as confounders. This indicates a high degree of agreement with the confounders identified in all three studies. However, the rate of confounder designation is nearly as high for the “Trimmed” group of variables removed from the causal diagram as unnecessary and the “Non-Confounder” group considered by experts not to be confounders. So this pattern seems to indicate less a strong agreement with the original studies, and more that the indirect method in these two models produces a high likelihood of returning a positive designation.

GPT-4o with an indirect prompt is much less likely to designate a variable as a confounder. Oddly, it designates the highest share of variables as confounders in the Trimmed group of variables, where, if GPT-4o were agreeing with the experts, we would expect a fairly low rate of agreement. GPT-4o does designate a smaller share of Non-Confounders as being confounders than in most other categories, but this is inconsistent: a small share of Non-confounders are identified as confounders 100% of the time the prompt is given (the far-right bar in the graph), but in many cases the same prompt produces inconsistent results: for more than half of Non-confounders, the variable is designated as a confounders more than 50% the time the prompt is given.




Figure 2: Distribution of LLM Confounder Designations with Reasoning-Encouraged Indirect Method

Confounder Designation Without Reasoning

Figure 3 and Figure 4 repeat Figure 1 and Figure 2 but with prompts that discourage the LLM from walking through its logic step-by-step and instead instruct it to produce an answer immediately.

Responses in Figure 3 are somewhat erratic. Claude 3.5-Sonnet identifies 100% of the confounders from CDPRG (1980), but only half of those kept in Murray and Hernán (2016), all of the Trimmed variables, and nearly all of the Non-Confounders.

GPT-4o shows a wide range of probabilities, with a great number of variables being designated as confounders in some iterations and not in others. It never identifies more than half of the variables in any group as confounders, although it also generally rejects the Trimmed variables and the Non-Confounders. This may just be due to its reduced tendency to designate a variable as a confounder at all, given its high false-negative rate.

Figure 4 shows very similar patterns to Figure 2. For Claude 3.5-Sonnet, a high share of variables are designated as confounders, including those in the Trimmed and Non-Confounders group, although these are designated at a slightly lower rate than under the direct method. GPT-4o finds the highest share of confounders in the Trimmed group. After that, it designates 71% of the CDPRG (1980) confounder set as confounders. It only designates 22% of the Non-Confounders as confounders 100% of the time, although there is little consistency across iterations, and it designates 80% of Non-Confounders as confounders at least half the time.

Consistency of LLM Confounder Designations

In this section, instead of comparing LLM confounder designations to the expert-determined ground truth, we consider how robust the confounder designations are to repeated prompting or slight variations in prompting.

For Claude 3.5-Sonnet and GPT-4o, each prompt was given 10 times, using a temperature setting of .7. Figure 5 shows the consistency of LLM designations across iterations of the same with-reasoning prompt.⁴ Consistency across iterations varies. Claude reported the same result for all ten iterations for 65.1% of variables under the direct method, and for 75.6% of all variables under the indirect method.⁵ GPT-4o was more sensitive to method. 63.4% of all variables produced the same result in every iteration under the direct method, but this fell to just 40.1% for the indirect method, with 22.6% of the sample splitting the ten

⁴Keep in mind that the reasoning prompts have the LLM produce a detailed explanation of its thinking before selecting an answer. Each different prompt generation produces a different explanation, and the explanation it happens to generate will lead to a different distribution of multiple-choice responses. So it is not feasible to simply show the internal probability of each multiple-choice token and take that as a distribution of response probabilities. We must actually generate the responses from the start.

⁵Notably, for both Claude and GPT, there was more inconsistency in designation among the Non-Confounder group. If this group is excluded, the shares for Claude are 66.1% direct and 81.2% indirect, and for GPT-4o are 68.8% direct and 48.2% indirect.




Figure 3: Distribution of LLM Confounder Designations with No-Reasoning Direct Method





Figure 4: Distribution of LLM Confounder Designations with No-Reasoning Indirect Method

iterations 4-6 or 5-5 in their designation. Over these iterations we see modest consistency across iterations, although there is not a strong pattern as to which model or method produced the most consistency, and a non-negligible portion of the sample produced a split conclusion.



The 0, 0.02, 0.05, 0.06, and 0.07 bars are equivalent to the less-popular recommendation being 0/10, 1/10, 2/10, 3/10, or 4-5/10 of the ten calls, respectively.

Figure 5: Consistency of Confounder Designations Across Iterations

The rest of the results in this section look at whether, for a given variable, two different approaches to prompting produce the same result. For each variable and prompting method (or model), the variable is categorized based on whether it is never (0%), always (100%), or sometimes (Mixed) designated as a confounder. We then look at the share of variables that, for example, are 100% confounders under one method but Mixed under another method. Non-confounders measured at follow-up are omitted from this graph for the GPT-o1-preview model, for the data inconsistency reasons outlined in the Data section.

In the previous section we already found that the distribution of confounder designations differed between direct and indirect prompting. Figure 6 shows the distribution of agreement by variable.⁶ For GPT o1-preview, there was fair agreement across methods, with 87.7% of the variables designated the same way; however, this was driven partially by the model’s tendency to label everything a confounder, so the Cohen’s kappa was still low at .16. Claude 3.5 Sonnet

⁶Chi-square tests of a statistically significant relationship between the two prompting methods are not included here since these tests are not identified when one of the rows or columns contains only zero values, which happens frequently in this case.

saw only 66.9% of confounders getting the same designation in both methods, and Cohen’s kappa of .21. In both, the mismatches usually occurred because the indirect method designated something as a confounder while the direct method did not. GPT-4o produced a similar Cohen’s kappa of .24, although much of this was due to counting different non-0/non-100% designations as matches. Mismatch was in the opposite direction, usually driven by the direct method designating something as a confounder when the indirect method did not.




Figure 6: Confounder Designation Agreement Between Direct and Indirect Prompting Methods With Reasoning

Figure 7 compares designations made by the reasoning and no-reasoning versions of the prompts. The degree of agreement across reasoning vs. no-reasoning is highly sensitive to the interaction with direct vs. indirect prompting. Reasoning vs. no-reasoning made no difference at all for indirect prompting, producing Cohen’s kappa values of 1.⁷ On the other hand, there was little agreement for direct prompting in GPT-4o, with a Cohen’s kappa value of .13. Agreement was higher for Claude Sonnet 3.5, with a Cohen’s Kappa of .41. The direction of mismatch varies: mismatches are more often due to the reasoning method designating more confounders than the no-reasoning method for GPT-4o, but the opposite is true for Claude 3.5 Sonnet.

The Figure 7 result can be taken as mixed evidence for our theory of how LLMs could designate

⁷Agreement is not actually perfect, since the “Mixed” designation includes the entire range of percentages between 0% and 100% (non-inclusive) and so a 10% in one method but 90% in the other would be regarded as a match. But agreement is perfect for the specified bins.

confounders, although only weakly. One might expect that if the LLMs are performing pure recall from their text data, then results should be identical between reasoning and no-reasoning prompts (as we find for indirect prompting). However, if we take that claim seriously, we only find mixed evidence of it as it does not replicate for direct prompting. That said, even if the LLM is performing pure recall, we still might expect responses with reasoning to differ, since LLMs generate token probabilities based on the prompt text up to that point, including its own output. Allowing the LLM to discuss the problem, even if it is not actually performing reasoning, may push it into the part of its training data where the information actually lies and improve its performance even if it is doing pure recall. So either way, this is only weak evidence for or against our proposed mechanism.




Figure 7: Confounder Designation Agreement Between Reasoning and No-Reasoning Prompts

For the direct version of the prompt with reasoning, we elicited a second set of responses where the only change to the prompt was a change in the order that the multiple-choice options were presented. This allows us to test for order-option sensitivity, as in Nori et al. (2023). Figure 8 shows the results. We find significant amounts of order-option sensitivity. In Claude 3.5, 36.7% of variables had different designations under one option-ordering system compared to another, leading to a Cohen’s kappa of .41. GPT-4o was less consistent, with 65.7% of variables changing designation, leading to a Cohen’s kappa of .13. These deviations based on option ordering were not minor either, with 4.6% of variables in Claude, and 16.3% in GPA-4o, switching between 0% confounder designation and 100% based only on option ordering. These results suggest a

heavy impact of option ordering, which should not rationally affect the response that the LLM gives.




Figure 8: Confounder Designation Sensitivity to Option Ordering

Conclusion

In this paper, we use three mass-market LLMs to designate a set of variables as confounders or not, using several different prompting strategies. We use the Coronary Drug Project (CDP) as a context in which to ask these questions, which allows us to use expert confounder designations in CDPRG (1980), Murray and Hernán (2016), and Debertin et al. (2024) as ground truths for comparison. Our working theory of how the LLM would be able to designate variables as confounders relies on the LLM having text data discussing confounder selection in its training data (as we know it does for CDPRG (1980)), as opposed to any reliance on the LLM being able to use real-world understanding to designate a variable as a confounder.

We find some moderate but mixed success in having LLMs produce confounder designations that match expert opinion. There are some cases in which the LLMs are able to match expert opinion a large share of the time, and in most cases, the LLM is able to categorize more than 70% of expert-designated confounders as confounders. However, the LLM also designated as confounders a high number of variables in the “Trimmed” or “Non-Confounders” categories,

which were, respectively removed from the causal diagram as unnecessary, or specifically designated as non-confounders. We would expect that these categories would be designated as confounders at a lower rate, but they are often designated at the same rate, and in some cases at higher rates. Success at matching expert confounder designations seems to rely more on whether a given model and prompting method tended to produce mostly-positive results or mostly-negative results, without a heavy signal to distinguish true-positives from true-negatives.

If we take as a rule of thumb a 70%+ rate of being able to identify variables as confounders (regardless of ability to identify non-confounders as non-confounders), this level of success may be in some cases acceptable. Further, it is possible that the LLMs are in fact not recalling expert opinion from its text data and instead are doing a *better* job of applying causal reasoning to identify confounders than the experts; we cannot prove that in the case of a deviation the experts are more correct than the LLMs, only that they are not the same.

However, both of these potential justifications for LLM performance are blunted by the considerable amounts of inconsistency we found in the LLM designations, which reduce the practical usefulness of a 70%+ match and make it less likely that the LLM is reporting some truth about confounders unknown to experts. Responses were sensitive to whether prompts were direct (asking directly about confounding status) vs. indirect (asking separately about the relationship of the variable with treatment and control). Multiple iterations of the same prompt produced the same result as little as 40% of the time in some cases, although as much as 76% in other cases. The quality of the output varied across which LLM model was used, and were highly sensitive to irrelevant details like what order the multiple-choice options for confounder designation were presented in. In all of these cases, the inconsistency sometimes favored one approach and other times favored its opposite, so this inconsistency does not simply let us conclude that we've discovered that one approach performs better than another.

These results show that available market LLMs achieve a non-negligible success rate in identifying that a given variable is a confounder. However, that success rate is also not high enough that it could be meaningfully used to select confounders in a real-world setting; even in some of our reasonably well-performing output, like Claude 3.5 Sonnet with indirect prompting, expert-selected covariates had an 80-86% chance of being correctly designated as confounders, but expert-rejected covariates had an 65-74% chance of being incorrectly designated as confounders. There is a signal here, but it is not strong enough that one could confidently generate a list of confounders for an actual study in this way, even if we knew ahead of time that Claude 3.5 Sonnet with indirect prompting was a desirable set of methodological choices.

Additionally, results are sensitive to seemingly arbitrary changes in prompting. Sensitivity to prompting can be acceptable in use cases where a user could distinguish which prompt is producing better output, but determining which output is better in the confounder-selection case would require that experts simply do the job from top to bottom anyway, making the LLM's contributions redundant. Further, even this level of success occurs in the CDP context where the LLMs have been handed the answer key ahead of time. One could reasonably believe that LLM confounder selection in a less well-studied case would be less effective.

These results of course cannot prove that LLMs can never complete this task. LLM technology is constantly improving, and none of the results in this paper prove that there will never be an LLM or a prompt design capable of effectively selecting covariates. But this paper shows that the technology does not as of yet have this capability, and the inconsistency in results suggests that even if we did design a prompt capable of matching experts in CDP in a certain model we should be skeptical that that same prompt and model would work in other contexts. We do not have to leave this to speculation, however: the setting and ground-truth in this study provides a test that can be re-performed with future models to determine whether success rates have indeed improved. To that end, our code, which can be easily revised to test future LLM tools, will be available at <https://osf.io/spzbu/>.

Appendix A: Full Variable Sets

Original Confounder Set

Confounders measured at baseline: Age at entry, Antiarrhythmic agents, Antihypertensives other than diuretics, Digitalis, Diuretics, History of acute coronary insufficiency, History of angina pectoris, History of congestive heart failure, History of intermittent cerebral ischemic attack, History of intermittent claudication, Number of myocardial infarctions at baseline, Oral hypoglycemic agents, Pre-randomization adherence, Race, Relative body weight, Risk group, Time since most recent myocardial infarction

Confounders measured at follow-up: Absolute neutrophil count, Cardiomegaly on chest X-ray, Cigarette smoking, Current habitual level of physical activity, Diastolic blood pressure, Heart rate, Hematocrit, New York Heart Association functional class, Plasma fasting glucose, Plasma one-hour glucose, after 75g oral load, Plasma urea nitrogen, Premature ventricular beats, Q/QS pattern on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Serum alkaline phosphatase, Serum total bilirubin, Serum total cholesterol, Serum triglyceride, Serum uric acid, ST segment depression on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, ST segment elevation on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Systolic blood pressure, T-wave findings on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Ventricular conduction defect, White blood cell count

2016 Follow-up Confounder Set

Confounders measured at baseline: Age at entry, Antiarrhythmic agents, Antihypertensives other than diuretics, Digitalis, Diuretics, History of acute coronary insufficiency, History of angina pectoris, History of congestive heart failure, History of intermittent cerebral ischemic attack, History of intermittent claudication, Number of myocardial infarctions at baseline, Oral hypoglycemic agents, Pre-randomization adherence, Race, Relative body weight, Risk group, Time since most recent myocardial infarction

Counfounders measured at follow-up: Absolute neutrophil count, Antiarrhythmic agents, Antihypertensives other than diuretics, Cardiomegaly on chest X-ray, Cigarette smoking, Current habitual level of physical activity, Diastolic blood pressure, Digitalis, Diuretics, Heart rate, Hematocrit, History of acute coronary insufficiency, History of angina pectoris, History of congestive heart failure, History of intermittent cerebral ischemic attack, History of intermittent claudication, New York Heart Association functional class, Oral hypoglycemic agents, Plasma fasting glucose, Plasma one-hour glucose, after 75g oral load, Plasma urea nitrogen, Premature ventricular beats, Q/QS pattern on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Serum alkaline phosphatase, Serum total bilirubin, Serum total cholesterol, Serum triglyceride, Serum uric acid, ST segment depression on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, ST segment elevation on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Systolic blood pressure, T-wave findings on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Ventricular conduction defect, White blood cell count

Confounder Set After Removing Non-Relevant Nodes

Confounders measured at baseline: Age at entry, Antiarrhythmic agents, Antihypertensives other than diuretics, Digitalis, Diuretics, History of acute coronary insufficiency, History of angina pectoris, History of congestive heart failure, History of intermittent cerebral ischemic attack, History of intermittent claudication, Number of myocardial infarctions at baseline, Oral hypoglycemic agents, Pre-randomization adherence, Race, Relative body weight, Risk group, Time since most recent myocardial infarction

Counfounders measured at follow-up: Antiarrhythmic agents, Antihypertensives other than diuretics, Cardiomegaly on chest X-ray, Cigarette smoking, Current habitual level of physical activity, Digitalis, Diuretics, History of acute coronary insufficiency, History of angina pectoris, History of congestive heart failure, History of intermittent cerebral ischemic attack, History of intermittent claudication, New York Heart Association functional class, Oral hypoglycemic agents, Plasma fasting glucose

Trimmed Variables

Confounders measured at follow-up: Absolute neutrophil count, Diastolic blood pressure, Heart rate, Hematocrit, Plasma one-hour glucose, after 75g oral load, Plasma urea nitrogen, Premature ventricular beats, Q/QS pattern on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Serum alkaline phosphatase, Serum total bilirubin, Serum total cholesterol, Serum triglyceride, Serum uric acid, ST segment depression on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, ST segment elevation on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Systolic blood pressure, T-wave findings on antero-lateral, postero-inferior, or antero-septal recording, Ventricular conduction defect, White blood cell count

Final Expert DAG With Added Nodes

Confounders measured at baseline: Age at entry, Alcohol use, Antiarrhythmic agents, Antihypertensives other than diuretics, Atrial fibrillation, Cognitive status, Depression, Diabetes, Digitalis, Diuretics, Dyslipidemia, Education level, Employment status, History of acute coronary insufficiency, History of angina pectoris, History of congestive heart failure, History of intermittent cerebral ischemic attack, History of intermittent claudication, Hypertension, Number of myocardial infarctions at baseline, Occupation, Oral hypoglycemic agents, Pre-randomization adherence, Race, Relative body weight, Risk group, Time since most recent myocardial infarction

Counfounders measured at follow-up: Alcohol use, Antiarrhythmic agents, Antihypertensives other than diuretics, Atrial fibrillation, Cardiomegaly on chest X-ray, Cigarette smoking, Cognitive status, Current habitual level of physical activity, Depression, Diabetes, Digitalis, Diuretics, Dyslipidemia, Employment status, History of acute coronary insufficiency, History of angina pectoris, History of congestive heart failure, History of intermittent cerebral ischemic attack, History of intermittent claudication, Hypertension, New York Heart Association functional class, Occupation, Oral hypoglycemic agents, Plasma fasting glucose

Non-Confounders

Confounders measured at baseline: Acute cholecystitis, Alpha-lipoprotein cholesterol, Black stools, Blood sample turbidity, Blood type, Breast enlargement, Bronchopulmonary abnormalities, Burning when urinating, Cause of death, Chemical composition of gallbladder stones, Chronic cholecystitis, Cigarettes per day, Date of study entry, Decreased appetite, Decreased libido, Dermatologic ailment, Difficulty swallowing, Enlarged prostate, Enlarged thyroid, Enrolled in follow-up study, Eye opacities, Far-sightedness, Finger tremor, Flushing, Forgetfulness, Frequent urination, Gallbladder cancer, Gouty arthritis, Gynecomastia, Hair loss, Heat intolerance, History of acute cholecystitis, History of common duct stone, Increased appetite, Insulin use, Itching, Musculoskeletal abnormalities, Nervous system abnormalities, Number of kids, Palpable liver, Palpable spleen, Rales, Reduced flow of urine, Return of unused study medication, Serum protein-bound iodine, Short-sightedness, Shortness of breath at night, Sleeplessness, Stomach pain, Supraventricular premature beats, Sweating, Swelling ankles, Thrombophlebitis, Thyroid nodules, Ulcer, Unusually warm or moist skin, Urinary stones, Urine conjugate of clofibrate, Urticaria, Vascular spiders

Appendix B: Full Prompts

In each of the below prompts, {confounder} is replaced in the prompt by the name of a potential confounder, which will often include a measurement period indication, like “baseline alcohol use” or “follow-up alcohol use.”

Prompt for the direct method, in which the LLM is directly asked whether something is a confounder, with reasoning encouraged. There is an alternate version of this prompt that is exactly the same except the order of the options is changed to “A. Not sure. B. Not a confounding variable. C. A confounding variable.”:

You are a bot that specializes in causal inference in medical contexts. When estimating the effect of X on Y in non-experimental data, you know which variables are confounding factors that need to be accounted for to isolate a causal effect.

I am going to ask you whether a specific variable is a confounder in my analysis.

Example tasks and correct answers:

I have a data set consisting of a large representative sample of women. I want to use causal analysis to figure out whether (hormone replacement therapy) has a causal effect on (coronary artery disease).

In this analysis, the variable “socioeconomic status” is...

A. Not a confounding variable B. A confounding variable C. Not sure.

CORRECT RESPONSE: Women who take hormone replacement therapy tend to be wealthier and have access to better medical care, which will reduce the incidence of coronary artery disease, so socioeconomic status is a confounding variable. B.

I have a data set consisting of people over the age of 55. I want to use causal analysis to figure out whether (ACE inhibitors) have a causal effect on (myocardial infarction).

In this analysis, the variable “takes daily low-dose aspirin” is...

A. Not a confounding variable B. A confounding variable C. Not sure.

CORRECT RESPONSE: People with more acute heart problems are often recommended both ACE inhibitors and low-dose aspirin, so the two drugs are correlated. Low-dose reduces myocardial infarction, so low-dose aspirin is a confounding variable. B.

I have a data set of people who suffer from allergies. I want to use causal analysis to figure out whether (taking acetaminophen) causally reduces (cephalalgia / headache).

In this analysis, the variable “takes regular vitamin D supplement” is...

A. Not a confounding variable B. A confounding variable C. Not sure.

CORRECT RESPONSE: Usage of acetaminophen and vitamin D may be correlated. However, vitamin D supplementation should not affect headache, so vitamin D is not a confounder in this analysis. A.

MY QUESTION FOR YOU:

I have a data set consisting only of people who have been assigned to take a certain medication X. However, some of the patients choose to take X as assigned, and others do not. I want to use causal analysis to figure out whether (a patient's decision to take X) has a causal effect on (the patient's mortality).

In this analysis, the variable (`{confounder}`) is...

A. Not a confounding variable B. A confounding variable C. Not sure.

Explain your reasoning step-by-step, and then choose either A, B, or C. The final word of your response should only be "A.", "B.", or "C."

Prompt for the indirect method, in which the LLM is separately asked about the relationship between the confounder and adherence, and between the confounder and mortality. The below prompt specifies (mortality), but the alternate version is the exact same but replacing (mortality) with (a patient's decision to take X).

You are a bot that specializes in causal inference in medical contexts. You are familiar with the medical literature on whether a given variable X is understood to have a causal effect on another variable Y.

I am going to ask you whether a specific variable is a cause of another variable or not.

Example tasks and correct answers:

I have a data set consisting of a large representative sample of women. Does (socioeconomic status) have a causal effect on (hormone replacement therapy)?

A. Yes. (socioeconomic status) has a causal effect on (hormone replacement therapy).
B. No. (socioeconomic status) and (hormone replacement therapy) are statistically related, but there is not a causal relationship between them in either direction.
C. No. (socioeconomic status) and (hormone replacement therapy) are not statistically or causally related to each other.
D. Unsure.

CORRECT RESPONSE: A higher socioeconomic status improves access to medical care, including hormone replacement therapy, which is expensive. Socioeconomic status is a cause of hormone replacement therapy. A.

I have a data set consisting of people over the age of 55. Does (takes daily low-dose aspirin) cause (takes ACE inhibitors)?

A. Yes. (takes daily low-dose aspirin) has a causal effect on (ACE inhibitors).
B. No. (takes daily low-dose aspirin) and (ACE inhibitors) are statistically related, but there is not a causal relationship between them in either direction.
C. No. (takes daily low-dose aspirin) and (ACE inhibitors) are not statistically or causally related to each other.
D. Unsure.

CORRECT RESPONSE: People with more acute heart conditions are likely to both be recommended aspirin and ACE inhibitors. This will lead to a correlation between the two. But it is the heart condition causing the patient to take both. Taking aspirin does not cause someone to take ACE inhibitors. B.

I have a data set of people who suffer from allergies. Does (takes regular vitamin D supplement) causally reduce (cephalalgia / headache)?

In this analysis, the variable “takes regular vitamin D supplement” is . . .

A. Yes. (takes regular vitamin D supplement) has a causal effect on (cephalalgia / headache). B. No. (takes regular vitamin D supplement) and (cephalalgia / headache) are statistically related, but there is not a causal relationship between them in either direction. C. No. (takes regular vitamin D supplement) and (cephalalgia / headache) are not statistically or causally related to each other. D. Unsure.

CORRECT RESPONSE: There is no reason to believe that taking a vitamin D supplement should be related to headache, causally or otherwise. C.

MY QUESTION FOR YOU:

I have a data set consisting only of people who have been assigned to take a certain medication X. However, some of the patients choose to take X as assigned, and others do not. In this data, does ({confounder}) have a causal effect on (mortality)?

A. Yes. ({confounder}) has a causal effect on (mortality). B. No. ({confounder}) and (mortality) are statistically related, but there is not a causal relationship between them in either direction. C. No. ({confounder}) and (mortality) are not statistically or causally related to each other. D. Unsure.

Explain your reasoning step-by-step, and then choose either A, B, C, or D. The final word of your response should only be “A.”, “B.”, “C.”, or “D.”.

Prompt for the direct method with no reasoning encouraged:

You are a bot that specializes in causal inference in medical contexts. When estimating the effect of X on Y in non-experimental data, you know which variables are confounding factors that need to be accounted for to isolate a causal effect.

I am going to ask you whether a specific variable is a confounder in my analysis.

I have a data set consisting only of people who have been assigned to take a certain medication X. However, some of the patients choose to take X as assigned, and others do not. I want to use causal analysis to figure out whether (a patient’s decision to take X) has a causal effect on (the patient’s mortality).

In this analysis, the variable ({confounder}) is . . .

A. Not a confounding variable B. A confounding variable C. Not sure.

Tell me your answer: A, B, or C. Give me ONLY your answer and no other text in your response. The entire response should only be “A.”, “B.”, or “C.”.

Prompt for the indirect method with no reasoning encouraged:

You are a bot that specializes in causal inference in medical contexts. You are familiar with the medical literature on whether a given variable X is understood to have a causal effect on another variable Y.

I am going to ask you whether a specific variable is a cause of another variable or not.

I have a data set consisting only of people who have been assigned to take a certain medication X. However, some of the patients choose to take X as assigned, and others do not. In this data, does ({confounder}) have a causal effect on (mortality)?

A. Yes. ({confounder}) has a causal effect on (mortality). B. No. ({confounder}) and (mortality) are statistically related, but there is not a causal relationship between them in either direction. C. No. ({confounder}) and (mortality) are not statistically or causally related to each other. D. Unsure.

Tell me your answer: A, B, C, or D. Give me ONLY your answer and no other text in your response. The entire response should only be “A.”, “B.”, “C.”, or “D.”.

Appendix C: Reasons for Non-Confounder Status

Administrative study data: Blood sample turbidity, Cause of death, Date of study entry, Enrolled in follow-up study, Return of unused study medication

Anticipated side-effect or known metabolite of active study medication(s): Alpha-lipoprotein cholesterol, Black stools, Breast enlargement, Burning when urinating, Decreased appetite, Decreased libido, Difficulty swallowing, Finger tremor, Flushing, Forgetfulness, Frequent urination, Gynecomastia, Hair loss, Heat intolerance, Increased appetite, Itching, Reduced flow of urine, Shortness of breath at night, Sleeplessness, Stomach pain, Sweating, Swelling ankles, Ulcer, Urine conjugate of clofibrate, Urticaria

General medical examination results: Blood type, Bronchopulmonary abnormalities, Enlarged prostate, Enlarged thyroid, Eye opacities, Far-sightedness, Finger tremor, Gouty arthritis, Gynecomastia, Hair loss, History of acute cholecystitis, History of common duct stone, Musculoskeletal abnormalities, Nervous system abnormalities, Number of kids, Palpable liver, Palpable spleen, Rales, Short-sightedness, Thrombophlebitis, Thyroid nodules, Ulcer, Unusually warm or moist skin, Urinary stones

Sub-study data collected only on a sample of participants: Acute cholecystitis, Alpha-lipoprotein cholecystitis, Blood sample turbidity, Chemical composition of gallbladder stones, Chronic cholecystitis, Cigarettes per day, Gallbladder cancer, Insulin use, Serum protein-bound iodine, Supraventricular premature beats, Ulcer, Urine conjugate of clofibrate

References

- Anthropic. 2024. “Anthropic Python API.” <https://github.com/anthropics/anthropic-sdk-python>.
- Ashwani, Swagata, Kshiteesh Hegde, Nishith Reddy Mannuru, Mayank Jindal, Dushyant Singh Sengar, Krishna Chaitanya Rao Kathala, Dishant Banga, Vinija Jain, and Aman Chadha. 2024. “Cause and Effect: Can Large Language Models Truly Understand Causality?” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2402.18139>.
- Cai, Hengrui, Shengjie Liu, and Rui Song. 2024. “Is Knowledge All Large Language Models Needed for Causal Reasoning?” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2401.00139>.
- Catalogue of Bias Collaboration, David Nunan, Jeffrey Aronson, and Clare Bankhead. 2018. “Confounding.” www.catalogueofbiases.org/biases/confounding.
- CDPRG. 1980. “Influence of Adherence to Treatment and Response of Cholesterol on Mortality in the Coronary Drug Project.” *New England Journal of Medicine* 303 (18): 1038–41. <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejm198010303031804>.
- Debertin, Julia, Javier A. Jurado Vélez, Laura Corlin, Bertha Hidalgo, and Eleanor J. Murray. 2024. “Synthesizing Subject-Matter Expertise for Variable Selection in Causal Effect Estimation: A Case Study.” *Epidemiology* 35 (5): 642–53. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ede.0000000000001758>.
- Gururaghavendran, Rajesh, and Eleanor J. Murray. 2024. “Can Algorithms Replace Expert Knowledge for Causal Inference? A Case Study on Novice Use of Causal Discovery.” *American Journal of Epidemiology*, August. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwae338>.
- Han, Sukjin. 2024. “Mining Causality: AI-Assisted Search for Instrumental Variables.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2409.14202>.
- Humphrey, Linda L, Benjamin KS Chan, and Harold C Sox. 2002. “Postmenopausal Hormone Replacement Therapy and the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease.” *Annals of Internal Medicine* 137 (4): 273–84.
- Jin, Zhijing, Yuen Chen, Felix Leeb, Luigi Gresle, Ojasv Kamal, Zhiheng LYU, Kevin Blin, et al. 2023. “CLadder: Assessing Causal Reasoning in Language Models.” In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, edited by A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, 36:31038–65. Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/631bb9434d718ea309af82566347d607-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- Kıçman, Emre, Robert Ness, Amit Sharma, and Chenhao Tan. 2023. “Causal Reasoning and Large Language Models: Opening a New Frontier for Causality.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.00050>.
- Liu, Xiaoyu, Paiheng Xu, Junda Wu, Jiaxin Yuan, Yifan Yang, Yuhang Zhou, Fuxiao Liu, et al.

2024. “Large Language Models and Causal Inference in Collaboration: A Comprehensive Survey.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2403.09606>.
- Long, Stephanie, Tibor Schuster, and Alexandre Piché. 2023. “Can Large Language Models Build Causal Graphs?” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2303.05279>.
- Murray, Eleanor J., and Miguel A. Hernán. 2016. “Adherence Adjustment in the Coronary Drug Project: A Call for Better Per-Protocol Effect Estimates in Randomized Trials.” *Clinical Trials* 13 (4): 372–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774516634335>.
- . 2018. “Improved Adherence Adjustment in the Coronary Drug Project.” *Trials* 19 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-018-2519-5>.
- NHLBI BioLINCC. 2024. “Coronary Drug Project (CDP).” <https://biolincc.nhlbi.nih.gov/studies/cdp/>.
- Nori, Harsha, Yin Tat Lee, Sheng Zhang, Dean Carignan, Richard Edgar, Nicolo Fusi, Nicholas King, et al. 2023. “Can Generalist Foundation Models Outcompete Special-Purpose Tuning? Case Study in Medicine.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2311.16452>.
- OpenAI. 2024. “OpenAI Python API.” <https://github.com/openai/openai-python>.
- Sheth, Ivaxi, Sahar Abdelnabi, and Mario Fritz. 2024. “Hypothesizing Missing Causal Variables with LLMs.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2409.02604>.
- Takayama, Masayuki, Tadahisa Okuda, Thong Pham, Tatsuyoshi Ikenoue, Shingo Fukuma, Shohei Shimizu, and Akiyoshi Sannai. 2024. “Integrating Large Language Models in Causal Discovery: A Statistical Causal Approach.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2402.01454>.
- Zečević, Matej, Moritz Willig, Devendra Singh Dhami, and Kristian Kersting. 2023. “Causal Parrots: Large Language Models May Talk Causality but Are Not Causal.” *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2308.13067>.
- Zhang, Huan, Yu Song, Ziyu Hou, Santiago Miret, and Bang Liu. 2024. “HoneyComb: A Flexible LLM-Based Agent System for Materials Science.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2409.00135>.
- Zhou, Hongjian, Fenglin Liu, Boyang Gu, Xinyu Zou, Jinfa Huang, Jinge Wu, Yiru Li, et al. 2023. “A Survey of Large Language Models in Medicine: Progress, Application, and Challenge.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2311.05112>.