SciReplicate-Bench: Benchmarking LLMs in Agent-driven Algorithmic Reproduction from Research Papers

Yanzheng Xiang¹, Hanqi Yan¹, Shuyin Ouyang¹, Lin Gui¹, Yulan He^{1,2} ¹King's College London, ²The Alan Turing Institute

 $\{yanzheng.xiang,hanqi.yan,shuyin.ouyang,lin.1.gui,yulan.he\}@kcl.ac.uk$

Abstract

This study evaluates large language models (LLMs) in generating code from algorithm descriptions from recent NLP papers. The task requires two key competencies: (1) algorithm comprehension: synthesizing information from papers and academic literature to understand implementation logic, and (2) coding expertise: identifying dependencies and correctly implementing necessary APIs. To facilitate rigorous evaluation, we introduce SciReplicate-Bench, a benchmark of 100 tasks from 36 NLP papers published in 2024, featuring detailed annotations and comprehensive test cases. Building on SciReplicate-Bench, we propose Sci-Reproducer, a multi-agent framework consisting of a Paper Agent that interprets algorithmic concepts from literature and a Code Agent that retrieves dependencies from repositories and implement solutions. To assess algorithm understanding, we introduce reasoning graph accuracy, which quantifies similarity between generated and reference reasoning graphs derived from code comments and structure. For evaluating implementation quality, we employ *execution accuracy*, *CodeBLEU*, and repository dependency/API recall metrics. In our experiments, we evaluate various powerful Non-Reasoning LLMs and Reasoning LLMs as foundational models. The best-performing LLM using Sci-Reproducer achieves only 39% execution accuracy, highlighting the benchmark's difficulty. Our analysis identifies missing or inconsistent algorithm descriptions as key barriers to successful reproduction. We will open-source our benchmark, and code at https://github.com/xyzCS/SciReplicate-Bench.

1 Introduction

The evolution of Large Language Models (LLMs) has ushered in a transformative era in scientific discovery, positioning them as powerful tools for streamlining research (Gridach et al., 2025; Buehler, 2024; Lu et al., 2024), from idea generation to verification and publication writing. For instance, Si et al. (2025); Gu & Krenn (2025) demonstrated how LLMs can be prompted to generate novel research ideas, while Yuan et al. (2022); Du et al. (2024) explored their use in producing literature reviews for idea evaluation. Additionally, LLMs are increasingly integrated into tools like Semantic Scholar¹, Research Rabbit², and Undermind Research Assistant³, enhancing literature discovery, citation analysis, and knowledge synthesis. These advancements, both in research methodologies and practical applications, suggest that LLMs have the potential to assist across multiple stages of scientific discovery.

Among the aforementioned advancements in research acceleration, the ability of LLMs to correctly generate code for validating real-world scientific ideas is particularly noteworthy. Computational validation is crucial across many fields, yet researchers often face barriers due to limited coding expertise or inaccessible implementations. By converting scientific algorithm descriptions into executable code, LLMs could enhance reproducibility and

¹https://www.semanticscholar.org

²https://www.researchrabbit.ai/

³https://www.undermind.ai/

accelerate scientific discovery. However, despite progress in LLM-based code generation, a significant gap remains in generating code directly from scholarly papers. *Firstly, algorithm comprehension from scientific papers is challenging*. Research papers are characterized by their brevity, methodological rigor, and extensive citations, with critical details about algorithms often dispersed across multiple sections of the paper. Understanding these algorithms requires synthesizing information from internal references and external scholarly works. *Secondly, code repositories typically comprise multiple interdependent files and directories*. To implement an algorithm, LLMs must comprehensively examine file dependencies, identify reusable components, and correctly handle both internal dependencies and external APIs.

Despite the importance of automatic scientific ideas verification, there exists no dataset specifically designed to evaluate the ability of LLMs to reproduce real-world algorithms proposed in peer-reviewed publications. As shown in Table 1, there are several machine learning software engineering benchmarks primarily focused on evaluating algorithmic design or straightforward implementations, which are significantly less complex than the methods typically described in academic research papers. For example, MLE-BENCH (Liu et al., 2023) and MLAgentBench (Huang et al., 2023) utilize Kaggle competitions, where LLMs must develop and implement solutions based on provided task specifications. ML-BENCH Chan et al. (2024) uses Machine Learning (ML) GitHub repositories to assess LLMs' text-to-code capabilities and test autonomous agents in task execution.

Benchmark	Paper Understanding	Repo-Search	Test Case	Source	Task Types
MLE-BENCH	×	×	×	Kaggle	Algorithm design and code gen.
MLAgentBench ML-BENCH	×	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	Kaggle Github	Algorithm design and code gen. Code gen.
SciReplicate-Bench	✓	\checkmark	\checkmark	Publications	Replicate code for algorithms in real-world NLP publications.

Table 1: Comparisons of different machine learning software engineering benchmarks.

Therefore, we manually developed SciReplicate-Bench, the first benchmark specifically designed to evaluate LLMs' capabilities in code generation for reproducing research findings from academic papers. It consists of 100 code reproduction tasks derived from 36 papers published in top NLP conferences in 2024. This recent publication window was deliberately chosen to minimize the risk of data leakage. An overview of the task is illustrated in Figure 1, with a concrete example provided in Figure A2 in Appendix E. The task consists of two main steps: **1.** Algorithm understanding. LLMs must extract essential information from the paper, such as workflow details, algorithm descriptions, and hyperparameter values. **2.** Code implementation. Based on the extracted information, LLMs are required to implement a function or method within a provided repository, based on the LaTeX representation of the algorithm from the paper.

To rigorously assess LLM performance on this benchmark, we evaluate two dimensions corresponding to aforementioned two steps: *algorithm comprehension correctness* and *code correctness*. To evaluate algorithm comprehension, we introduce a **reasoning graph** to represent the reasoning logic behind algorithm reproduction. Each node in the graph represents a code comment, which reflects a single reasoning step and is aligned with a specific segment of code. Edges between nodes are defined based on data flow relationships across different code segments. We compute the similarity between the generated reasoning graph and a reference graph to derive the *reasoning graph accuracy*. To evaluate code correctness, we employ established metrics including *execution accuracy* (Rajkumar et al., 2022; Xiang et al., 2023), *CodeBLEU* (Ren et al., 2020), and *recall* of intra/cross-file dependencies and APIs.

Our work makes the following contributions:

Benchmarks: we present SciReplicate-Bench, The first benchmark aims to evaluate LLMs' ability in reproducing the algorithms proposed in real-world NLP publications.

Metric: we propose a *reasoning graph accuracy* for evaluating the correctness of implicit reasoning process behind code generation, serving as an indicator of an LLM's algorithm comprehension capability.




Figure 1: Overview of the task and the proposed Sci-Reproducer framework. The task involves algorithm understanding and code implementation, handled by a paper agent and a code agent operating in separate contexts with specialized actions.

Approach: we introduce Sci-Reproducer, a dual-agent framework that combines a paper agent for extracting and understanding algorithmic logic from research papers with a code agent that retrieves necessary dependencies from code repositories. Their collaborative enables comprehensive paper reproduction by combining deep algorithmic understanding with practical implementation capabilities.

Observations: we employed various state-of-the-art LLMs on this benchmark. The experimental results show that (i) even the most advanced models still find this task very challenging, with *execution accuracy* rates below 40% for all models. (ii) reasoning models often rely excessively on internal reasoning instead of utilizing pre-defined actions to extract relevant information from literature and code contexts. This behavior, referred to as the 'Overthinking Problem' (Cuadron et al., 2025; Sui et al., 2025), can lead to suboptimal performance in agent-based systems. (iii) LLMs can comprehend algorithm logic but face challenges with actual implementation. (iv) many failures stem from the missing or inconsistent algorithm descriptions, and the incorporation of the Paper Agent effectively mitigates issues related to incomplete information.

2 SciReplicate-Bench

Overview SciReplicate-Bench is a benchmark consisting of 100 tasks curated from 36 NLP publications, constructed using their open-source code repositories and corresponding LaTeX sources. The task categories are detailed in Appendix A1. The benchmark focuses on repository-level code generation, where each task is centered around implementing a specific function or class method. As illustrated in Figure A3 in Appendix E, each task comprises nine components, which can be categorized into three groups corresponding to code generation, evaluation, and analysis, respectively.

For code generation, the following components are provided as inputs to LLMs:

- *Function signature*: the definition of the target function, including detailed descriptions of its input and output variables.
- *Algorithm LaTex code*: The LaTeX code description of the target algorithm, typically located within a subsection or paragraph of the target paper.
- *Literature context*: the original paper along with its cited references, providing broader conceptual context.
- *Repository context*: all source files and code in the repository that inform or support the target implementation.

For evaluation, the following components are provided for code execution and metrics calculation:

Implementation reference: the ground-truth implementation of the target algorithm, used for computing the *CodeBLEU* metric.

Annotated reasoning graph: a structured graph capturing the reasoning process behind the reference implementation, used to evaluate reasoning graph accuracy.

Dependency information: annotations covering intra-file and cross-file dependencies, as well as external APIs invoked in the reference code, used to calculate *recall* across all three dependency types.

Verification suite: each task includes a dedicated Python environment with ten test cases and scripts to verify the correctness of the output produced by generated code.

To enable further analysis of the underlying causes of LLM failures, the benchmark includes:

Missing/Mismatch Information: the LaTeX description of the algorithm may omit certain implementation details, which could either appear elsewhere in the paper or be entirely absent. We also annotate mismatches between the paper description and the reference implementation.

Task Definition Based on SciReplicate-Bench, an LLM is given the algorithm LaTeX code, function signature, literature context, and repository context as input. The LLM is asked to output a function that implements the target algorithm.

Benchmark Construction The benchmark construction process comprises four key steps: paper selection, Python environment setup, documentation, and verification suite preparation. To mitigate the risk of data leakage, we selected papers published in 2024 that provide publicly available code repositories. During the annotation process, each repository was refactored to isolate the core algorithm into a standalone function, and all sources of randomness were removed to ensure reproducibility and prevent leakage. On average, annotating each paper requires approximately 12 hours. Details of the annotation process are provided in Appendix B.

2.1 Evaluation Metrics

2.1.1 Evaluating Algorithm Comprehension

We propose the *reasoning graph accuracy* metric to evaluate how well LLMs understand the logic and implementation of algorithms. During code generation, LLMs are prompted to insert specially formatted, non-overlapping, non-nested comments that mark reasoning steps derived from the algorithm's LaTeX code (The prompt can be found in Figure A5). We then construct a reasoning graph $G = \{N, E\}$ (illustrated in Figure A3), modeled as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG). Each node $n_i = \langle w_i, c_i \rangle, n_i \in N$ represents a reasoning step with a comment w_i and corresponding code snippet c_i . An edge $e_i = \langle n_i, n_j \rangle, e_i \in E$ is added if a variable used in c_j is defined or last modified in c_i . To compute the *reasoning graph accuracy*, we compare the generated graph G_g with the reference graph G_r via node and edge matching:

Node matching: comments from G_r and G_g are passed to GPT-40, which maps each reference node to one or more nodes in the generated graph. A node in G_r is considered matched if it has at least one corresponding node in G_g . The prompt template used for this process is available in Figure A4.

Edge matching: for each reference edge $e_r = \langle n_r^i, n_r^j \rangle$, if both endpoints are matched, we apply BFS to verify whether a corresponding edge exists in G_g .

The *reasoning graph accuracy* S_r is computed as:

$$S_{r} = \sum_{n_{i}}^{n_{i} \in N_{m}} s_{i}^{n} + \sum_{e_{j}}^{e_{j} \in E_{m}} s_{j}^{e}.$$
 (1)

where N_m and E_m denote the sets of matched nodes and edges, respectively, and s_i^n and s_j^e represent their corresponding significance scores. Node significance is determined by the

complexity of its corresponding code segment, measured by the number of variable definitions and usages, function calls, arithmetic operations, and lines of code, then normalized across the reference graph. Edge significance is calculated as the product of the significance scores of its connected nodes, followed by normalization.

2.1.2 Evaluating Code Generation

For assessing coding ability, we use the following evaluation metrics:

- *Execution accuracy* (Xiang et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024b; Long et al., 2022): we integrate the generated code into the repository and execute it to obtain results. If all test cases match the reference results, we consider the code correct.
- *CodeBLEU* (Ren et al., 2020): this metric evaluates how similar the generated code is to reference code by using the traditional BLEU metric (Papineni et al., 2002) while incorporating syntactic information through abstract syntax trees (AST) and semantic understanding via data-flow graphs (DFG).
- *Recall* (Li et al., 2024): we calculate recall scores specifically for intra-file dependencies, cross-file dependencies, and external APIs.

3 Sci-Reproducer

Action Name	Input	Observation		
Paper Agent				
SearchPaper	Query	The retrieved response from the target paper in relation to the query.		
SearchSection	Section ID	The entire content of a section based on the section label.		
SearchLiterature	Paper ID, query	The answer to the query searched from the literature (identified by Paper ID).		
		Code Agent		
SearchCode	Name	The definition of a specific code element in repository.		
SearchFile	Name	The content of a certain file in repository.		
SearchWeb	Query	The information obtained from the website.		
Compiler	code	The feedback from the compiler after executing the code.		

Table 2: The pre-defined actions for the Paper Agent and the Code Agent.

To address this task, we introduce Sci-Reproducer, a dual-agent framework designed for scientific paper methodology replication. As illustrated in Figure 1, Sci-Reproducer comprises a Paper Agent and a Code Agent that collaboratively work to replicate algorithms described in a given paper. The predefined actions employed by the agents are summarized in Table 2, with implementation details provided in Appendix D.

3.1 Paper Agent

Due to the input length limitations of LLMs, it is infeasible to input entire paper along with their associated literature. Consequently, the Paper Agent must selectively extract pertinent information, following a strategy akin to Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) (Wang et al., 2024; Sarthi et al., 2024). The Paper Agent incrementally builds an understanding of the target algorithm by executing predefined actions to query the literature context. To facilitate this process, we adopt ReAct (Yao et al., 2022) as the agent strategy, which enables seamless integration of action execution with intermediate reasoning steps.

After the Paper Agent concludes that all necessary information has been collected, it generates a comprehensive report comprising key findings that fill in the missing components of the target algorithm's LaTeX source. An example of the report is shown in Figure A8. This report subsequently serves as a crucial input for the Code Agent. The prompt used to guide the Paper Agent is provided in Figure A6.

3.2 Code Agent

The Code Agent integrates the target algorithm's LaTeX code with the Paper Agent's report to comprehensively understand the algorithm. It leverages actions to search the code repository for necessary dependencies that aid implementation. The agent can also browse websites for additional information and use a compiler to test and iteratively debug the code, ensuring proper execution by identifying and fixing syntax errors. The prompt for the Code Agent is provided in Figure A7.

4 Experiments

We evaluate Sci-Reproducer on the SciReplicate-Bench benchmark using 7 advanced LLMs, including five non-reasoning LLMs: GPT-4o-mini (4o mini, 2024), GPT-4o (GPT-4o, 2024), Claude-Sonnet-3.7 (Claude-Sonnet-3.7, 2025), Gemini-2.0-Flash (Gemini-2.0-Flash, 2024), and Deepseek-V3 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2024), and different versions of the reasoning models O3-mini (o3 mini, 2024), i.e., three different levels of reasoning intensity. For the *reasoning graph accuracy* metric, node matching is performed using GPT-4o, which may introduce some randomness. To reduce this variability, we set the temperature to 0 and top-p to 1, ensuring deterministic generation. The calculation is repeated three times, and we report the average score as the final result.

4.1 Results on SciReplicate-Bench

Table 3 displays Sci-Reproducer's evaluation results and contributions of code/paper agent. The "No Agent" directly prompts the LLM to generate code based solely on the algorithm LaTeX code and function signature. "No Paper Agent" allows the LLM to use code agent actions, i.e., website and repository research and compiler incorporation, but restricts access to paper agent actions. "No Code Agent" grants access to paper agent actions but blocks Code Agent capabilities. The results offer key insights, discussed in the following.

LLMs struggles on SciReplicate-Bench Most LLMs perform poorly, achieving less than 0.1 *execution accuracy* without using the agent to examine literature and repository contexts. With enhancement of Sci-Reproducer, these LLMs showed notable improvements, with an average increase of 0.181 in execution ACC and 0.057 in *CodeBLEU*, although even the best-performing model, Claude-Sonnet-3.7, only achieved 0.390 *execution accuracy*. This highlights the exceptional challenge presented by our SciReplicate-Bench.

LLMs can comprehend algorithm logic Most models are capable of understanding the core implementation logic of target algorithms (indicated by *reasoning graph accuracy*), even without any external assistance, with an average score of 0.731 in the "No Agent" setting. Both the Paper Agent and Code Agent further enhance the algorithm understanding, i.e., leading to an average increase of 0.013 and 0.049, respectively; using both agents together results in an improvement of 0.060. These can be explained that Paper Agent's retrieved contextual information from the surrounding literature can help the model comprehend the theoretical and methodological aspects; the Code Agent extracts relevant code snippets and dependencies from code repositories for the implementation logic understanding.

LLMs face challenges with actual implementation Although LLMs are capable of understanding algorithms, their performance in code generation remains suboptimal. Despite using Sci-Reproducer, the average *execution accuracy* remains low at 0.235, with a *CodeBLEU* score of 0.320.

Accurate dependency and API identification is crucial for code implementation Effectively recognizing and leveraging dependencies from the source repository and external APIs is essential for accurate code implementation. The integration of Code Agent led to substantial gains in *recall* with average increases of 0.441, 0.239, and 0.100, respectively, compared to cases without the agent. With Sci-Reproducer, Claude-Sonnet-3.7 attains the highest *execution accuracy* of 0.390, with the highest *recall* for intra/cross file dependency and API usage, at 0.776, 0.636, and 0.626 respectively.

Approach	Exe Acc(†)	CodeBLEU(†)	RG Acc(↑)	Intra-File(↑)	Recall Cross-File(↑)	API(↑)
	© GPT-40-mini					
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	0.030 0.040 0.140 0.170	0.238 0.246 0.279 0.303	0.708 0.739 0.747 0.768	0.012 0.024 0.565 0.576	0.000 0.000 0.364 0.364	0.217 0.251 0.328 0.362
		\$	GPT-40			<u> </u>
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	0.040 0.020 0.260 0.270	0.259 0.263 0.325 0.329	0.727 0.732 0.803 0.808	0.059 0.023 0.682 0.688	0.000 0.000 0.576 0.636	0.281 0.298 0.421 0.417
		A Claud	le-Sonnet-3.7			
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	0.070 0.050 0.320 0.390	0.282 0.291 0.394 0.401	0.739 0.736 0.784 0.794	0.094 0.082 0.765 0.776	0.091 0.091 0.545 0.636	0.362 0.379 0.545 0.626
		🔶 Gem	ini-2.0-Flash			
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	0.070 0.040 0.220 0.250	0.275 0.278 0.323 0.346	0.686 0.699 0.725 0.758	0.071 0.082 0.553 0.588	0.000 0.000 0.212 0.333	0.294 0.332 0.426 0.455
		🚫 De	epseek-V3			
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	0.030 0.050 0.210 0.220	0.260 0.275 0.312 0.334	0.747 0.762 0.776 0.778	0.012 0.012 0.482 0.565	0.061 0.030 0.182 0.333	0.272 0.306 0.383 0.443
	₲ o3-mini-low ©					
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	0.080 0.050 0.150 0.180	0.259 0.262 0.278 0.280	0.767 0.768 0.815 0.806	0.035 0.035 0.306 0.376	0.000 0.000 0.000 0.121	0.323 0.315 0.348 0.328
🛞 03-mini-medium 🖓						
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	0.040 0.060 0.220 0.240	0.263 0.263 0.289 0.283	0.747 0.752 0.792 0.799	0.035 0.047 0.376 0.341	0.000 0.000 0.030 0.061	0.336 0.319 0.404 0.362
🕲 o3-mini-high 😋						
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	0.070 0.070 0.160 0.160	0.269 0.267 0.277 0.283	0.723 0.774 0.797 0.810	0.047 0.035 0.165 0.294	0.000 0.000 0.152 0.091	0.345 0.366 0.374 0.357

Table 3: Performance evaluation on the SciReplicate-Bench benchmark. Models with notation indicate **reasoning LLMs**. "Exe Acc" represents *execution accuracy* while "RG Acc" indicates *reasoning graph accuracy*.

Overthinking leads to limited improvement in reasoning LLMs The performance gains of reasoning LLMs with Sci-Reproducer are relatively limited. Specifically, they show an average improvement of 0.13 in *execution accuracy*, compared to a higher average improvement of 0.212 observed in non-reasoning ones. For *recall* metrics, reasoning LLMs achieve average gains of 0.243, 0.061, and 0.041, respectively. In contrast, non-reasoning LLMs demonstrate notably higher improvements of 0.560, 0.345, and 0.135 on the same metrics. This discrepancy implies that reasoning LLMs tend to rely heavily on their internal reasoning capabilities, rather than pre-defined actions. This tendency highlights a limitation refer to as "overthinking" (Cuadron et al., 2025; Sui et al., 2025), which we further analyze in the next subsection.

4.2 Tool Usage Analysis

Figure 2 presents the number of times each LLM invokes actions on the full dataset with Sci-Reproducer. The first four actions are code-related actions, while the last three are paper-related actions. We observe the following:




Figure 2: A grouped bar chart illustrating the frequency of tool usage by different models. The x-axis represents various actions, while the y-axis indicates the total number of times each tool was used on this dataset.

- Regarding code-related actions, reasoning LLMs use "SearchFile", "SearchCodeItem", and "SearchWeb" an average of 25.0, 3.3, and 0.0 times, respectively. In comparison, non-reasoning LLMs use these actions significantly more often, with averages of 210.4, 68.2, and 16.8 times, respectively. This suggests that reasoning models tend to rely more on internal deliberation rather than retrieving external information. In contrast, the invocation frequency of "Compiler" is notably higher for reasoning models, indicating that they require more attempts to correct syntactic errors. Such over-reliance on internal reasoning hurts their overall performance: the *execution accuracy* of models such as o3-mini-high and o3-mini-low is comparable to that of gpt-40-mini, despite their theoretical advantages.
- A similar trend is observed for paper-related actions. Reasoning LLMs use "SearchPaper", "SearchSection", and "SearchLiterature" an average of 56.3, 70.0, and 20.0 times, respectively. In contrast, non-reasoning LLMs make significantly greater use of these actions, with average usage counts of 244.8, 188.4, and 58.0, respectively. Furthermore, LLMs are more inclined to extract information from the target paper rather than from related literature. On average, all LLMs invoke the actions "SearchPaper" and "Search-Section"—which retrieve information from the target paper—174.1 and 144 times, respectively, while "SearchLiterature", which accesses related literature, is used only 43.8 times on average.

4.3 Error Analysis

4.3.1 Syntax Errors

Table A1 shows the syntax error rates for each model across different configurations. Without the Code Agent, syntax errors occurred at rates of 80.3% ("NoAgent") and 83.3% ("Paper Agent"). After implementing the Code Agent, these error rates dropped significantly to 29.4% ("Code Agent") and 24.9% ("Sci-Reproducer"). The remaining syntax errors mainly result from incorrectly using repository dependencies. This occurs because our approach, unlike human developers, cannot dynamically access variable values through an compiler during the code generation process.

4.3.2 Logic Errors

Another issue stems from differences in implementation logic, which can be broadly categorized into: (1) discrepancy in algorithm implementation that result in differing outputs, and (2) missing or mismatch information in the algorithm descriptions in the paper compared to the actual code.

Model (Sci-Reproducer)	Exe Acc(↑)	CodeBLEU(↑)	RG Acc(↑)	Intra-File(†)	Recall Cross-File(↑)	API(↑)
🕲 GPT-40-mini	0.220	0.316	0.809	0.588	0.485	0.409
🚫 Deepseek-V3	0.470	0.378	0.834	0.682	0.424	0.609
ගී o3-mini-low ෆ්	0.220	0.292	0.850	0.259	0.091	0.460

Table 4: Experimental Results when missing/mismatched information is regard as external input in the prompt.

Implementation discrepancy An algorithm may have multiple valid implementation approaches. For example, the cross-entropy loss function can be implemented by directly invoking the PyTorch API "torch.nn.CrossEntropy" or by manually coding it from scratch. Such implementation choices may introduce subtle differences that lead to variations in the final output of the function.

Missing/Mismatched information in algorithm description Algorithmic descriptions in research papers often lack concrete implementation details, and in certain cases, the provided code may exhibit minor discrepancies compared to the descriptions in the paper. We manually compared the implementation code of all tasks in the dataset with their descriptions in the papers to identify missing or mismatch information. We then provided this information as additional input and apply Sci-Reproducer framework on three LLMs. The Results is shown in Table 4, regarding to Execution Acc, the performance for GPT-40-mini, Deepseek-V3 and O3-mini-low improved 0.050, 0.250 and 0.040 respectively. The missing information can be divided into four categories:

- Hyperparameters and configurations: descriptions of target algorithms in papers often omit specific hyperparameter settings, such as the batch size.
- Numerical stability techniques: standard techniques for ensuring numerical stability, such as handling division by zero.
- Implementation logic: common implementation practices and model design choices, such as data splitting protocols.
- Coding strategy: practical programming techniques that enhance implementation efficiency and reliability, such as early stopping criteria.

More examples for each category can be found in Table A2 in Appendix E. As for mismatched information, it occurs far less frequently compared to missing information, and its categories largely overlap with those mentioned above.

To mitigate the widespread issues of missing and mismatched information, the first category can generally be addressed by referencing the original research paper and related literature, or by inspecting the code repository for explicit configurations. However, addressing the other three categories requires familiarity with general machine learning coding conventions, thus necessitating that the LLMs identify and utilize implementation patterns from comparable algorithms to enhance code quality. Future research may improve performance by incorporating implementation insights from similar algorithms through techniques such as in-context learning (Zhou et al., 2023; Xiang et al., 2024), and by leveraging real-time compiler feedback to infer precise variable values.

5 Related Work

Our work lies at the intersection of AI for scientific discovery and LLM-based code generation. While prior studies (Wang et al., 2023; Ghafarollahi & Buehler, 2024; Si et al., 2024) explore LLMs for hypothesis generation, their ability to generate code for hypothesis verification remains underexplored. Existing code generation benchmarks focus on text-to-code tasks and ML software engineering, but none evaluate LLMs' ability to reproduce algorithm or model description from real-world scientific papers. Additional details are provided in Appendix A.

6 Conclusion

We evaluate LLMs' ability to replicate algorithms described in recent NLP papers. To support this, we introduce SciReplicate-Bench, a benchmark with rich annotations, and Sci-Reproducer, a multi-agent framework for bridging algorithm understanding and code generation. We assess performance using *reasoning graph accuracy* and standard implementation metrics. Results show the task is highly challenging, with failures largely caused by missing or inconsistent algorithm descriptions.

7 Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) through a Turing AI Fellowship (grant no. EP/V020579/1, EP/V020579/2).

References

GPT 4o mini. https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o-mini. 2024.

- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie J. Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc V. Le, and Charles Sutton. Program synthesis with large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2108.07732, 2021.
- Markus J. Buehler. Accelerating scientific discovery with generative knowledge extraction, graph-based representation, and multimodal intelligent graph reasoning. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 2024. URL http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/2632-2153/ad7228.
- Jun Shern Chan, Neil Chowdhury, Oliver Jaffe, James Aung, Dane Sherburn, Evan Mays, Giulio Starace, Kevin Liu, Leon Maksin, Tejal A. Patwardhan, Lilian Weng, and Aleksander Mkadry. Mle-bench: Evaluating machine learning agents on machine learning engineering. *ArXiv*, abs/2410.07095, 2024.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Pondé, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yura Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mo Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, David W. Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William H. Guss, Alex Nichol, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, Andrew Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew M. Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.03374, 2021.

Claude-Sonnet-3.7. https://www.anthropic.com/claude/sonnet. 2025.

- Alejandro Cuadron, Dacheng Li, Wenjie Ma, Xingyao Wang, Yichuan Wang, Siyuan Zhuang, Shu Liu, Luis Gaspar Schroeder, Tian Xia, Huanzhi Mao, Nicholas Thumiger, Aditya Desai, Ion Stoica, Ana Klimovic, Graham Neubig, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. The danger of overthinking: Examining the reasoning-action dilemma in agentic tasks. *ArXiv*, abs/2502.08235, 2025.
- DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bing-Li Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Deli Chen, Dong-Li Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Haowei Zhang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Li, Hui Qu, J. L. Cai, Jian Liang, Jianzhong Guo, Jiaqi Ni, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jin Chen, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, Jun-Mei Song, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Liang

Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peiyi Wang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qihao Zhu, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Ruyi Chen, S. S. Li, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shao-Ping Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Shirong Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shuang Zhou, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, T. Wang, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, W. L. Xiao, Wangding Zeng, Wanjia Zhao, Wei An, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wen-Xuan Yu, Wentao Zhang, X. Q. Li, Xiangyu Jin, Xianzu Wang, Xiaoling Bi, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xi-Cheng Shen, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaokang Zhang, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xingkai Yu, Xinnan Song, Xinxia Shan, Xinyi Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Y. X. Zhu, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yao Li, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yi Zheng, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yi Xiong, Ying He, Ying Tang, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yi-Bing Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yu Wu, Yuan Ou, Yuchen Zhu, Yuduan Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yukun Zha, Yunfan Xiong, Yunxiang Ma, Yuting Yan, Yu-Wei Luo, Yu mei You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Z. F. Wu, Zehui Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhen Huang, Zhen Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Zhen guo Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhibin Gou, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhihong Shao, Zhipeng Xu, Zhiyu Wu, Zhongyu Zhang, Zhuoshu Li, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zi-An Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Ziyi Gao, and Zizheng Pan. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2412.19437, 2024.

Jiangshu Du, Yibo Wang, Wenting Zhao, Zhongfen Deng, Shuaiqi Liu, Renze Lou, Henry Peng Zou, Pranav Narayanan Venkit, Nan Zhang, Mukund Srinath, Haoran Ranran Zhang, Vipul Gupta, Yinghui Li, Tao Li, Fei Wang, Qin Liu, Tianlin Liu, Pengzhi Gao, Congying Xia, Chen Xing, Cheng Jiayang, Zhaowei Wang, Ying Su, Raj Sanjay Shah, Ruohao Guo, Jing Gu, Haoran Li, Kangda Wei, Zihao Wang, Lu Cheng, Surangika Ranathunga, Meng Fang, Jie Fu, Fei Liu, Ruihong Huang, Eduardo Blanco, Yixin Cao, Rui Zhang, Philip S. Yu, and Wenpeng Yin. LLMs assist NLP researchers: Critique paper (meta-)reviewing. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 5081–5099, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.292. URL https: //aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.292/.

Gemini-2.0-Flash. https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/flash/. 2024.

- Alireza Ghafarollahi and Markus J. Buehler. Sciagents: Automating scientific discovery through multi-agent intelligent graph reasoning. *ArXiv*, abs/2409.05556, 2024.
- GPT-4o. https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o. 2024.
- Mourad Gridach, Jay Nanavati, Khaldoun Zine El Abidine, Lenon Mendes, and Christina Mack. Agentic ai for scientific discovery: A survey of progress, challenges, and future directions. 2025.
- Xuemei Gu and Mario Krenn. Interesting scientific idea generation using knowledge graphs and llms: Evaluations with 100 research group leaders, 2025. URL https://arxiv.org/ abs/2405.17044.
- Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Saurav Kadavath, Mantas Mazeika, Akul Arora, Ethan Guo, Collin Burns, Samir Puranik, Horace He, Dawn Xiaodong Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring coding challenge competence with apps. *ArXiv*, abs/2105.09938, 2021.
- Qian Huang, Jian Vora, Percy Liang, and Jure Leskovec. Mlagentbench: Evaluating language agents on machine learning experimentation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. Livecodebench: Holistic and

contamination free evaluation of large language models for code. *ArXiv*, abs/2403.07974, 2024.

- Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? *ArXiv*, abs/2310.06770, 2023.
- John M. Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Žídek, Anna Potapenko, Alex Bridgland, Clemens Meyer, Simon A A Kohl, Andy Ballard, Andrew Cowie, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Stanislav Nikolov, Rishub Jain, Jonas Adler, Trevor Back, Stig Petersen, David Reiman, Ellen Clancy, Michal Zielinski, Martin Steinegger, Michalina Pacholska, Tamas Berghammer, Sebastian Bodenstein, David Silver, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew W. Senior, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Pushmeet Kohli, and Demis Hassabis. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596:583 – 589, 2021.
- Jia Li, Ge Li, Yunfei Zhao, Yongming Li, Huanyu Liu, Hao Zhu, Lecheng Wang, Kaibo Liu, Zheng Fang, Lanshen Wang, Jiazheng Ding, Xuanming Zhang, Yuqi Zhu, Yihong Dong, Zhi Jin, Binhua Li, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. Deveval: A manually-annotated code generation benchmark aligned with real-world code repositories. *ArXiv*, abs/2405.19856, 2024.
- Yuliang Liu, Xiangru Tang, Zefan Cai, Junjie Lu, Yichi Zhang, Yanjun Shao, Zexuan Deng, Helan Hu, Zengxian Yang, Kaikai An, Ruijun Huang, Shuzheng Si, Sheng Chen, Haozhe Zhao, Zheng Li, Liang Chen, Yiming Zong, Yan Wang, Tianyu Liu, Zhiwei Jiang, Baobao Chang, Yujia Qin, Wangchunshu Zhou, Yilun Zhao, Arman Cohan, and Mark B. Gerstein. Ml-bench: Evaluating large language models and agents for machine learning tasks on repository-level code. 2023.
- Zejie Liu, Xiaoyu Hu, Deyu Zhou, Lin Li, Xu Zhang, and Yanzheng Xiang. Code generation from flowcharts with texts: A benchmark dataset and an approach. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022.
- Lingli Long, Yongjin Zhu, Jun Shao, Zheng Kong, Jian Li, Yanzheng Xiang, and Xu Zhang. Nl2sql generation with noise labels based on multi-task learning. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2294, 2022.
- Chris Lu, Cong Lu, Robert Tjarko Lange, Jakob N. Foerster, Jeff Clune, and David Ha. The ai scientist: Towards fully automated open-ended scientific discovery. *ArXiv*, abs/2408.06292, 2024.
- o3 mini. https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/o3-mini. 2024.
- Haojie Pan, Zepeng Zhai, Hao Yuan, Yaojia Lv, Ruiji Fu, Ming Liu, Zhongyuan Wang, and Bing Qin. Kwaiagents: Generalized information-seeking agent system with large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2312.04889, 2023.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2002.
- Nitarshan Rajkumar, Raymond Li, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. Evaluating the text-to-sql capabilities of large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.00498, 2022.
- Shuo Ren, Daya Guo, Shuai Lu, Long Zhou, Shujie Liu, Duyu Tang, M. Zhou, Ambrosio Blanco, and Shuai Ma. Codebleu: a method for automatic evaluation of code synthesis. *ArXiv*, abs/2009.10297, 2020.
- Parth Sarthi, Salman Abdullah, Aditi Tuli, Shubh Khanna, Anna Goldie, and Christopher D. Manning. Raptor: Recursive abstractive processing for tree-organized retrieval. *ArXiv*, abs/2401.18059, 2024.

- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.04761, 2023.
- Samuel Schmidgall, Yusheng Su, Ze Wang, Ximeng Sun, Jialian Wu, Xiaodong Yu, Jiang Liu, Zicheng Liu, and Emad Barsoum. Agent laboratory: Using llm agents as research assistants. *ArXiv*, abs/2501.04227, 2025.
- Akshay Sethi, Anush Sankaran, Naveen Panwar, Shreya Khare, and Senthil Mani. Dlpaper2code: Auto-generation of code from deep learning research papers. *ArXiv*, abs/1711.03543, 2017.
- Chenglei Si, Diyi Yang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Can llms generate novel research ideas? a large-scale human study with 100+ nlp researchers. *ArXiv*, abs/2409.04109, 2024.
- Chenglei Si, Diyi Yang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Can LLMs generate novel research ideas? a large-scale human study with 100+ NLP researchers. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id= M23dTGWCZy.
- Yang Sui, Yu-Neng Chuang, Guanchu Wang, Jiamu Zhang, Tianyi Zhang, Jiayi Yuan, Hongyi Liu, Andrew Wen, Shaochen Zhong, Hanjie Chen, and Xia Hu. Stop overthinking: A survey on efficient reasoning for large language models. 2025.
- Qingyun Wang, Doug Downey, Heng Ji, and Tom Hope. Scimon: Scientific inspiration machines optimized for novelty. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- Xinyu Wang, Yanzheng Xiang, Lin Gui, and Yulan He. Garlic: Llm-guided dynamic progress control with hierarchical weighted graph for long document qa. *ArXiv*, abs/2410.04790, 2024.
- Yanzheng Xiang, Qian-Wen Zhang, Xu Zhang, Zejie Liu, Yunbo Cao, and Deyu Zhou. G³r: A graph-guided generate-and-rerank framework for complex and cross-domain text-to-sql generation. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- Yanzheng Xiang, Hanqi Yan, Lin Gui, and Yulan He. Addressing order sensitivity of incontext demonstration examples in causal language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.15637, 2024.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2210.03629, 2022.
- Weizhe Yuan, Pengfei Liu, and Graham Neubig. Can we automate scientific reviewing? *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 75, December 2022. ISSN 1076-9757. doi: 10.1613/jair.1.12862. URL https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.12862.
- Kechi Zhang, Ge Li, Jia Li, Zhuo Li, and Zhi Jin. Toolcoder: Teach code generation models to use api search tools. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.04032, 2023a.
- Kechi Zhang, Jia Li, Ge Li, Xianjie Shi, and Zhi Jin. Codeagent: Enhancing code generation with tool-integrated agent systems for real-world repo-level coding challenges. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024a.
- Xu Zhang, Yanzheng Xiang, Zejie Liu, Xiaoyu Hu, and Deyu Zhou. I2r: Intra and intermodal representation learning for code search. *Intell. Data Anal.*, 28:807–823, 2023b.
- Xu Zhang, Xiaoyu Hu, Zejie Liu, Yanzheng Xiang, and Deyu Zhou. Hfd: Hierarchical feature decoupling for sql generation from text. *Intell. Data Anal.*, 28:991–1005, 2024b.
- Xu Zhang, Zexu Lin, Xiaoyu Hu, Jianlei Wang, Wenpeng Lu, and Deyu Zhou. Secon: Maintaining semantic consistency in data augmentation for code search. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 2024c.

Yuxiang Zhou, Jiazheng Li, Yanzheng Xiang, Hanqi Yan, Lin Gui, and Yulan He. The mystery of in-context learning: A comprehensive survey on interpretation and analysis. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. URL https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:264832783.

Appendix

A Extended Discussion of Related Work

A.1 AI for Automating Scientific Discovery

Numerous research efforts aim to accelerate scientific discovery using large language models (LLMs) (Jumper et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023; Ghafarollahi & Buehler, 2024; Si et al., 2024; Schmidgall et al., 2025; Lu et al., 2024; Sethi et al., 2017). Some studies focus on scientific hypothesis generation: Wang et al. (2023); Ghafarollahi & Buehler (2024) explore the potential of LLMs to propose novel research concepts, while Si et al. (2024) suggests that AI-generated ideas can, in some cases, surpass those of human researchers in originality.

In parallel, Schmidgall et al. (2025); Lu et al. (2024) introduce AI systems capable of automating the end-to-end research workflow, encompassing idea generation, validation, and manuscript drafting. Although these systems leverage LLMs to implement algorithms, the algorithms themselves are synthesized by the models, rather than derived from peerreviewed scientific publications. As a result, they lack the complexity and scientific rigor typically found in real research algorithms. Moreover, these works do not verify whether the generated code faithfully implements the underlying algorithmic logic.

In contrast, our work is the first to investigate the ability of LLMs to reproduce algorithms proposed in peer-reviewed academic papers, bridging the gap between natural language understanding and faithful scientific code generation.

A.2 LLMs for Code Generation

Code generation has been a prominent research topic in natural language processing (NLP), giving rise to a range of benchmarks and methodologies. Several works evaluate models' ability to generate code from natural language descriptions (Chen et al., 2021; Jain et al., 2024; Austin et al., 2021; Hendrycks et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022). Although state-of-the-art models have achieved high performance on many of these benchmarks, they still fall short of fully automating the role of a software engineer. To address realism and complexity, SWE-bench (Jimenez et al., 2023) introduces tasks based on actual pull requests from open-source repositories. However, most of these benchmarks are grounded in the domain of general software engineering.

Some recent efforts have shifted focus toward machine learning-specific software engineering benchmarks (Liu et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023; Chan et al., 2024). Nevertheless, their goals often involve implementing algorithms proposed by the models themselves or solving relatively simple tasks, which do not require the depth of algorithmic understanding or rigorous paper analysis involved in reproducing algorithms from peer-reviewed publications.

LLMs have demonstrated strong capabilities in complex code generation, particularly when equipped with tool-use strategies. Methods such as ToolFormer (Schick et al., 2023), KwaiAgents (Pan et al., 2023), CodeAgent (Zhang et al., 2024a) and ToolCoder (Zhang et al., 2023a) showcase the potential of LLMs to solve challenging tasks through effective tool integration.

Despite these advances, no existing system is specifically designed for reproducing algorithms from academic papers. Current approaches are not directly applicable in this setting, as they lack dedicated components for comprehending, interpreting, and aligning scientific descriptions with executable code.

B Details of the Annotation Process

Step 1: paper selection We curated papers from top-tier NLP conferences in 2024, including ACL, EMNLP, and COLING. Using a web crawler, we collected accepted paper titles and employed the PapersWithCode API⁴ to identify those with open-source implementations. For each identified paper, we retrieved corresponding GitHub repository links and metadata (e.g., stars, issues, release dates) via the GitHub REST API⁵.

To filter candidates, we applied the following criteria:

- Removed survey/exploratory papers while retaining method-focused research.
- Applied a cutoff date of January 1, 2024 to avoid data leakage.
- Excluded repositories with fewer than 5 stars to ensure basic quality assurance.

Subsequently, researchers manually reviewed each candidate paper and its repository. We discarded papers with excessive computational demands, poorly structured code, ambiguous documentation, missing preprocessing steps, or reported reproduction issues.

Step2: python environment setup For papers passing the initial screening, annotators followed the README to set up the environment and replicate experiments. Common issues included dependency conflicts, data loading failures, and incomplete or buggy code. Annotators attempted to resolve these problems; repositories with irrecoverable errors were excluded.

Step3: annotation Annotation consists of two steps:

- 1. Algorithm-Function alignment: most papers contain multiple algorithmic components, often organized as subsections. Annotators segmented these into distinct units and mapped each to its corresponding implementation. Code was refactored to encapsulate each algorithm in a standalone function or method. Papers with implementations too fragmented for restructuring were excluded.
- 2. Detailed annotation: for each aligned function, annotators documented input/output variables, intra- and cross-file dependencies, and external API usage. Additionally, they inserted explanatory comments mapping code segments to algorithm components. Based on these annotations and variable dependencies, we can construct a reasoning graph representing the implementation logic. During the annotation process, LLMs were employed to assist with algorithm-function alignment and the generation of variable descriptions and code comments. All outputs were subsequently reviewed and corrected by human annotators to ensure accuracy.

Step 4: verification suite preparation In the final step, annotators created a verification suite with 10 test cases drawn from the original datasets used in each repository. Given the inherent randomness in many NLP implementations and potential machine-related variability, we addressed reproducibility from two angles:


- Eliminating code randomness: annotators fixed random seeds and replaced nondeterministic operations (e.g., unordered sets) with deterministic equivalents to ensure consistent outputs across runs.
- Controlling machine variability: users were instructed to run both reference and generated code locally to eliminate discrepancies caused by system-level differences.


Lastly, annotators implemented task-specific comparison scripts to evaluate output correctness, accounting for variations in return types across tasks.

⁴https://paperswithcode.com/api/v1/docs/

⁵https://docs.github.com/en/rest?apiVersion=2022-11-28

C Details of the Task Categories





The benchmark encompasses five main task categories in the NLP domain: representation and embedding methods, loss functions and optimization objectives, information extraction and aggregation, model architecture components, and inference and search algorithms. The distribution of each task category is illustrated in Figure A1.

D Details of the Actions

In this section, we provide implement details for all actions defined in the Sci-Reproducer.

SearchPaper We obtain the LaTeX source code of the target academic paper from arXiv⁶ and apply regular expression-based parsing to extract the content corresponding to each section. Subsequently, we iteratively feed the content of each subsection, along with the query generated by the large language model, into GPT-4o-mini. The model extracts relevant information and returns it as an observation to the paper agent.

SearchSection Following the same approach as SearchPaper, the tool begins by parsing the LaTeX source code of the target algorithm. Upon receiving a section ID from the Paper Agent, it retrieves and returns the content of the corresponding section.

SearchLiterature Given a paper ID and a query, the tool attempts to download the corresponding LaTeX source code from arXiv. If the LaTeX source code is unavailable, it returns no information. Otherwise, it extracts content relevant to the query from the paper, following the same procedure as the SearchPaper action.

SearchCode For each Python file in the code repository, we utilize the Python AST ⁷ package to parse the file and extract all defined classes, functions, and global variables. Unlike embedding-based code search methods (Zhang et al., 2024c; 2023b), the Code Agent

⁶https://arxiv.org/

⁷https://docs.python.org/3/library/ast.html

in our framework directly provides the name of a code item. The tool then returns the corresponding definition if it exists; otherwise, it returns an empty response.

SearchFile When the Code Agent provides a file name, the tool returns the full content of the corresponding file.

SearchWeb When the Code Agent issues a query, we use the Google Search API ⁸ to retrieve relevant information from websites. These results are then processed by GPT-40-mini, which filters the content and extracts the information most relevant to the query for return.

Compiler Once the Code Agent completes code generation, it invokes the compiler to execute the code. The generated function or method is inserted into the original Python file, and the corresponding Python environment is used to run the code. The output from the compiler is then returned as the feedback.

E Figures and Tables




Figure A2: The task consists of two steps: *Algorithm Understanding* and *Code Implementation*. (Left) The model must extract an algorithm's workflow and details from the research paper, including descriptions and variable values from cited papers and other paper sections. (Right) Using this extracted information, the model implements the corresponding function in the code repository, correctly handling dependencies and API calls.

Approach	Error Ratio (\downarrow)
No Agent Paper Agent Code Agent Sci-Reproducer	80.3 83.3 29.4 24.9

Table A1: Syntax error across different settings.

⁸https://developers.google.com/custom-search/v1/




Figure A3: An overview of the SciReplicate-Bench.

Categories	Examples
Hyperparameters and configurations	Thresholds, batch sizes, maximum iteration counts, exact numbers of clusters, initialization methods for variables or vectors, types of regularization (such as L1 or L2) , and specific distance metrics (e.g., using L2 norm for Euclidean distances)
Numerical stability techniques	clamping values to avoid numerical instability, adding small constants during logarithmic calculations, managing division by zero scenarios, and addressing rounding and precision issues.
Implementation logic	Data splitting, application of dropout, formatting of input sequences, and handling special or edge cases in the input data.
Coding strategy	Caching for performance enhancement, retry mechanisms to handle failures, early stopping criteria, and strategies for memory optimization.

Table A2: Some examples for different missing information categories.

Task: Match each generated step with its functionally equivalent reference step(s).

Input:

- 1. Target Method: Scientific research method described in LaTeX.
- 2. Reference Steps: Ordered steps from the original implementation, labeled [Ref 1], [Ref 2], etc.
- 3. Generated Steps: Ordered steps from an LLM-generated implementation, labeled [Gen 1], [Gen 2], etc.

Output Requirements:

1. For each generated step, identify the reference step(s) that implement the same specific functionality.

2. Format your answer as follows:

Gen 1: Ref X

Gen 2: Ref Y, Ref Z

Gen 3: -1

- 3. Matching criteria:
- Match based on functional equivalence, not textual similarity
- Steps must perform the same specific operation
- Steps must serve the same role in the overall algorithm
- Steps must produce equivalent results given the same inputs
- 4. Consider sequential position:
- Earlier generated steps likely match earlier reference steps
- Later generated steps likely match later reference steps
- 5. If a generated step has no clear equivalent or is ambiguous, output "-1"

6. Important:

- Ensure all reference indices actually exist in the reference steps
- Do not include explanations in your output
- Provide answers for all generated steps


Input Format:

[Target Method] {target_method}


[Reference Steps] {ref_comments}

[Generated Steps] {gen_comment}

Your answer:



```
Please complete the target function (or method) and provide the pure code output without any additional text. Include
comments in the code following these specific guidelines:
Code Comments:
1. Focus on Reasoning: Comments should explain the reasoning behind the code generation process, as derived from the
LaTeX description.
2. No Implementation Details: Avoid including any code-specific implementation details in the comments.
3. Mapping to LaTeX: Each comment must indicate which functionality described in the LaTeX code is implemented in the
subsequent Python code snippet.
4. No overlap: The code snippets corresponding to each comment must not overlap, and nesting is not allowed.
5. Single Function: Implement the code within a single function (or method), without breaking it into multiple functions.
6. Import Package: Import all packages within the function (or method) to ensure the code is self-contained.
7. Format, the comment for each snippet should be in the following format:
# Snippet x: Comment here
# [Begin Snippet X]
Code snippet here
# [End Snippet X]
[Example]:
 ``python
def apply\_token\_level\_transformation(
         token_representation,
         auxiliary_representation,
        transformation_indices,
         batch_mask,
         scaling_factor=0.01
):
         import torch
         import numpy as np
         transformed_tokens = token_representation.clone()
         for i, (start_idx, end_idx) in enumerate(transformation_indices):
         # Snippet 1: We first verify if the current batch item is valid by checking the
         # batch_mask, analogous to referencing an in-context example \(\mathbf{S}\)
         # that has a corresponding reference \(\mathbf{H_r}\) in the LaTeX snippet.
         # [Begin Snippet 1]
         if batch mask[i]:
         # [End Snippet 1]
                 #
                 # Snippet 2: Here, we apply a basic shift to the token_representation by
                 # incorporating a slice from the auxiliary_representation, akin to
                 \# \ combining \(\mathbf{H}\) \ with a portion of \(\mathbf{H_r}\) for
                 # enhanced alignment.
                 # [Begin Snippet 2]
                 segment_main = transformed_tokens[i, start_idx:end_idx, :]
                  segment_aux = auxiliary_representation[i, start_idx:end_idx, :]
                 # [End Snippet 2]
                 # ---
                 # Snippet 3: The transformation is a simple element-wise operation combined with
                 # the scaling_factor, illustrating a simplified version of the
                 # alignment concept from the LaTeX, which might involve more complex
                 # contrastive or attentional calculations.
                 # [Begin Snippet 3]
                 updated_segment = torch.add(segment_main, torch.mul(segment_aux, scaling_factor))
                 transformed_tokens[i, start_idx:end_idx, :] = updated_segment
                 # [End Snippet 3]
                 # ---
         # Snippet 4: The final transformed tokens are now partially aligned with the auxiliary
         # reference, reflecting the notion of augmenting token-level outputs
         # (Equation references in the LaTeX snippet would correspond to eq. (2-3) or
         # similar definitions of reference alignment).
         #
        # [Begin Snippet 4]
         return transformed_tokens
         # [End Snippet 4]
Your answer:
```



[Task Overview] Reproduce Python code corresponding to a LaTeX-based methodology from a scientific paper. However, due to the paper's length, it cannot be fully ingested by a large language model at once. Therefore, the solution requires two main steps: 1. Information Retrieval (Your Current Task): Extract relevant details, insights, and supporting information from the academic paper's LaTeX description and related literature 2. Code Reproduction (Subsequent Task): Implement the Python code based on the information gathered and the provided LaTeX. [Your Specific Focus] You are tasked exclusively with Step 1: Information Retrieval. You must gather and organize all necessary details that will later be used to implement the Python code. [Input] 1. List of sections: The paper includes the following sections (titles are provided for reference): {Section String} 2. LaTeX Description: The LaTeX code for the corresponding subsection in the paper, describing the algorithm implemented by the target function. {latex code} 3. Tools: Tools that can be adopted to gather external information during the information retrieval process. * SearchPaper[query] Description: When a variable, concept, or any other element appears in the target section without its full definition or sufficient details, use this action to search for the complete information in the full paper. Parameters: - 'query' (string): A query describing the information that needs to be located within the full paper. Examples: - If the LaTeX contains: "We use the concept of \$X_i\$ to define Y," then the action should be: SearchPaper["The definition of \$X i\$"1 - If the LaTeX contains: "The function \$f(x)\$ is defined based on the properties of \$\mathcal{G}\$.", then the action should be: SearchPaper["The properties of \$\mathcal{G}\$"] * SearchSection[x] Description: If the target section references another section in the paper with the title x, extract the information from the referenced section and return SearchSection[x]. Parameters - w'x' (string): The title of the referenced section. Example: - Latex: "The full derivation of our loss function can be found in method Section .". Action: SearchSection["method"] * SearchLiterature[key, guery] Description: If the target section cites another paper (\cite{label}) and you determine that some information needs to be retrieved from that paper, return SearchLiterature[label, query], where query is the specific information you need to look for in the referenced paper. Parameters: 'key' (string): The citation key of the referenced paper. In LaTeX, when citing a paper, we use \cite{x}, where x represents the citation key. - 'query' (string): The specific information to search for in the referenced paper. Example: I - Latex: "We adopt the metric proposed in \cite{wang2025}". Action: SearchLiterature["wang2025", "The proposed metric in the paper"] - Latex: "The algorithm is based on the work of \cite{smith2018}". Action: SearchLiterature["smith2018", "The algorithm details in the paper"] - Latex: "The dataset is based on the study by \cite{jones2020}". Action: SearchLiterature["jones2020", "The dataset details in the paper"] [Instruction] In order to complete code reproduction, it is first necessary to understand the algorithm described in the LaTeX description. The tools "SearchPaper", "SearchSection" and "SearchLiterature" should be used to retrieve relevant information from the paper to help you understand the methodology proposed in the latex description. For example: 1. If the LaTeX Description lacks the definition of a variable, use "SearchPaper" tool to find its definition. 2. If the LaTeX Description references other sections of the paper, use "SearchSection" tool to retrieve those sections and supplement the missing details. 3. If the LaTeX Description cites methods from other papers, use "SearchLiterature" tool to extract relevant information from the referenced papers. [Action] 1. Apply a tool defined above to gather external information. 2. If you have gathered all the necessary information, fully understood the LaTeX code, and are prepared to proceed to the Code Reproduction stage, the appropriate action is "Finish" [Observation] 1. If the action is apply predefined tool, then the observation should be the return response of the tool. [Response Template] Thought: I think .. Action: SearchPaper[query] or SearchSection[label] or SearchLiterature[key, query] or Finish Observation: Outcome of the action. [Your Answer] Please start information extraction step by step, strictly adhering to the provided template for the response format.

Figure A6: The prompt for Paper Agent.

	tant tasked with reproducing a Python function corresponding to a algorithm in the methods part of he local coding environment includes a GPU and supports CUDA. I will provide the following
task, so you should e 2. Target function: T 3. LaTeX description implemented by the 4. The extracted info you more details wh	ure: The organization of files within the code repository. This is a repository-level code generation explore the repo thoroughly to extract useful code. The definition of the python function you need to implement. The LaTeX code for the corresponding algorithm in the paper, describing the algorithm e target function. The information extracted from the target paper, and relevant literature that can provide en implement the target function. Can be adopted to gather external information during the generation process.
[Repository Structur	re]
{organization}	
[Target Function]	
The target function i	is located at "{Python_File_Path}". Its definition consists of the following components:
1. Input Variables 2. Output Variables	
The definition is as f	iollows:
{Target_Function}	
[LaTeX Description]	
{latex_code}	
[Extracted Informati	ion]
information points. understand the targe	extracted from the paper and relevant literature by a paper search agent, which consists of a series When you implement the target function, you should refer to the extracted information to et algorithm. When information from "Relevant Literature" conflicts with the target paper, always ation from the target paper.
The extracted inform	nation is as follows:
{extracted_info}	
search for examples Parameters: Query (Example: SearchWe	YI a query using the Google search engine to retrieve relevant information. You can use this tool to : of API usage, API definitions, bug fixes, implementations of similar algorithms, and more. (string): The search query to retrieve relevant information. b["How to implement a neural network in PyTorch"]
	e the content of a Python file from the current repository. ng): The name of the python file to search for in the current repository. ["model.py"]
methods, or classes. Parameters: M (strir Example: SearchCod Instruction: In order to complete implement the targe 1. Use "SearchFile" t	nformation about a specific code item in the repository, including global variables, functions, ng): The name of the code item to search for in the current repository.
3. Use "SearchWeb"	to retrieve information from the website. the code reproduction task, follow a structured process that alternates between Thought, Action,
functions, classes, in	int situation. formation from code. As it is a repo-level code generation task, you need to explore the relvant the code repository. os to gather the required information.
	ed above to gather external information. o generate the code, then the action should be "GenerateCode".
	ply predefined tool, then the observation should be the return response of the tool. enerateCode", then the observation is the result returned by the interpreter after executing the
[Response Template Thought: I think Action: SearchWeb[Observation: Outcor	Query] or SearchFile[M] or SearchCodeItem[M] or GenerateCode
2. Comprehensive re 3. Clean and efficien	uidelines] ysis of the LaTeX algorithm alongside extracted information. epository exploration using provided tools. It code implementation strictly matching the LaTeX algorithm. - structured Thought, Action, Observation response format.
[Your Answer]	

Figure A7: The prompt for Code Agent.

Information Point 1: Hidden Representation of Last Token Overview: Explanation of the variable \(\bm{H}[i,-1]\) used in the consistency enhancement algorithm. Source: Target Paper Extracted Information: * \(\bm{H}\) represents the token-level outputs of the last self-attention layer of the model. * $(\Phi H) \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ \(d\) is the dimensionality of the hidden layer. * The notation ([i,-1]) refers to accessing the hidden representation of the last token for the (i)-th input in the batch. Information Point 2: LoRA Adaptation Overview: Description of the LoRA adaptation technique used in the algorithm. Source: Target Paper Extracted Information: * LoRA adaptation keeps all model parameters fixed except for the trainable query (W_Q) and value (W_V) matrices within the self-attention layers. * This technique integrates information from reference representations into the LoRA parameters during fine-tuning. * The rank of LoRA is set to 8 for all LLMs. Information Point 3: Consistency Enhancement Methodology Overview: Methodology for enhancing consistency in model outputs across a batch. Source: Target Paper Extracted Information: * The approach enforces similarity among the hidden representations of the last token across the input batch \(I\). * The classification head parameters remain fixed during training. * The consistency loss (\mathbf{L}_{text}) is calculated as $(\sum_{i=1}^{m} (1-\operatorname{text}_{cos}))$ $bm{H_a}))$. * \($bm{H_a}$) is the average of the last token's hidden representations across the batch: $(bm{H_a})$ $frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m}(bm{H}[i,-1]}{m}).$

Figure A8: An example of output report of the Paper Agent.