

---

# ANESBENCH: Multi-Dimensional Evaluation of LLM Reasoning in Anesthesiology

---

Xiang Feng<sup>1\*</sup>, Wentao Jiang<sup>1\*</sup>, Zengmao Wang<sup>1</sup>, Yong Luo<sup>1†</sup>  
Pingbo Xu<sup>2,3</sup>, Baosheng Yu<sup>4</sup>, Hua Jin<sup>5,6</sup>, Bo Du<sup>1†</sup>, Jing Zhang<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science, Wuhan University, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Anesthesiology, Zhejiang Cancer Hospital, China

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Medicine, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China

<sup>4</sup>Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

<sup>5</sup>Department of Anesthesiology, First People’s Hospital of Yunnan Province, China

<sup>6</sup>Kunming University of Science and Technology, China

{fengxiang\_cs, jiang\_wentao, wangzengmao, luoyong, dubo}@whu.edu.cn

xupingboshanghai@163.com, baosheng.yu@ntu.edu.sg

{hua jin.km, jingzhang.cv}@gmail.com

## Abstract

The application of large language models (LLMs) in the medical field has gained significant attention, yet their reasoning capabilities in more specialized domains like anesthesiology remain underexplored. In this paper, we systematically evaluate the reasoning capabilities of LLMs in anesthesiology and analyze key factors influencing their performance. To this end, we introduce ANESBENCH, a cross-lingual benchmark designed to assess anesthesiology-related reasoning across three levels: factual retrieval (System 1), hybrid reasoning (System 1.x), and complex decision-making (System 2). Through extensive experiments, we first explore how model characteristics, including model scale, Chain of Thought (CoT) length, and language transferability, affect reasoning performance. Then, we further evaluate the effectiveness of different training strategies, leveraging our curated anesthesiology-related dataset, including continuous pre-training (CPT) and supervised fine-tuning (SFT). Additionally, we also investigate how the test-time reasoning techniques, such as Best-of-N sampling and beam search, influence reasoning performance, and assess the impact of reasoning-enhanced model distillation, specifically DeepSeek-R1. We will publicly release ANESBENCH, along with our CPT and SFT training datasets and evaluation code at <https://github.com/MiliLab/AnesBench>.

## 1 Introduction

The success of LLMs has fundamentally reshaped the domain of medical artificial intelligence and catalyzed the creation of specialized medical models [1]. However, the reasoning abilities of LLMs within the medical sector still need significant improvement, particularly when compared with general reasoning tasks such as mathematics and programming [2].

Anesthesiology, as a highly specialized discipline in medicine, requires extensive medical knowledge and high-risk decision-making. General medical Question-Answering (QA) primarily involves fact retrieval (System 1), whereas anesthesia decision-making demands complex, context-aware judgments and reasoning ability (System 2) [3]. Existing benchmarks overlook the unique characteristics of

---

\*Equal Contribution

†Corresponding Author




Figure 1: **Overview of our work and proposed benchmark** The top section of the figure presents the benchmark’s basic information, including examples for three question types and statistics. The bottom section displays multiple dimensions that may be related to the model’s reasoning ability, as revealed by our analyses and experiments.

anesthesiology or limit evaluations to general fact retrieval [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. Our study aims to systematically assess LLMs’ anesthesia reasoning capabilities and investigate the factors that influence these abilities.

To this end, we construct ANESBENCH, a comprehensive cross-lingual benchmark designed to evaluate both fact retrieval and decision-making in anesthesia-related tasks. ANESBENCH categorizes reasoning tasks into three levels. System 1 focuses on fact retrieval. System 2 involves complex reasoning and decision-making. System 1.x represents a hybrid category that requires both factual recall and basic reasoning [12]. Utilizing ANESBENCH, we conduct multiple experiments and carry out a detailed and multi-dimensional analysis of the anesthesiology reasoning capabilities of representative LLMs, including those in general and medical domains.

Currently, analyses of factors enhancing LLM reasoning capabilities focus on two main issues. The first issue focuses on identifying the characteristics typically exhibited by LLMs with enhanced reasoning capabilities. The second issue concerns how to endow LLMs with enhanced reasoning skills. In the context of anesthesiology reasoning, our analysis of the first issue considers several fundamental model characteristics, including model scale, CoT [13] length, and language transferability [14]. Our analysis of the second issue examines several training and reasoning methodologies, encompassing CPT [15], SFT [16], knowledge distillation [17], and test-time reasoning techniques [18, 19, 20].

For the first issue, we analyze reasoning performance across over thirty state-of-the-art LLMs and obtain the following key insights: (1) System 1 tasks benefit from larger model scales by expanding their knowledge base, while System 2 reasoning exhibits comparatively smaller gains. Notably, both systems experience diminishing marginal returns, with each additional unit of scale contributing progressively less to performance improvements. (2) CoT length plays an important role in enhancing performance, particularly in System 2 tasks, by enabling more structured and step-by-step reasoning. (3) Language transferability is still an important factor limiting the performance of multilingual models. We suggest supplementing bilingual domain-specific data in the CPT stage to alleviate the language gap.

For the second issue, we investigate how training and reasoning strategies affect anesthesia reasoning. We first construct CPT and SFT datasets for the anesthesiology domain and conduct multiple experiments using a two-stage training strategy. Then, we implement and analyze various test-time compute reasoning techniques, including Best-of-N [21] and Beam Search [19]. Furthermore, we evaluate LLMs enhanced by DeepSeek-R1 distillation. Our findings indicate that SFT alone is

insufficient to enhance System 2 reasoning, even though it improves System 1 performance. On the other hand, test-time compute strategies consistently boost reasoning performance. Additionally, our experiments reveal that larger models benefit more from distillation of reasoning data than small LLMs when addressing System 2 anesthesia problems.

Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce a cross-lingual benchmark with a three-level reasoning system (System 1, System 1.x, and System 2) that systematically disentangles knowledge retrieval from reasoning capabilities, bridging a critical gap in anesthesiology evaluation.
- Based on extensive evaluation results, our work demonstrates the impact of several model characteristics, such as model scale, language transferability, and COT length, in relation to anesthesiology reasoning performance, yielding several key insights.
- Using a curated dataset, our extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of CPT and SFT training strategies while evaluating reasoning techniques such as Best-of-N sampling and beam search. Furthermore, we investigate the impact of distillation on anesthesiology reasoning, using an analysis of DeepSeek-R1 distilled models.

Overall, we are committed to leveraging our benchmark and in-depth analyses to provide valuable insights for developing LLMs with enhanced anesthesiology reasoning capabilities. We will publicly release our benchmark, the CPT and SFT datasets, and the evaluation code.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Reasoning LLMs

Reasoning refers to answering questions that involve complex, multi-step processes with intermediate steps [22]. The emergence of reasoning LLMs such as OpenAI o1/o3 [23, 24] and Deepseek R1 [25] has spurred interest in enhancing LLM reasoning ability. Existing research can be divided into two categories: (1) analyses of models’ basic characteristics and output structures, and (2) improvements in training and inference paradigms. Recent research indicates that LLMs tend to generate longer outputs when solving mathematical or reasoning problems [26]. Model performance benefits from scaling the length of the reasoning process [27, 28]. Models that exhibit strong exploratory tendencies or incorporate intrinsic verification mechanisms in their outputs often demonstrate enhanced reasoning capabilities [26, 25]. Moreover, different model scales have been demonstrated to exhibit significant differences in training dynamics and reasoning characteristics [23, 24, 29]. On the other hand, training and inference paradigms, such as reinforcement learning fine-tuning (RFT) [30, 25, 31], self-improvement methods [32, 33, 34], and structured search techniques exemplified by MCTS [20, 35, 36], have shown significant development potential.

### 2.2 Anesthesia-related Benchmarks and LLMs

Anesthesiology, due to its unique interdisciplinary nature, is often implicitly classified under surgery, dentistry, or similar categories [7, 8, 9, 10], even in benchmarks that categorize based on different departments. Some benchmarks explicitly treat anesthesiology as a separate category [4, 5, 6], while some studies employ existing anesthesiology-related questions [37, 38, 39, 40, 41] (e.g., exam questions from American Society of Anesthesiologists, ASA and Japanese Society of Anesthesiologists, JSA) to evaluate LLMs. However, the overall scale of these evaluations for anesthesiology remains very limited. Chinese Anesthesiology Benchmark (CAB) [11] is the first to focus primarily on anesthesiology. Nevertheless, CAB still overlooks the specific challenges of reasoning and decision-making in anesthesiology, and its use of exclusively Chinese questions restricts its broader applicability. Moreover, Hypnos and some works [42, 43] have attempted to use anesthesiology-related corpora for supervised fine-tuning to improve question-answering abilities, but they have not significantly enhanced the models’ reasoning capabilities.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Benchmark Overview

We construct **ANESBENCH** to assess LLMs’ reasoning and decision-making in anesthesiology. The benchmark contains 4,427 anesthesiology questions in English. Each question is labeled with a three-level categorization of cognitive demands, and detailed examples and statistics are provided in Fig. 1. Each question also includes Chinese-English translations, enabling evaluation of LLMs’ knowledge, application, and clinical reasoning abilities across diverse linguistic contexts.

#### 3.1.1 Benchmark Collection

**ANESBENCH** is constructed from authoritative sources, including American Board of Anesthesiology examination materials, standardized textbooks, and validated online assessment tools. These resources provide diverse questions assessing factual knowledge, application-based decision-making, and computational problem-solving.

We incorporate the CAB [11] as a supplementary resource. CAB contains over 8,000 multiple-choice questions (MCQs), 2,000 consultation-style question-answer (CQA) pairs, and 136 adversarially crafted questions designed to test model safety and robustness. Since evaluating specialized QA pairs involves subjective judgments and imperfect metrics, and the interchangeability of anesthetic drug names complicates assessment, we include only the Anesthesiology Multiple Choice Question Answering (AMCQA) subset from CAB, as MCQs offer clear, standardized metrics.

**ANESBENCH** thus serves as a structured benchmark across multiple complexity levels. The incorporated CAB content functions as both a comparative reference to highlight differences in reasoning performance and a linguistic supplement for bilingual evaluation. This design allows for a more nuanced and robust analysis of LLMs’ reasoning capabilities in anesthesiology.

**Data Leakage Detection** After the construction of **ANESBENCH**, we conduct a comprehensive data leakage analysis, using a data leakage detection algorithm [44] designed for multiple-choice questions. As detailed in Appendix F, our analysis confirms that **ANESBENCH** exhibits minimal data leakage, underscoring its reliability for assessing anesthetic reasoning in LLMs.

#### 3.1.2 Benchmark Categorization

To provide a fine-grained assessment of LLMs’ reasoning capabilities in anesthesiology, we categorize benchmarks, including **ANESBENCH** and **AMCQA**, into three distinct levels based on the cognitive demands. Specifically, we adopt the System 1 and System 2 framework to characterize questions with different cognitive processes [3]. System 1 represents fast and intuitive thinking, typically applied to straightforward knowledge-retrieval tasks, whereas System 2 denotes slow, logical, and conscious thinking, essential for complex reasoning and decision-making. Building on this framework, we further incorporate the concept of System 1.x [12], which blends elements of both System 1 and System 2. The question examples of these three levels can be found in Fig. 1.

For question categorization, we employ DeepSeek-R1 [25], prompting it with detailed criteria and few-shot examples. The full prompt for categorization is provided in Appendix B.

#### 3.1.3 Cross-Language Benchmarking

To mitigate the potential impact of language proficiency on reasoning evaluation, we adopt a cross-lingual benchmarking approach. We construct two bilingual benchmark sets by translating **ANESBENCH** and **AMCQA** in complementary directions. Specifically, **ANESBENCH**, originally developed in English, is translated into Chinese (EN2CN), while **AMCQA**, originally in Chinese, is translated into English (CN2EN). This process ensures that each dataset exists in both languages, enabling direct cross-lingual comparisons of model performance.

We employ GPT-4o [45] to achieve high-quality translations, which preserve the original meaning, logical structure, and domain-specific terminology. Furthermore, to enhance translation accuracy, we perform post-translation validation, including expert review and consistency checks against standardized anesthesiology references. The full prompt for translation is provided in Appendix C.

This cross-lingual benchmarking allows us to investigate critical aspect of LLM performance: how language transferability affects complex decision-making processes. By analyzing performance discrepancies between EN2CN and CN2EN tasks, we gain insights into how different linguistic structures influence the model’s reasoning ability.

### 3.1.4 Zero-Shot CoT for Reasoning Evaluation

Given that our evaluation focuses on reasoning-intensive System 2 tasks, we applied CoT prompting to encourage structured, step-by-step reasoning. In our evaluation, we employed a Zero-Shot CoT [13] prompting strategy, which enhances model reasoning by incorporating explicit reasoning cues, such as “Let’s think step by step”, without relying on examples.

Additionally, recognizing the variability in instruction adherence among different models, we opted not to impose rigid output format constraints. This choice ensures a fair comparison across models with diverse instruction-following behaviors, allowing for a more accurate assessment of their reasoning proficiency in complex anesthetic decision-making scenarios.

## 3.2 Evaluation of Training & Reasoning

### 3.2.1 Training Dataset Collection.

For the evaluation on the impact of Continuous Pre-training and Supervised Fine-Tuning, we construct specialized training datasets tailored to the anesthesiology domain. We employ two primary strategies for data collection. First, we extract domain-specific data from existing large-scale corpora, such as FineWeb [46], using a keyword frequency-based filtering approach. Second, we gather anesthesiology-related research papers from PubMed<sup>3</sup> and perform extensive data cleaning. The cleaning process involves removing extraneous content, standardizing formatting, and filtering out low-relevance sections to retain high-quality, domain-specific textual data.

For CPT, we merge and utilize the curated dataset, referred to as **AnesCorpus**, from these two sources to enhance the model’s domain-specific knowledge. By pre-training on this specialized corpus, we aim to improve the model’s foundational understanding of anesthesiology concepts, terminology, and common clinical scenarios. The CPT corpus is further illustrated by the word cloud analysis in Appendix E, demonstrating its strong alignment in anesthesiology-related topics.

Since domain-specific SFT requires high-quality QA data, which is often scarce and difficult to obtain, we employ a data synthesis pipeline leveraging LLMs. Specifically, we segment papers into small chunks based on length and section structure, then use LLaMA3.3-70B-Instruct [47] to generate self-contained questions for each chunk. Next, we employ Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct [48] to filter and answer the most informative and domain-relevant questions. Finally, we translate the QA pairs into Chinese using GPT-4o-mini, creating a bilingual dataset for fine-tuning. We name the entire question-answering dataset as **AnesQA**. The specifications of the **AnesCorpus** and the **AnesQA** are presented in Appendix D Table 5.

### 3.2.2 Training & Reasoning Process.

We employ a two-stage training strategy, including CPT and SFT. We first conduct CPT on Qwen2.5-7B-Base [48] using our curated anesthesia-related corpus. The objective of CPT is to enhance the model’s foundational knowledge in anesthesiology by exposing it to high-quality domain-specific text. For SFT, we focus on aligning the model with the structure of multiple-choice question tasks while reinforcing its ability to handle anesthesia-specific inquiries. To achieve this, we incorporate the medical-o1 [49] dataset alongside our **AnesQA** dataset.

Following training, we implement an advanced test-time compute process inspired by Marco-o1 [29], designed to enhance multi-step reasoning. Specifically, we structure CoT reasoning into mini-steps with a predefined token budget, ensuring a granular and interpretable reasoning pathway. To further improve response quality, we incorporate a self-reflection mechanism [29], prompting the model to critically reassess and refine its initial outputs. Additionally, we employ tree search strategies, including Best-of-N [21] and Beam Search [19], enabling the model to explore multiple reasoning

---

<sup>3</sup>PubMed: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>

Table 1: **Main Evaluation Results on AnesBench and AMCQA:** The highest and second-highest scores in the “Overall” column are highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively. Only a selection of representative models is shown here; full evaluation results are in Table 4 in Appendix A.

Model	ANESBENCH				AMCQA				Overall
	Sys1	Sys1.x	Sys2	Total	Sys1	Sys1.x	Sys2	Total	
<b>~7B models</b>									
ChatGLM3-6B	0.37	0.28	0.25	0.34	0.36	0.36	0.34	0.36	0.35
HuatuoGPT-o1-7B	0.56	0.45	0.38	0.52	0.71	0.65	0.63	0.70	0.63
Internlm3-8b-instruct	0.60	0.43	0.40	0.54	0.85	0.76	0.77	0.84	0.73
Glm-4-9b-chat	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.44	0.61	0.60	0.56	0.61	0.55
<b>&gt; 10B models</b>									
Baichuan2-13B-Chat	0.42	0.31	0.34	0.39	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.48	0.45
Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	0.61	0.52	0.41	0.57	0.74	0.70	0.62	0.73	0.67
Gemma-2-27b-it	0.60	0.43	0.36	0.54	0.57	0.52	0.48	0.56	0.55
Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct	0.65	0.55	0.44	0.61	0.77	0.73	0.69	0.76	0.70
QwQ-32B-Preview	0.69	0.58	0.44	0.64	0.74	0.70	0.68	0.73	0.70
Llama-3-70B-UltraMedical	0.73	0.60	0.47	0.68	0.72	0.68	0.62	0.71	0.70
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct	0.72	0.60	0.48	0.67	0.82	0.77	0.76	0.81	0.76
HuatuoGPT-o1-72B	0.71	0.61	0.48	0.67	0.82	0.78	0.78	0.81	0.76
<b>DeepSeek V3/R1 &amp; GPT-4o</b>									
DeepSeek-V3	0.77	0.69	0.55	0.73	0.79	0.77	0.70	0.78	<u>0.77</u>
DeepSeek-R1	0.85	0.78	0.70	0.82	0.88	0.85	0.81	0.87	<b>0.85</b>
GPT-4o	0.81	0.72	0.59	0.77	0.78	0.77	0.68	0.78	<u>0.77</u>

trajectories. The final answer is determined through the majority vote mechanism, selecting the most coherent and accurate response.

### 3.2.3 Distillation

Beyond CPT and SFT, we further evaluate the impact of reasoning-enhanced model distillation. Specifically, we assess models distilled from DeepSeek-R1 [25] and compare them with their original instruct versions. As one of the state-of-the-art reasoning models, DeepSeek-R1 serves as a strong reference point for evaluating the efficacy of distillation in enhancing reasoning performance.

The distillation process was conducted by the official DeepSeek team. For these distilled models, only SFT was applied, without incorporating reinforcement learning (RL) [25]. While RL could potentially further enhance performance, the primary objective of this evaluation is to demonstrate the effectiveness of distillation as a technique for transferring reasoning abilities to smaller models. Future research may explore the additional benefits of RL in complementing this distillation process.

## 4 Impact of Model Characteristics

In this section, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of state-of-the-art LLMs. Through rigorous analysis of the results, we derived several key insights. These insights contribute to a deeper understanding of the potential and limitations of LLMs in this domain.

### 4.1 Evaluation Setup

**Decoding Hyperparameters** Given resource constraints, each model is tested a single time on the benchmark. To mitigate response variance, we configure the decoding temperature to 0 for text

generation. The maximum output length is also limited to 2048 tokens to maintain consistency and comparability across all experiments.

## 4.2 Main Results

**Overall Performance** Due to space limitations, we only select the most representative models, such as those with the highest overall scores in each model scale, as illustrated in Table 1. The remaining results can be found in the Appendix A. Based on the results, we have the following observations. First, Deepseek-R1 consistently surpasses a wide array of open-source and closed-source models, including OpenAI’s GPT-4o, across all evaluated subjects, demonstrating exceptional strengths in reasoning, knowledge retrieval, and multilingual adaptability, making it highly competitive. Notably, QwQ-32B-Preview and Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct achieve or even surpass the performance of 70B-sized models. Furthermore, for System2 questions in ANESBENCH, most models score below 0.5. This suggests that current LLMs still face significant challenges in anesthesiology reasoning and attests to the difficulty and quality of our newly collected questions.

## 4.3 Multi-Dimensional Analysis




Figure 2: **Performance Impact of Model Scale.** Colors denote model scale (model index) and problem type (scatter points). Models are sorted by overall score in ascending order. (a) Evaluation Results on ANESBENCH. (b) Evaluation Results on AMCQA.

**Performance Across Model Scale** We arrange the models in increasing order according to their total scores on ANESBENCH and AMCQA. Fig. 2 reveal a strong positive correlation between model performance and model scale, and this correlation exhibits diminishing marginal returns. Each unit increase in model scale brings progressively smaller performance gains. Fig. 2a shows that the fitted-line slopes for System1 and System1.x on ANESBENCH are nearly identical. In contrast, the slope for System2 is significantly lower. This indicates that performance gains from increasing model size are notably lower for System2 compared to System1. Fig. 2b further shows that the slopes differences for different problem types on AMCQA are less pronounced. These results indicate that our ANESBENCH exhibits well-defined and distinct difficulty levels.

**Performance Across Language** We evaluate multiple models on ANESBENCH and AMCQA, along with their English-Chinese translations, to investigate multilingual performance in anesthesiology. As shown in Fig. 3, Qwen2.5-7B based and other models exhibit minimal disparity between English and Chinese performance. In contrast, Llama-3.1-8B-based models, despite claiming multilingual support [47], perform notably worse in Chinese than in English. These results indicate that language transferability remains a key factor influencing multilingual model performance. According to the theory proposed in [50], once an LLM reaches a stable language learning stage, different languages form independent knowledge systems rather than relying on translation. At this stage, a lack of domain-specific knowledge within the language-specific knowledge system can lead to substantial performance disparities across languages. Therefore, we recommend supplementing bilingual domain-specific knowledge during the CPT stage to mitigate cross-linguistic performance gaps.




Figure 3: **Multilingual Assessment on Translated Benchmarks.** Background colors denote base models: purple for Qwen2.5-7B, blue for Llama-3.1-8B. Here, “Q” and “L” respectively refer to models trained based on Qwen and Llama.

**Performance Across Output Length** By comparing output length and scores across three types of questions in ANESBENCH<sup>4</sup>, we discovered: (1) Models with longer CoT reasoning processes tend to exhibit superior response performance. As illustrated in the right subplot of Fig. 4, for System2 type questions, models achieve higher scores with longer outputs. (2) However, this trend is not pronounced in System1 and System1.x, which do not require extensive reasoning processes. As shown in the left and middle subplots of Fig. 4, the scores of models are almost solely correlated with the size of the model.




Figure 4: **Output length (log scale) vs. scores.** Shapes and colors denote model families and scales, respectively.

## 5 Impact of Training & Reasoning Strategy

### 5.1 Experiments Setup

**CPT Settings** We fine-tune Qwen2.5-7B-Base on the anesthesia-related corpus to obtain Qwen2.5-7B-Base-CPT. The training is conducted for 2 epochs, using a batch size of 8 with gradient accumulation steps of 8. Training is performed in BF16 precision to optimize memory efficiency.

**SFT Settings** After CPT, we conduct comparative experiments using Qwen2.5-7B-Base and Qwen2.5-7B-Base-CPT. Specifically, we perform an ablation study by fine-tuning these two models

<sup>4</sup>For a fair and effective comparison, we only selected models obtained by fine-tuning on widely used base models (including Qwen2.5-7B, Llama-3.1-8B, Qwen2.5-72B, and Llama-3.1-70B).



on Medical-o1 [49] and AnesQA separately and in combination. We use a batch size of 16 with gradient accumulation steps of 4, and the learning rate is 1.0e-5. To ensure a fair comparison across datasets of varying sizes, we fix the total training steps at 2,000 for all experiments.

**Reasoning Settings** For reasoning evaluation, we experiment with Best-of-N [21] sampling and Beam Search [19] to assess different reasoning strategies. The decoding parameters are set to temperature = 1.0 and top-p = 0.9 to balance diversity and determinism. Additionally, key parameters such as mini-step token budget, tree width, and beam width are systematically varied as experimental factors to analyze their impact on reasoning performance.

## 5.2 Effectiveness of Training Strategies

We conduct experiments on Qwen2.5-7B-Base and Qwen2.5-7B-Base-CPT models, fine-tuning them using AnesQA and Medical-o1 separately and in combination, and then evaluate on ANESBENCH. Additionally, we use the Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct as a reference model. The results are demonstrated in Table 2, providing two key insights into the effectiveness of these training strategies.

Table 2: **Effectiveness of Training Strategies.** The **Qwen2.5-7B-Base-CPT** model is trained on our custom anesthesiology-related CPT corpus, with **Qwen2.5-7B-Base** serving as the foundation model.

Model	SFT Data		Accuracy
	AnesQA	Medical-o1	ANESBENCH
<b>Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct</b>	-	-	51.5
<b>Qwen2.5-7B-Base</b>	✓	×	49.3
	×	✓	49.1
	✓	✓	49.7
<b>Qwen2.5-7B-Base-CPT</b>	✓	×	49.7
	×	✓	50.7
	✓	✓	51.2

**Impact of Continuous Pre-Training.** Our results reveal that CPT significantly improves model performance on the ANESBENCH, with the Qwen2.5-7B-Base-CPT model outperforming its non-CPT counterpart across all SFT data configurations. This domain-adaptive pre-training approach demonstrates clear effectiveness, achieving a benchmark accuracy of up to 51.2 compared to the non-CPT version’s maximum of 49.7. Notably, using the full SFT dataset (AnesQA and Medical-o1) yields the greatest performance boost for the CPT model, bringing it close to Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, indicating that combining domain-adaptive pre-training with comprehensive supervised fine-tuning data produces optimal results.

**Complementarity of AnesQA and Medical-o1.** The results further highlight the complementary nature of AnesQA and Medical-o1 for fine-tuning. Neither dataset alone is sufficient to optimize model performance across all benchmarks, but combining them yields the best results. Specifically, AnesQA improves the model’s problem-solving ability, while Medical-o1 provides critical domain-specific knowledge. This combination emphasizes that both domain knowledge and problem-solving capability are essential for effective model reasoning performance.

## 5.3 Impact of Reasoning Techniques

To assess the impact of different reasoning strategies on model performance, we use the best SFT model, which is Qwen2.5-7B-Base-CPT trained on both AnesQA and medical-o1, and then compare Best-of-N and Beam Search using varying tree widths (number of candidate paths), beam sizes, and step token budgets. The results, presented in Table 3, reveal notable trends.

Firstly, in Best-of-N sampling, increasing tree width from 4 to 8 does not yield additional gains. This suggests that simply expanding the candidates without increasing the search space provides limited

benefits. In contrast, Beam Search consistently outperforms Best-of-N, demonstrating that step-level structured exploration is more beneficial to reasoning ability. Furthermore, increasing the beam size leads to incremental improvements in accuracy.

Overall, from a test-time computation perspective, increasing the exploration path width requires higher computational resources but results in a performance boost. By allocating more computation during test time, the model can explore a broader range of paths, leading to more comprehensive reasoning and, ultimately, better outcomes.

Table 3: Comparison of Different Reasoning Strategies.

Reasoning Strategy	Tree Width	Beam Size	Step Tokens	Accuracy(%)
None	-	-	-	51.2
Best-of-N [21]	4	-	-	51.5
	8	-	-	51.5
Beam Search [19]	4	4	32	52.1
	8	8	32	<b>52.4</b>

#### 5.4 Evaluation of Distillation Performance




Figure 5: **Impact of R1 distillation.** “It” in the figure abbreviates “Instruct”.

As shown in Figure 5, our comparative analysis of DeepSeek-R1 distilled models and instruction-tuned models<sup>5</sup> derived from the same base model reveals two key observations: **(1)** Reasoning capabilities developed in general domains can enhance model performance on anesthesiology-related reasoning tasks. Specifically, models initialized from Qwen2.5-32B-Base and Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct and subsequently distilled using R1 outperformed their instruction-tuned counterparts in both System 2 and System 1.x type questions. **(2)** However, the effectiveness of R1 distillation correlates positively with model size. As noted in [51], small LLMs struggle to acquire reasoning abilities from long CoT data due to their lack of domain-specific knowledge, compared to larger LLMs in this regard. Notably, as model size increases from left to right in the results, the performance improvement from R1 distillation becomes more pronounced for System 2 questions requiring explicit reasoning.

<sup>5</sup>We exclude Qwen2.5-Math-1.5B and Qwen2.5-Math-7B as these base models lack adaptability to non-mathematical domains, which may cause an unfair comparison.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce ANESBENCH, an anesthesiology evaluation benchmark featuring a three-level cognitive demand system. Through a comprehensive analysis of evaluation results on over thirty state-of-the-art LLMs, we derive key insights into the relationship between model characteristics and anesthesiology reasoning ability. Additionally, extensive experiments and analyses demonstrate the effectiveness of training strategies such as CPT and SFT, as well as various reasoning techniques. We hope that ANESBENCH and our multidimensional analysis serve as an effective stepping stone for developing LLMs with enhanced anesthesiology reasoning capabilities.

## References

- [1] Lei Liu, Xiaoyan Yang, Junchi Lei, Xiaoyang Liu, Yue Shen, Zhiqiang Zhang, Peng Wei, Jinjie Gu, Zhixuan Chu, Zhan Qin, et al. A survey on medical large language models: Technology, application, trustworthiness, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03712*, 2024.
- [2] Yixuan Weng, Bin Li, Fei Xia, Minjun Zhu, Bin Sun, Shizhu He, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Large language models need holistically thought in medical conversational qa. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05410*, 2023.
- [3] Daniel Kahneman. Fast and slow thinking. *Allen Lane and Penguin Books, New York*, 2011.
- [4] Binbin Li, Tianxin Meng, Xiaoming Shi, Jie Zhai, and Tong Ruan. Meddm: Llm-executable clinical guidance tree for clinical decision-making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02441*, 2023.
- [5] Łukasz Grzybowski, Jakub Pokrywka, Michał Ciesiółka, Jeremi I Kaczmarek, and Marek Kubis. Polish medical exams: A new dataset for cross-lingual medical knowledge transfer assessment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.00559*, 2024.
- [6] Xidong Wang, Guiming Chen, Song Dingjie, Zhang Zhiyi, Zhihong Chen, Qingying Xiao, Junying Chen, Feng Jiang, Jianquan Li, Xiang Wan, et al. Cmb: A comprehensive medical benchmark in chinese. In *NAACL*, 2024.
- [7] Dimitrios P Panagoulas, Persephone Papatheodosiou, Anastasios P Palamidis, Mattheos Sanoudos, Evridiki Tsourelis-Nikita, Maria Virvou, and George A Tsihrantzis. Cognet-md, an evaluation framework and dataset for large language model benchmarks in the medical domain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10893*, 2024.
- [8] Tobi Olatunji, Charles Nimo, Abraham Owodunni, Tassallah Abdullahi, Emmanuel Ayodele, Mardhiyah Sanni, Chinemelu Aka, Fofafunmi Omofoye, Foutse Yuehgoh, Timothy Faniran, et al. Afrimed-qa: A pan-african, multi-specialty, medical question-answering benchmark dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15640*, 2024.
- [9] Asma Ben Abacha, Yassine Mrabet, Mark Sharp, Travis R Goodwin, Sonya E Shooshan, and Dina Demner-Fushman. Bridging the gap between consumers’ medication questions and trusted answers. In *MEDINFO*, 2019.
- [10] Mianxin Liu, Weiguo Hu, Jinru Ding, Jie Xu, Xiaoyang Li, Lifeng Zhu, Zhian Bai, Xiaoming Shi, Benyou Wang, Haitao Song, et al. Medbench: A comprehensive, standardized, and reliable benchmarking system for evaluating chinese medical large language models. *Big Data Mining and Analytics*, 7(4):1116–1128, 2024.
- [11] Bohao Zhou, Yibing Zhan, Zhonghai Wang, Yanhong Li, Chong Zhang, Baosheng Yu, Liang Ding, Hua Jin, Weifeng Liu, Xiongbing Wang, et al. Benchmarking medical llms on anesthesiology: A comprehensive dataset in chinese. In *TETCI*. IEEE, 2025.
- [12] Swarnadeep Saha, Archiki Prasad, Justin Chih-Yao Chen, Peter Hase, Elias Stengel-Eskin, and Mohit Bansal. System-1. x: Learning to balance fast and slow planning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14414*, 2024.
- [13] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [14] Gabriel Nicholas and Aliya Bhatia. Lost in translation: Large language models in non-english content analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.07377*, 2023.

- [15] Zixuan Ke, Yijia Shao, Haowei Lin, Tatsuya Konishi, Gyuhak Kim, and Bing Liu. Continual learning of language models. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [16] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [17] Xiaohan Xu, Ming Li, Chongyang Tao, Tao Shen, Reynold Cheng, Jinyang Li, Can Xu, Dacheng Tao, and Tianyi Zhou. A survey on knowledge distillation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13116*, 2024.
- [18] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [19] Markus Freitag and Yaser Al-Onaizan. Beam search strategies for neural machine translation. In *ACL*, 2017.
- [20] Zhenni Bi, Kai Han, Chuanjian Liu, Yehui Tang, and Yunhe Wang. Forest-of-thought: Scaling test-time compute for enhancing llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09078*, 2024.
- [21] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [22] Zhong-Zhi Li, Duzhen Zhang, Ming-Liang Zhang, Jiabin Zhang, Zengyan Liu, Yuxuan Yao, Haotian Xu, Junhao Zheng, Pei-Jie Wang, Xiuyi Chen, et al. From system 1 to system 2: A survey of reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17419*, 2025.
- [23] OpenAI. Learning to reason with llms, September 2024.
- [24] OpenAI. Openai o3-mini, January 2025.
- [25] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [26] Violet Xiang, Charlie Snell, Kanishk Gandhi, Alon Albalak, Anikait Singh, Chase Blagden, Duy Phung, Rafael Rafailov, Nathan Lile, Dakota Mahan, et al. Towards system 2 reasoning in llms: Learning how to think with meta chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.04682*, 2025.
- [27] Zeyu Tang, Zhenhao Chen, Loka Li, Xiangchen Song, Yunlong Deng, Yifan Shen, Guangyi Chen, Peter Spirtes, and Kun Zhang. Reflection-window decoding: Text generation with selective refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03678*, 2025.
- [28] Zhongzhen Huang, Gui Geng, Shengyi Hua, Zhen Huang, Haoyang Zou, Shaoting Zhang, Pengfei Liu, and Xiaofan Zhang. O1 replication journey—part 3: Inference-time scaling for medical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06458*, 2025.
- [29] Yu Zhao, Huifeng Yin, Bo Zeng, Hao Wang, Tianqi Shi, Chenyang Lyu, Longyue Wang, Weihua Luo, and Kaifu Zhang. Marco-o1: Towards open reasoning models for open-ended solutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.14405*, 2024.
- [30] Trung Quoc Luong, Xinbo Zhang, Zhanming Jie, Peng Sun, Xiaoran Jin, and Hang Li. Ref: Reasoning with reinforced fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08967*, 2024.
- [31] Kimi Team, Angang Du, Bofei Gao, Bofei Xing, Changjiu Jiang, Cheng Chen, Cheng Li, Chenjun Xiao, Chenzhuang Du, Chonghua Liao, et al. Kimi k1. 5: Scaling reinforcement learning with llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12599*, 2025.
- [32] Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah Goodman. Star: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [33] Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Ksenia Konyushkova, Lotte Weerts, Abhishek Sharma, Aditya Siddhant, Alex Ahern, Miaosen Wang, Chenjie Gu, et al. Reinforced self-training (rest) for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08998*, 2023.

- [34] Avi Singh, John D Co-Reyes, Rishabh Agarwal, Ankesh Anand, Piyush Patil, Xavier Garcia, Peter J Liu, James Harrison, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, et al. Beyond human data: Scaling self-training for problem-solving with language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024.
- [35] Jiahao Qiu, Yifu Lu, Yifan Zeng, Jiacheng Guo, Jiayi Geng, Huazheng Wang, Kaixuan Huang, Yue Wu, and Mengdi Wang. Treebon: Enhancing inference-time alignment with speculative tree-search and best-of-n sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.16033*, 2024.
- [36] Jierui Li, Hung Le, Yingbo Zhou, Caiming Xiong, Silvio Savarese, and Doyen Sahoo. Codetree: Agent-guided tree search for code generation with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04329*, 2024.
- [37] Adnan A Khan, Rayaun Yunus, Mahad Sohail, Taha A Rehman, Shirin Saeed, Yifan Bu, Cullen D Jackson, Aidan Sharkey, Feroze Mahmood, and Robina Matyal. Artificial intelligence for anesthesiology board-style examination questions: Role of large language models. *Journal of Cardiothoracic and Vascular Anesthesia*, 38(5):1251–1259, 2024.
- [38] Mirana C Angel, Joseph B Rinehart, Maxime P Canneson, and Pierre Baldi. Clinical knowledge and reasoning abilities of ai large language models in anesthesiology: A comparative study on the american board of anesthesiology examination. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 139(2):10–1213, 2022.
- [39] Denys Shay, Bhawesh Kumar, David Bellamy, Anil Palepu, Mark Dershwitz, Jens M Walz, Maximilian S Schaefer, and Andrew Beam. Assessment of chatgpt success with specialty medical knowledge using anaesthesiology board examination practice questions. *BJA: British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 131(2):e31, 2023.
- [40] Michiko Kinoshita, Mizuki Komasa, and Katsuya Tanaka. Chatgpt’s performance on jsa-certified anesthesiologist exam. *Journal of Anesthesia*, 38(2):282–283, 2024.
- [41] Sourav S Patnaik and Ulrike Hoffmann. Comparison of chatgpt vs. bard to anesthesia-related queries. *medRxiv*, pages 2023–06, 2023.
- [42] Zhonghai Wang, Jie Jiang, Yibing Zhan, Bohao Zhou, Yanhong Li, Chong Zhang, Liang Ding, Hua Jin, Jun Peng, Xu Lin, et al. Towards training a chinese large language model for anesthesiology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02742*, 2024.
- [43] Estefania Guthrie, Dominique Levy, and Gabriel Del Carmen. The operating and anesthetic reference assistant (oara): A fine-tuned large language model for resident teaching. *The American Journal of Surgery*, 234:28–34, 2024.
- [44] Shiwen Ni, Xiangtao Kong, Chengming Li, Xiping Hu, Ruifeng Xu, Jia Zhu, and Min Yang. Training on the benchmark is not all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.01790*, 2024.
- [45] OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o, May 2024.
- [46] Guilherme Penedo, Hyněk Kydlíček, Loubna Ben allal, Anton Lozhkov, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Leandro Von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. The fineweb datasets: Decanting the web for the finest text data at scale. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [47] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [48] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Pei Zhang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Runji Lin, Tianhao Li, Tingyu Xia, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zihan Qiu. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- [49] Junying Chen, Zhenyang Cai, Ke Ji, Xidong Wang, Wanlong Liu, Rongsheng Wang, Jianye Hou, and Benyou Wang. Huatuogpt-o1, towards medical complex reasoning with llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.18925*, 2024.
- [50] Jiawei Chen, Wentao Chen, Jing Su, Jingjing Xu, Hongyu Lin, Mengjie Ren, Yaojie Lu, Xianpei Han, and Le Sun. The rise and down of babel tower: Investigating the evolution process of multilingual code large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.07298*, 2024.

- [51] Yuetai Li, Xiang Yue, Zhangchen Xu, Fengqing Jiang, Luyao Niu, Bill Yuchen Lin, Bhaskar Ramasubramanian, and Radha Poovendran. Small models struggle to learn from strong reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12143*, 2025.
- [52] Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Dan Zhang, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, et al. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793*, 2024.
- [53] Baichuan. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305*, 2023.
- [54] Yanis Labrak, Adrien Bazoge, Emmanuel Morin, Pierre-Antoine Gourraud, Mickael Rouvier, and Richard Dufour. Biomistral: A collection of open-source pretrained large language models for medical domains, 2024.
- [55] Kaiyan Zhang, Sihang Zeng, Ermo Hua, Ning Ding, Zhang-Ren Chen, Zhiyuan Ma, Haoxin Li, Ganqu Cui, Biqing Qi, Xuekai Zhu, Xingtai Lv, Jin-Fang Hu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Bowen Zhou. Ultramedical: Building specialized generalists in biomedicine. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [56] Malaikannan Sankarasubbu Ankit Pal. Openbiollms: Advancing open-source large language models for healthcare and life sciences. <https://huggingface.co/aaditya/OpenBioLLM-Llama3-70B>, 2024.
- [57] Hongzhou Yu, Tianhao Cheng, Ying Cheng, and Rui Feng. Finemedlm-o1: Enhancing the medical reasoning ability of llm from supervised fine-tuning to test-time training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09213*, 2025.
- [58] ContactDoctor. Bio-medical: A high-performance biomedical language model. <https://huggingface.co/ContactDoctor/Bio-Medical-Llama-3-8B>, 2024.
- [59] Zheng Cai, Maosong Cao, Haojiong Chen, Kai Chen, Keyu Chen, Xin Chen, Xun Chen, Zehui Chen, Zhi Chen, Pei Chu, et al. Internlm2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17297*, 2024.
- [60] Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118*, 2024.
- [61] Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, et al. Phi-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08905*, 2024.
- [62] Qwen. Qwq-32b: Embracing the power of reinforcement learning, March 2025.
- [63] Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Guoyin Wang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, et al. Yi: Open foundation models by 01. ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652*, 2024.
- [64] Guoxin Wang, Minyu Gao, Shuai Yang, Ya Zhang, Lizhi He, Liang Huang, Hanlin Xiao, Yexuan Zhang, Wanyue Li, Lu Chen, et al. Citrus: Leveraging expert cognitive pathways in a medical language model for advanced medical decision support. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18274*, 2025.
- [65] Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2024.
- [66] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [67] Haonan Li, Yixuan Zhang, Fajri Koto, Yifei Yang, Hai Zhao, Yeyun Gong, Nan Duan, and Timothy Baldwin. Cmmlu: Measuring massive multitask language understanding in chinese. In *ACL*, 2024.
- [68] Yuzhen Huang, Yuzhuo Bai, Zhihao Zhu, Junlei Zhang, Jinghan Zhang, Tangjun Su, Junteng Liu, Chuancheng Lv, Yikai Zhang, Jiayi lei, Yao Fu, Maosong Sun, and Junxian He. C-eval: A multi-level multi-discipline chinese evaluation suite for foundation models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.

## A Complete Results

Table 4: Complete Evaluation Results on ANESBENCH and AMCQA.

Model	ANESBENCH				AMCQA				Overall
	Sys1	Sys1.x	Sys2	Total	Sys1	Sys1.x	Sys2	Total	
<b>~7B models</b>									
ChatGLM3-6B [52]	0.37	0.28	0.25	0.34	0.36	0.36	0.34	0.36	0.35
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct [48]	0.56	0.44	0.36	0.52	0.68	0.63	0.58	0.67	0.61
HuatuoGPT-o1-7B [49]	0.56	0.45	0.38	0.52	0.71	0.65	0.63	0.70	0.63
Baichuan2-7B-Chat [53]	0.39	0.31	0.30	0.37	0.44	0.41	0.41	0.43	0.41
BioMistral-7B [54]	0.43	0.30	0.32	0.39	0.26	0.25	0.28	0.26	0.31
Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct [47]	0.54	0.42	0.39	0.50	0.49	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.49
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct [47]	0.58	0.45	0.36	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.55	0.53	0.53
Llama-3.1-8B-UltraMedical [55]	0.63	0.47	0.41	0.57	0.54	0.52	0.50	0.54	0.55
HuatuoGPT-o1-8B [49]	0.58	0.46	0.39	0.53	0.57	0.53	0.57	0.56	0.55
Llama3-OpenBioLLM-8B [56]	0.44	0.35	0.30	0.41	0.26	0.25	0.19	0.25	0.31
FineMedLM [57]	0.40	0.35	0.27	0.38	0.30	0.34	0.38	0.31	0.34
FineMedLM-o1 [57]	0.43	0.34	0.26	0.39	0.34	0.38	0.40	0.35	0.37
Bio-Medical-Llama-3-8B [58]	0.53	0.41	0.38	0.49	0.48	0.47	0.49	0.48	0.48
Internlm3-8b-instruct [59]	0.60	0.43	0.40	0.54	0.85	0.76	0.77	0.84	0.73
ChatGLM-4-9b-chat [52]	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.44	0.61	0.60	0.56	0.61	0.55
Gemma-2-9b-it [60]	0.53	0.40	0.36	0.49	0.54	0.49	0.41	0.52	0.51
<b>&gt; 10B models</b>									
Baichuan2-13B-Chat [53]	0.42	0.31	0.34	0.39	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.48	0.45
Phi-4 [61]	0.69	0.57	0.41	0.64	0.57	0.57	0.56	0.57	0.59
Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct [48]	0.61	0.52	0.41	0.57	0.74	0.70	0.62	0.73	0.67
Gemma-2-27b-it [60]	0.60	0.43	0.36	0.54	0.57	0.52	0.48	0.56	0.55
Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct [48]	0.65	0.55	0.44	0.61	0.77	0.73	0.69	0.76	0.70
QwQ-32B-Preview [62]	0.69	0.58	0.44	0.64	0.74	0.70	0.68	0.73	0.70
Yi-1.5-34B-Chat [63]	0.54	0.44	0.35	0.50	0.65	0.64	0.64	0.65	0.59
HuatuoGPT-o1-70B [49]	0.70	0.58	0.48	0.65	0.70	0.70	0.64	0.70	0.68
Llama-3-70B-UltraMedical [55]	0.73	0.60	0.47	0.68	0.72	0.68	0.62	0.71	0.70
Llama3-OpenBioLLM-70B [56]	0.68	0.55	0.44	0.63	0.65	0.60	0.60	0.64	0.64
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct [47]	0.74	0.63	0.51	0.70	0.69	0.66	0.63	0.68	0.69
Citrus1.0-llama-70B [64]	0.71	0.60	0.52	0.67	0.71	0.69	0.67	0.71	0.69
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct [48]	0.72	0.60	0.48	0.67	0.82	0.77	0.76	0.81	0.76
HuatuoGPT-o1-72B [49]	0.71	0.61	0.48	0.67	0.82	0.78	0.78	0.81	0.76
<b>DeepSeek family &amp; GPT</b>									
R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B [25]	0.32	0.28	0.27	0.31	0.26	0.26	0.22	0.26	0.28
R1-Distill-Qwen-7B [25]	0.40	0.34	0.28	0.38	0.33	0.32	0.34	0.33	0.35
R1-Distill-Llama-8B [25]	0.52	0.39	0.34	0.47	0.33	0.31	0.36	0.33	0.38
R1-Distill-Qwen-14B [25]	0.64	0.51	0.40	0.59	0.62	0.66	0.61	0.63	0.61
R1-Distill-Qwen-32B [25] [25]	0.67	0.56	0.45	0.63	0.66	0.71	0.65	0.67	0.65
R1-Distill-Llama-70B [25]	0.77	0.68	0.56	0.73	0.64	0.64	0.59	0.64	0.67
DeepSeek-V3 [65]	0.77	0.69	0.55	0.73	0.79	0.77	0.70	0.78	0.77
DeepSeek-R1 [25]	0.85	0.78	0.70	0.82	0.88	0.85	0.81	0.87	0.85
GPT-4o [45]	0.81	0.72	0.59	0.77	0.78	0.77	0.68	0.78	0.77

## B Prompt for Question Categorization

We utilize Deepseek-R1 for multi-dimensional, few-shot question categorization. For models lacking system prompt support, we integrate the system prompt into the user prompt. The categorization process follows precise analytical guidelines and illustrative examples.

**Prompt for Question Categorization**

**System Prompt:**

You are an anesthesiologist and helpful personal assistant, proficient in categorizing questions strictly according to user instructions.

**User Prompt:**

**Problem description:**

[{instance["problem"]}]  
A: [{instance["A"]}]  
B: [{instance["B"]}]  
.....

**Answer:**

[{instance["answer"]}]

**Classification Categories:**

- 1. Knowledge-Based:** Involves recalling fundamental facts, definitions, or procedures. This type of question primarily tests factual memory without requiring application or in-depth reasoning. For example: “What is the standard dose of Propofol for an adult patient undergoing general anesthesia?”
- 2. Application-Based:** Involves using basic knowledge or concepts in straightforward situations. The question requires applying known information to solve problems or make decisions, but does not require complex thinking or multiple-step reasoning. For example: “If a patient has a history of allergies to local anesthetics, which alternative drug should be considered?”
- 3. Reasoning-Based:** Requires logical thinking, analysis, and the use of problem-solving skills. This type of question challenges the ability to evaluate complex situations, reason through different factors, and make informed decisions. For example: “Given the patient’s medical history and lab results, determine the most appropriate anesthetic technique for the upcoming surgery.”

**Instructions for Classification:**

Please categorize the problem by selecting the most appropriate category that aligns with the type of thinking and approach required to address the question. Consider factors such as the level of complexity, the type of cognitive processing needed, and whether the problem involves straightforward recall, application, or in-depth reasoning. Your response should conclude with: “So, the problem can be categorized as {ANSWER},” where ANSWER is one of the numbers 1, 2, or 3.

Figure 6: The prompt used for question categorization.



## C Prompt for Question Translation

We use ChatGPT-4o to translate all questions. Additionally, we provide detailed translation instructions and formatting requirements in the prompt.

**Prompt for Question Translation**

**System Prompt:**  
You are a translator and helpful assistant proficient in the field of anesthesiology, strictly completing translation tasks according to the user's requirements.

**User Prompt:**  
Translate the following English multiple-choice question into Chinese and output it in the specific format:

English question:

```
{  
  "question": [{"instance": "problem"}]  
  A: [{"instance": "A"}]  
  B: [{"instance": "B"}]  
  .....  
}
```

Format:

```
{  
  "question": "中文问题",  
  A: 选项A  
  B: 选项B  
  .....  
}
```

Do not include any additional reasoning or explanations, only provide the translated content.

Figure 7: The prompt used for question translation.

## D Overview of CPT and SFT datasets

Dataset	AnesCorpus (CPT)	AnesQA (SFT)
Source	PubMed articles, FineWeb corpus	GPT-generated QA pairs
Data Type	Text corpus	Question-Answer pairs
Language	English/Chinese	English/Chinese
Data Scale	EN ~ 18.5M docs (~ 3B tokens)	~ 20k QA-pairs (~ 4M tokens)
	CH ~ 6M docs (~ 0.2B tokens)	~ 20k QA-pairs (~ 6M tokens)

Table 5: CPT and SFT Dataset Specifications

## E Word Cloud Analysis of Corpus

As illustrated in Fig. 8, our constructed anesthesia-related corpus encompasses a diverse range of medical terminologies, both in English and Chinese. The English word cloud highlights key terms such as “general anesthesia”, “local anesthetic”, “surgical procedure”, and “pain management”, reflecting a strong focus on clinical applications, patient care, and perioperative considerations. Additionally, frequent mentions of terms like “nerve block”, “blood pressure”, and “side effect” indicate a broad coverage of anesthesia techniques and associated physiological impacts. Similarly, the Chinese word cloud presents a comparable distribution, with dominant terms such as “手术(surgery)”, “治疗(treatment)”, “麻醉(anesthesia)”, indicating a strong alignment with procedural and treatment-related aspects. The presence of terms related to medical interventions, such as “气管插管(intubation)” and “药物治疗(medication)”, exhibits emphasis on clinical procedures and pharmacological considerations.



Figure 8: Word clouds of CPT corpus.

## F Data Leakage Detection

Given the increasing volume of pre-training data utilized by large language models, coupled with the fact that the sources and specific acquisition methods are often regarded as core secrets and rarely disclosed, a pertinent issue arises: whether the questions in our benchmark have been inadvertently leaked into the pre-training data of various models. We have employed a method specifically designed for multiple-choice questions to detect potential data leakage [44]. For a given multiple-choice instance  $x = (x_{\text{stem}}, o_1, o_2, \dots, o_n)$ , where  $x_{\text{stem}}$  represents the question stem and  $o_1, o_2, \dots, o_n$  are the options, we generate all possible permutations of the options, resulting in  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n!}\}$ . For each permutation, the sequence is decomposed into tokens as  $x = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ . We then compute the confidence score for each sequence using the following method:

$$\text{Conf}_{\text{LLM}}(x) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} p_{\text{LLM}}(t_i|x) \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}. \quad (1)$$

If the original order  $x_0$  has the highest confidence score among all permutations, we consider that the multiple-choice instance **may** have experienced data leakage. We randomly select 500 questions from ANESBENCH, excluding those with excessive options. Under the assumption that the LLM has no prior knowledge and calculates probabilities randomly, this method yields a potential leakage proportion of 0.04. As shown in Fig. 9, most models exhibit a potential data leakage proportion around 0.10, with the exception of the Qwen and Yi model families, which are slightly higher (consistent with the evaluation results of MMLU[66], CMMLU[67], C-Eval[68], and CMB[6] in the original text [44]). Overall, the low potential leakage proportions of most models on ANESBENCH validate the quality of our work.




Figure 9: **Proportion of potential data leakage in the model.** Each  $\blacktriangle$  below the x-axis denotes a model family.

## G Datasheet for AnesBench

### G.1 Motivation

**1. For what purpose was the dataset created? Was there a specific task in mind? Was there a specific gap that needed to be filled? Please provide a description.**

**A1:** AnesBench was created to systematically evaluate LLMs reasoning capabilities in the specialized field of anesthesiology, addressing a critical gap in existing medical AI benchmarks. Authors developed a comprehensive cross-lingual benchmark (AnesBench) that could distinguish between different levels of cognitive processing - specifically knowledge retrieval (System 1), complex decision-making (System 2), and a hybrid category (System 1.x) - which was missing in previous anesthesiology evaluation frameworks. Furthermore, we primarily consider employing multiple-choice questions with a single correct answer to assess the anesthesiology-related competencies of LLMs.

**2. Who created this dataset (e.g., which team, research group) and on behalf of which entity (e.g., company, institution, organization)?**

**A2:** This dataset is created by the authors of this paper.

**3. Who funded the creation of the dataset? If there is an associated grant, please provide the name of the grantor and the grant name and number.**

**A3:** N/A.

### G.2 Composition

**1. What do the instances that comprise the dataset represent (e.g., documents, photos, people, countries)? Are there multiple types of instances (e.g., movies, users, and ratings; people and interactions between them; nodes and edges)? Please provide a description.**

**A1:** Each instance in AnesBench is a plain text multiple-choice question. Each multiple-choice question contains between 2 to 9 options, with an average question length of 32.4 tokens.

**2. How many instances are there in total (of each type, if appropriate)?**

**A2:** AnesBench has 4,427 instances.

**3. Does the dataset contain all possible instances or is it a sample (not necessarily random) of instances from a larger set? If the dataset is a sample, then what is the larger set? Is the sample representative of the larger set (e.g., geographic coverage)? If so, please describe how this representativeness was validated/verified. If it is not representative of the larger set, please describe why not (e.g., to cover a more diverse range of instances, because instances were withheld or unavailable).**

**A3:** AnesBench is a sample drawn from a larger set of instances. This larger set comprises all anesthesiology-related questions that can be expressed in text, including both those that require knowledge retrieval and those that involve logical reasoning. Since the questions in AnesBench are exclusively sourced from multiple-choice items found in anesthesiology professional examinations, textbooks, and reliable online test banks, they do not represent the entirety of the larger set.

**4. What data does each instance consist of? "Raw" data (e.g., unprocessed text or images) or features? In either case, please provide a description.**

**A4:** Each instance contains a raw multiple-choice question in plain text extracted from formats including HTML, PDF, and various others. Each question contains 2 to 9 options.

**5. Is there a label or target associated with each instance? If so, please provide a description.**

**A5:** Yes, each instance contains exactly one target as the true answer corresponding to the question.

**6. Is any information missing from individual instances? If so, please provide a description, explaining why this information is missing (e.g., because it was unavailable). This does not include intentionally removed information, but might include, e.g., redacted text.**

**A6:** No.

**7. Are relationships between individual instances made explicit (e.g., users' movie ratings, social network links)? If so, please describe how these relationships are made explicit.**

**A7:** No, there is no explicit relationship between each instance.

**8. Are there recommended data splits (e.g., training, development/validation, testing)? If so, please provide a description of these splits, explaining the rationale behind them.**

**A8:** Yes, we recommend using all of AnesBench for testing.

**9. Are there any errors, sources of noise, or redundancies in the dataset? If so, please provide a description.**

**A9:** No.

**10. Is the dataset self-contained, or does it link to or otherwise rely on external resources (e.g., websites, tweets, other datasets)? If it links to or relies on external resources, a) are there guarantees that they will exist, and remain constant, over time; b) are there official archival versions of the complete dataset (i.e., including the external resources as they existed at the time the dataset was created); c) are there any restrictions (e.g., licenses, fees) associated with any of the external resources that might apply to a future user? Please provide descriptions of all external resources and any restrictions associated with them, as well as links or other access points, as appropriate.**

**A10:** The dataset is self-contained because all questions can be downloaded from various sources. Yes, we will release official archival versions of the complete dataset. For specific usage restrictions, users need to consult the instructions of relevant external resources.

**11. Does the dataset contain data that might be considered confidential (e.g., data that is protected by legal privilege or by doctor-patient confidentiality, data that includes the content of individuals non-public communications)? If so, please provide a description.**

**A11:** No. Although it may contain medical case data, it does not contain any sensitive personal information.

**12. Does the dataset contain data that, if viewed directly, might be offensive, insulting, threatening, or might otherwise cause anxiety? If so, please describe why.**

**A12:** No.

### **G.3 Collection Process**

**1. How was the data associated with each instance acquired? Was the data directly observable (e.g., raw text, movie ratings), reported by subjects (e.g., survey responses), or indirectly inferred/derived from other data (e.g., part-of-speech tags, model-based guesses for age or language)? If data was reported by subjects or indirectly inferred/derived from other data, was the data validated/verified? If so, please describe how.**

**A1:** The data associated with each instance is directly observable. Although they are contained in content such as HTML or PDF, they can be extracted by various methods without more inference and derivation.

**2. What mechanisms or procedures were used to collect the data (e.g., hardware apparatus or sensor, manual human curation, software program, software API)? How were these mechanisms or procedures validated?**

**A2:** All data are automatically sorted and filtered using Python programs after being downloaded from web pages. After the sorting and filtering is completed, we randomly selected 200 questions and manually compared the sorted content with the original content to verify the reliability of the program.

**3. If the dataset is a sample from a larger set, what was the sampling strategy (e.g., deterministic, probabilistic with specific sampling probabilities)?**

**A3:** In terms of the required cognitive level, the sampling process is probabilistic. There are approximately 5% of system2 type questions and 20% of system1.x type questions. The length of

the questions and the number of options are also probabilistically sampled. The number of options ranges from 2 to 9.

**4. Who was involved in the data collection process (e.g., students, crowdworkers, contractors) and how were they compensated (e.g., how much were crowdworkers paid)?**

**A4:** The authors of this paper.

**5. Over what timeframe was the data collected? Does this timeframe match the creation timeframe of the data associated with the instances (e.g., recent crawl of old news articles)? If not, please describe the timeframe in which the data associated with the instances was created.**

**A5:** The timeframe for data collection is from January to February 2025 and lasts for more than one month. The creation time of the data matches the time of data collection.

#### **G.4 Preprocessing/cleaning/labeling**

**1. Was any preprocessing/cleaning/labeling of the data done (e.g., discretization or bucketing, tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, SIFT feature extraction, removal of instances, processing of missing values)? If so, please provide a description. If not, you may skip the remainder of the questions in this section.**

**A1:** No.

**2. Was the “raw” data saved in addition to the preprocessed/cleaned/labeled data (e.g., to support unanticipated future uses)? If so, please provide a link or other access point to the “raw” data.**

**A2:** N/A.

**3. Is the software used to preprocess/clean/label the instances available? If so, please provide a link or other access point.**

**A3:** N/A.

#### **G.5 Uses**

**1. Has the dataset been used for any tasks already? If so, please provide a description.**

**A1:** Yes, we use this dataset to evaluate the reasoning abilities of current state-of-the-art LLMs in the context of anesthesiology and analyze multiple key factors influencing their performance.

**2. Is there a repository that links to any or all papers or systems that use the dataset? If so, please provide a link or other access point.**

**A2:** N/A.

**3. What (other) tasks could the dataset be used for?**

**A3:** It can be used for testing and evaluating large language models for reasoning, especially for issues related to anesthesiology.

**4. Is there anything about the composition of the dataset or the way it was collected and preprocessed/cleaned/labeled that might impact future uses? For example, is there anything that a future user might need to know to avoid uses that could result in unfair treatment of individuals or groups (e.g., stereotyping, quality of service issues) or other undesirable harms (e.g., financial harms, legal risks) If so, please provide a description. Is there anything a future user could do to mitigate these undesirable harms?**

**A4:** No.

**5. Are there tasks for which the dataset should not be used? If so, please provide a description.**

**A5:** No.

## G.6 Distribution

**1. Will the dataset be distributed to third parties outside of the entity (e.g., company, institution, organization) on behalf of which the dataset was created? If so, please provide a description.**

A1: Yes.

**2. How will the dataset will be distributed (e.g., tarball on website, API, GitHub)? Does the dataset have a digital object identifier (DOI)?**

A2: It will be publicly available at <https://github.com/MiliLab/AnesBench>.

**3. When will the dataset be distributed?**

A3: The dataset will be distributed once the paper is accepted after peer review.

**4. Will the dataset be distributed under a copyright or other intellectual property (IP) license, and/or under applicable terms of use (ToU)? If so, please describe this license and/or ToU, and provide a link or other access point to, or otherwise reproduce, any relevant licensing terms or ToU, as well as any fees associated with these restrictions.**

A4: It will be distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License.

**5. Have any third parties imposed IP-based or other restrictions on the data associated with the instances? If so, please describe these restrictions, and provide a link or other access point to, or otherwise reproduce, any relevant licensing terms, as well as any fees associated with these restrictions.**

A5: No.

**6. Do any export controls or other regulatory restrictions apply to the dataset or to individual instances? If so, please describe these restrictions, and provide a link or other access point to, or otherwise reproduce, any supporting documentation.**

A6: No.

## G.7 Maintenance

**1. Who will be supporting/hosting/maintaining the dataset?**

A1: The authors.

**2. How can the owner/curator/manager of the dataset be contacted (e.g., email address)?**

A2: They can be contacted via email available on the paper.

**3. Is there an erratum? If so, please provide a link or other access point.**

A3: No.

**4. Will the dataset be updated (e.g., to correct labeling errors, add new instances, delete instances)? If so, please describe how often, by whom, and how updates will be communicated to users (e.g., mailing list, GitHub)?**

A4: No.

**5. Will older versions of the dataset continue to be supported/hosted/maintained? If so, please describe how. If not, please describe how its obsolescence will be communicated to users.**

A5: N/A.

**6. If others want to extend/augment/build on/contribute to the dataset, is there a mechanism for them to do so? If so, please provide a description. Will these contributions be validated/verified? If so, please describe how. If not, why not? Is there a process for communicating/distributing these contributions to other users? If so, please provide a description.**

A6: N/A.