

GPT vs Human for Scientific Reviews: A Dual Source Review on Applications of ChatGPT in Science

Chenxi Wu¹, Alan John Varghese¹, Vivek Oommen¹, and George Em Karniadakis^{1,2,*}

¹School of Engineering, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912, USA

²Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912, USA

*Corresponding author. Email: george_karniadakis@brown.edu

Abstract

The new polymath Large Language Models (LLMs) can speed-up greatly scientific reviews, possibly using more unbiased quantitative metrics, facilitating cross-disciplinary connections, and identifying emerging trends and research gaps by analyzing large volumes of data. However, at the present time, they lack the required deep understanding of complex methodologies, they have difficulty in evaluating innovative claims, and they are unable to assess ethical issues and conflicts of interest. Herein, we consider 13 GPT-related papers across different scientific domains, reviewed by a human reviewer and SciSpace, a large language model, with the reviews evaluated by three distinct types of evaluators, namely GPT-3.5, a crowd panel, and GPT-4. We found that 50% of SciSpace’s responses to objective questions align with those of a human reviewer, with GPT-4 (informed evaluator) often rating the human reviewer higher in accuracy, and SciSpace higher in structure, clarity, and completeness. In subjective questions, the uninformed evaluators (GPT-3.5 and crowd panel) showed varying preferences between SciSpace and human responses, with the crowd panel showing a preference for the human responses. However, GPT-4 rated them equally in accuracy and structure but favored SciSpace for completeness.

Keywords: Large Language Models; Scientific Reviews; SciSpace

1 Introduction

The journal “Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society” is often credited as the first journal to establish a formal peer review process for scientific papers. While the journal dates back to 1665, a formal peer review process was first introduced in the mid-18th century, when the Royal Society began experimenting with a new form of peer review. Specifically, this early process involved distributing papers submitted to the Society to appropriate members (the reviewers) for their comments and recommendations while the final decision on publication was made by the Society’s council. The peer review process evolved over time and became more systematic, rigorous and anonymous in the 19th and 20th centuries, aligning more closely with today’s peer review process.

Hence, for over a century, rigorous scientific literature reviews have been exclusively conducted by domain-specific human experts, disciplinary scientists who have spent decades on deepening their knowledge on a scientific topic by conducting experiments, deriving theory or performing computational simulations. However, as artificial intelligence (AI) advances, being at the dawn of

artificial general intelligence (AGI) at the present time, we witness the emergence of advanced large language models (LLMs), bringing us to a crossroads in scientific literature review. In the following years, we will be confronted with the decision of whether LLMs will replace the traditional human experts in scientific literature reviews. As we are heading towards an era where LLMs will play a dominant role in the literature review, several key questions emerge at this crossroads. Firstly, what implications does this change hold for the quality and integrity of literature reviews in terms of rigor, fairness, depth, and context? Secondly, is it possible for LLMs to perform at the same level of expertise as domain experts who have dedicated decades to their fields? And finally, if LLMs can take over human roles in literature review, is there still a need for human involvement and oversight in this process? We have recently conducted a study that aims to partially address these questions by providing a dual-source literature review, where both humans and LLMs are simultaneously involved. Our goal is to initiate an in-depth discussion about the evolving role of LLMs in scientific literature reviews, examining how they can complement or potentially transform traditional methods, and offering insights into the future landscape of scholarly research. The papers we reviewed for this comparative analysis focus specifically on applications of ChatGPT within different scientific domains. These fields are characterized by a high volume of research and their dynamic nature, with numerous studies being published weekly. Besides exploring the role of LLMs in scientific literature reviews, this study also provides an overview of current trends and methodologies in the application of ChatGPT in science.

Researchers from various domains have conducted a multitude of studies to examine how large language models (LLMs) can be utilized to aid different tasks [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7], ranging from simple text generation to complex problem-solving. LLMs have also been studied in diverse areas such as speech recognition and synthesis [8, 9], multimedia analysis [10, 11], coding [12], and even in taking exams [13, 14, 15]. The rapid development in the field of AI has led to the creation of multiple advanced LLMs [16]. These include GPT-2, GPT-3, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 from OpenAI [17], PaLM 2 from Google [18], Claude from Anthropic [19], and LLaMA 2 from Meta [20]. Among these LLMs, the GPT series from OpenAI has garnered significant attention due to its impressive capabilities. Over the past year, numerous studies have examined ChatGPT’s capabilities and potential applications, particularly in public health [21, 22, 23, 24], medicine [25, 26, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32], education [33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39], environment [40], and mathematics [41, 15].

Recently, the focus of academic inquiry has started to shift from just utilizing the model’s functionalities to investigating ways in which ChatGPT can be augmented and tailored to solve domain-specific problems in scientific disciplines, where there is a demand not only for speed but also for precision, robustness, accuracy, and reliability. An increasing number of papers goes beyond merely outlining what ChatGPT can do [42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56]. They focus on exploring how the ChatGPT model can be extended or customized to meet specific needs, especially in scientific disciplines. Exploring how LLMs, like ChatGPT, can improve scientific research is crucial, with the potential to greatly enhance efficiency, productivity, and innovation. LLMs can process vast datasets quickly, offering insights and aiding hypothesis generation [57, 58], which is especially valuable in interdisciplinary fields [59]. Additionally, domain-specific LLMs can lower barriers to entry, make complex information more accessible to non-experts, and encourage diverse participation from various backgrounds [45, 49, 50, 53]. This not only enriches the scientific discourse but also drives inclusive innovation, paving the way for a more collaborative and versatile research environment.

For example, in the field of medicine, the expansion of ChatGPT’s capabilities has proven to be particularly impactful [1]. Applications range from predicting drug interactions and synergies [46, 55], developing comprehensive medication plans [47], categorizing and interpreting intricate medical reports, suggesting novel drugs [44, 45], and summarizing health narratives to gain insights into

conditions like Alzheimer’s disease [42]. By integrating domain-specific databases and sophisticated algorithms, researchers have tailored ChatGPT to provide more accurate and relevant responses to queries related to gene sequences, protein structures, and associated biological functions [48].

Similarly, in the realms of machine learning [43], engineering [54, 53, 56], and geography [49, 50], scientists have been working on modifying ChatGPT to assist scientists and engineers in working more efficiently and productively. Specifically, in the domain of machine learning, ChatGPT is designed to conduct data preprocessing, fine-tuning hyperparameters, and aiding in model selections [43]. Within the field of engineering, ChatGPT has been customized for specific tasks such as answering questions about surface engineering [54] and generating code for robotics design [53]. Additionally, it has been utilized to perform comprehensive tasks in the field of geography [49, 50].

In the present study, we present a partial overview of innovative frameworks and extensions applied to ChatGPT in scientific domains, presented in a question-answer format for clear and accessible communication. The responses are compiled from both SciSpace, a large language model (LLM), and one human reviewer, aiming to present a partial overview of ChatGPT’s developments in science. Additionally, this dual-source approach enables us to initiate a critical discussion on the performance of LLMs versus human reviewers in literature reviews, contributing valuable insights to the ongoing discourse on AI integration in academic research.

Scispace initially emerged as a typesetting tool designed to automate formatting for journal submissions. Over time, it evolved to proficiently leverage LLMs, aiming to enhance the accessibility of scientific information by reducing the comprehension barrier [60]. While SciSpace has made significant advances in understanding and answering questions on scientific papers, it might lack the depth of understanding, critical thinking, logical analysis, and constructive expertise that human reviewers can provide. The combination of subjective judgment, expert knowledge, and logical reasoning might enable human reviewers to outperform SciSpace. Despite this, SciSpace holds considerable value as a supportive tool, offering preliminary assessments that can streamline the review process and bolster efficiency.

This work has multi-fold motivations and goals:

1. To provide a comparative review from two perspectives (Scispace and the human reviewer) on the applications of ChatGPT in scientific fields.
2. To present a representative sample of prevalent frameworks developed and implemented for various versions of ChatGPT across diverse scientific disciplines, such as medicine, machine learning, engineering, and geography.
3. To demonstrate the effectiveness of SciSpace and the human reviewer in analyzing recent literature related to the applications of ChatGPT in scientific domains.
4. To provide insights and statistical analyses that reflect the performance of SciSpace and the human reviewer, as evaluated from three different perspectives (GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and a crowd panel).
5. To explore and articulate the potential limitations of LLMs-based models in performing and evaluating literature review.

2 Methodology

The use of ChatGPT in science and engineering is a prominent and ongoing subject of intense research, leading to frequent publication of numerous scholarly papers on a daily basis. Capturing

the current and innovative concepts becomes a critical component of research in the study of LLMs. Scispace, specifically developed for conducting literature reviews, can analyze papers at a significantly faster rate than humans. We aim to assess the performance of Scispace compared to humans in examining recent papers focused on the applications of ChatGPT in science. For our analysis, we have selected 13 papers and formulated five to six targeted questions for each. All questions and answers are included in the Appendix A for reference. The primary aim of these questions is to summarize the fundamental objectives, methodologies, and findings of each paper. It is important to note that these questions are not intended to appraise the novelty or quality of the papers. Instead, they are designed to provide the audience with a basic understanding of each paper’s content without a comprehensive read-through.

The designed questions are responded to by both Scispace and one human reviewer. The responses are subject to assessment by three distinct types of evaluators, namely GPT-3.5, a crowd panel, and GPT-4. These evaluators are categorized into two groups: uninformed evaluators (GPT-3.5 and the crowd panel) and informed evaluator (GPT-4). The uninformed evaluators provide their assessments without having access to the paper, whereas the informed evaluator conducts evaluations having reviewed the paper. In Figure 1, a graphical representation of our methodology is depicted. Detailed information regarding the evaluators and their respective methodologies can be found in Section 2.3.

2.1 SciSpace

SciSpace is a GPT-3 based AI-tool that aims to accelerate scientific discovery by assisting researchers to analyze and understand scientific literature faster. SciSpace offers the ability to read, summarize and provide in-depth explanations of scientific papers. Moreover, it enables users to interact with research papers through a chatbot. Users can upload research papers to SciSpace or access a repository with over 200 million papers from diverse disciplines [60]. SciSpace is equipped with the following utilities.

- **Copilot:** SciSpace has a utility called ‘Copilot - Read with AI’ that reads and comprehends research articles and answers related queries in an interactive manner. Copilot supports follow-up questions and replies to both general and specific questions from within the article and highlights the corresponding location in the manuscript. SciSpace also provides a chrome extension of copilot and extends the utilities to anywhere on the web for a better user experience.
- **AI assisted literature survey:** SciSpace offers a literature review tool that can summarize and help gain insights into a given research topic from a collection of research papers uploaded by the user or from a repository of more than 200 million papers already available within SciSpace. Users also have the flexibility to customize the criteria that SciSpace uses to compare and contrast research articles.
- **Citation generator:** SciSpace has a citation generator that allows users to create citations in their preferred style from a selection of over 2500 citation styles.
- **Paraphraser:** SciSpace offers a paraphrasing tool that helps to change the structure of the sentence without changing its meaning. The paraphrasing tool can rephrase the provided sentences up to 500 words into a more academic tone.
- **AI Detector:** SciSpace has an AI detector that quantifies the presence of AI in query sentences.




Figure 1: The methodology adopted in this study consists of two steps. First, a human reviewer and Scispace separately read the articles and answered a predefined questionnaire. In the second step, we evaluate the recorded responses. Specifically, we have three evaluators, 1) GPT 3.5, 2) crowd with 25 individuals, and 3) GPT 4.0. The crowd and GPT 3.5 directly evaluate the responses without reading the articles, while GPT 4.0 reads the articles before grading the responses.

In this study, we utilize the copilot tool provided by SciSpace for understanding the research article. We consider research articles that investigate the influence of ChatGPT in four scientific disciplines - Medicine and Health, Machine Learning, Engineering, and Geography, as mentioned earlier. We prepare a questionnaire for each article, and use these questions for prompting the SciSpace copilot, and record the response. Next, we compare and critically analyze the copilot's response with a human's response.

2.2 Human reviewer

To ensure an unbiased and fair comparison of the competencies between the human reviewer and SciSpace, the human reviewer conducts the review of scientific papers independently, without referring to the answers provided by SciSpace or any other external tools. We ensured that the conclusions and assessments of the human reviewer are derived exclusively from the reviewer’s own expertise, knowledge, and critical analytical skills, devoid of any influence from SciSpace’s responses.

The primary objective of this study is to demonstrate the performance of Scispace in comparison to that of a human reviewer, specifically within the realm of literature focusing on the recent advancements in ChatGPT. This investigation is intentionally designed to be case-specific, concentrating on a niche area of research rather than covering a wide range of topics. This targeted approach allows for a more detailed and focused examination of Scispace’s capabilities in handling specialized content, thereby providing valuable insights into its efficacy in facilitating scientific research around ChatGPT.

As a result of this specialized focus, the study does not incorporate a wide range of human reviewers from various academic or professional backgrounds. For the sake of consistency, the same human reviewer is utilized throughout the study. The human reviewer involved in this study possesses a moderate level of expertise in machine learning, deep learning, and large language models, ensuring that the reviewer has the requisite understanding necessary to critically evaluate and interpret the specialized literature in this field. Our intention is to maintain a consistent level of expertise and understanding of the content across all papers. This approach seeks to balance the depth of knowledge with a representative level of expertise that reflects a significant portion of the academic community engaged in this area of research.

2.3 Evaluations

To assess the responses provided by Scispace and the human reviewer, we utilize GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and a panel of crowd evaluators to systematically rate the answers from both Scispace and the human reviewer.

2.3.1 Uninformed evaluators

The uninformed evaluators, GPT-3.5 and the crowd panel, conduct their assessments solely based on the responses, without access to the papers. Thus, their evaluations rely exclusively on the information presented in the responses from Scispace and the human reviewer. This scenario mirrors the real-world situation with many readers, especially those who seek quick insights or with limited time. They rely heavily on summaries, abstracts, or expert opinions to grasp the paper’s content. In this context, they effectively act as uninformed evaluators. An ideal set of responses to the designed questions should equip the uninformed readers with a basic understanding of the paper’s content, objectives, methodology, and results, thereby eliminating the need for them to read the full paper. The feedback from these uninformed evaluators provides critical insights into how effectively the responses from Scispace and the human reviewer can convey the essence of the research paper to someone who has not read it.

However, uninformed evaluators face inherent challenges in assessing the accuracy of answers due to their lack of access to the original source material. This limitation is particularly significant in the case of objective questions, which are based entirely on factual information from the paper. Without direct access to these details, uninformed evaluators are unable to verify the factual correctness of the responses. When the questions are not merely interpretive or subjective, but

require specific information directly from the paper, ratings from uninformed evaluators become less effective. Therefore, in this study, we have oriented uninformed evaluators towards evaluating more subjective and interpretive questions.

Here is a prompt provided to both GPT-3.5 and the crowd panel for evaluation:

As an instructor, you assigned two students a literature review and posed several questions to assess their understanding. Your aim is to determine which student's responses are more informative. Without reading the paper yourself, assess which student provides a clearer and better explanation of the paper. Please assign a score from 1 to 10 to each student's responses.

This prompt sets up a scenario where evaluators act as instructors and judge the quality of literature reviews based on the students' responses to specific questions. They are instructed not to read the papers themselves, focusing instead on assessing clarity and informativeness of each response, with a scoring system from 1 to 10 for comparison.

- **GPT-3.5:** GPT-3.5, as developed by OpenAI, is designed with a wide range of capabilities, but it does not possess the ability to directly access or read external documents, such as academic papers. This limitation inherently positions GPT-3.5 as an uninformed evaluator. In this study, the prompt and the responses from both Scispace and the human reviewer are inputted into GPT-3.5 anonymously, labeled simply as 'Student 1' and 'Student 2'. To further mitigate any potential biases, the labels 'Student 1' and 'Student 2' are alternated between Scispace and the human reviewer in different instances. Such a methodological design ensures that GPT-3.5's assessments are based solely on the content and quality of the responses, independent of any preconceived notions about the source of the response.
- **Crowd panel:** The crowd panel for this study consists of 25 researchers affiliated with Brown University with diverse academic and professional backgrounds, including biomedical engineering, ocean engineering, chemical engineering, fluid mechanics, and mathematics. This diversity across disciplines allows the panel to provide a wide range of viewpoints in their evaluations. All members of the panel possess experience in machine learning and deep learning research, which is crucial for evaluating literature on ChatGPT and similar models. Their collective expertise enables them to critically analyze and provide insightful ratings on the effectiveness of the responses in conveying complex technical information. Physical copies of the questionnaires are provided to the crowd panel. In these questionnaires, the responses from Scispace and the human reviewer are anonymously labeled as 'Student 1' and 'Student 2'. To remove potential biases, the labels 'Student 1' and 'Student 2' are alternated in each questionnaire. Along with the questionnaires, the crowd panel is given the aforementioned prompt to guide their evaluation process. Each paper in the study has been assessed by four distinct individuals from the crowd panel. The average scores from these four separate assessments are calculated.

2.3.2 Informed evaluators

In this study, the role of the informed evaluator is fulfilled by GPT-4, which is equipped with a plugin feature that enables it to read and analyze academic papers. This functionality allows GPT-4 to access and process the papers' content, enhancing its ability to provide insightful evaluations of responses compared to GPT-3.5. GPT-4 can evaluate responses to questions and directly compare them against the actual content of the papers, thereby offering a more informed and accurate assessment.

While innovative, the functionality of GPT-4, equipped with a plugin to read and analyze academic papers, does come with certain limitations. Its understanding relies on data patterns, differing from human-like comprehension. For instance, although GPT-4 can process and analyze text, its understanding is based on patterns in data rather than human-like comprehension. Moreover, GPT-4’s interpretations are influenced by the data it has been trained on, which can introduce biases or a lack of understanding of context. The detailed discussion about its limitations can be found in section 5. Despite the limitations, GPT-4 can efficiently provide a high-level overview of the content, highlight key points in a paper, and verify the responses from both Scispace and the human reviewer for objective questions. Thus, GPT-4’s contribution to analyzing responses in academic papers can still be both substantial and meaningful.

In this study, we instruct GPT-4 to evaluate the responses from Scispace and the human reviewer based on three criteria: accuracy, structure & clarity, and completeness. Similarly, Scispace and the human reviewer are anonymously labeled as ‘Student 1’ and ‘Student 2’, with these labels being alternated for different cases. The following prompt is provided to GPT-4 for this purpose:

As a teacher, you are to evaluate the responses of two students to a paper. Please begin by reading the paper provided. Then, rate each student’s answers according to the following criteria on a scale from 1 to 10:

- *Accuracy: The correctness of the answers in relation to the paper.*
- *Structure and Clarity: The logical organization, conciseness, and ease of understanding of the answers.*
- *Completeness: The extent to which the answer fully addresses the question posed.*

Your evaluation should reflect the students’ level of comprehension and their ability to effectively communicate their understanding.

This prompt directs GPT-4 to provide three separate scores based on the factual accuracy of the responses, their structure and clarity, as well as the completion with which they address the posed questions. The objective is to ensure that the evaluation captures both the depth of content and the effectiveness of communication.

3 Applications of ChatGPT in scientific fields

During the preparation of this paper, Microsoft released a study titled ‘Impact of Large Language Models on Scientific Discovery: a Preliminary Study using GPT-4’ [16]. Their research primarily explored the inherent abilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) in addressing scientific challenges. They explicitly stated that the integration of LLMs with other tools or models was beyond the scope of their study.

In our research, we strive to provide a summary of various external tools and methods utilized for enhancing the performance of GPT models in scientific disciplines. Our study is not restricted to a specific version of GPT; it includes examples utilizing GPT-2, GPT-3, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 across different fields such as medicine, machine learning, engineering, and geography. We summarize strategies that scientists employ to merge the capabilities of GPT models with their specific domains, aiming to enhance outcomes. The majority of the papers we reviewed adopted a combination of these methods.

- **Iterative Questioning and Incorporating Evaluators’ Feedback:** The effectiveness of GPT models can be enhanced through iterative questioning. When initial responses from the model are inadequate or incorrect, evaluators refine their prompts, highlight mistakes, or supply additional information. This process can guide the model towards providing more accurate and relevant answers. The ChatDrug [44] integrated an evaluator module to validate responses and facilitate iterative questioning. In [53], non-technical users can stay in the loop to evaluate ChatGPT’s code output, either through direct inspection or by using a simulator. The non-technical users can provide feedback and help GPT models improve their coding for robotics in an iterative manner.
- **Chain-Of-Thought:** The success of Chain-of-Thought reasoning when combined with Large Language Models’ (LLMs) use of external tools demonstrates a significant advancement in AI capabilities [61, 62]. The Chain-of-Thought model adheres to a structured format known as Thought, Action, Action Input, and Observation. The GPT model acts as organizer of information; it reasons and assesses the current status of a task, evaluates its relevance to the final objective, and plans subsequent steps to solve the task. In this study, we include six papers that applied the iterative Chain-of-Thought to enhance the performance in chemistry [45], biology [48], health [42, 47], and geography [49, 50]. This iterative Chain-of-Thought process, as illustrated in studies such as [45, 49, 50, 42, 48], is typically combined with domain-specific tools to boost performance. During the ‘Thought’ phase, the GPT model reasons and then requests a domain-specific tool, indicated by the keyword “Action,” along with the necessary input for this tool, marked by “Action Input.” Following this, during the text generation pauses, an external tool executes the requested function using the given input. The outcome is returned back to the GPT models with the keyword “Observation,” prompting the models to return to the ‘Thought’ phase. This cycle repeats iteratively until the final goal is achieved.
- **Integration with Domain-Specific Tools:** It is Often advantageous to blend GPT models’s capabilities with tools and models specifically designed for scientific discovery. This synergy allows researchers to capitalize on the strengths of both GPT models and specialized tools for more reliable and precise outcomes. For scientists, considering the integration of existing domain-specific tools with GPT models can be highly beneficial. In our study, we summarize examples of how this can be effectively achieved [45, 49, 50, 42].
- **External Database:** GPT models have a vast knowledge base, but they might not always be up-to-date or comprehensive in a specific domain. External databases can provide up-to-date and specific data, which significantly improve the accuracy of the model’s outputs, especially in rapidly evolving fields like medicine or technology. This can be done by connecting the GPT model with external databases through APIs (Application Programming Interfaces) [42]. Another method is to develop a hybrid system where the GPT model can query the external database as part of its processing [55, 46, 47, 52, 54, 43].
- **Existing Platforms:** Several platforms are currently available, which facilitate the development of custom GPT models for a diverse range of users, including AutoGPT, HuggingGPT [63], LlamaIndex and AutoGen [64]. AD-AutoGPT is a customized AutoGPT that aims to analyze complex health narratives of Alzheimer’s Disease [42]. GPT for Surface Engineering [54] utilizes LlamaIndex to index data in the field of surface engineering and also assess whether or not the sourced information given by the sourced model can adequately answer the query.

- **Few-shot In-context Learning:** Few-shot in-context learning involves providing a small number of examples within the prompt to GPT models. These examples can add context to the task at hand, helping to enhance the model’s performance by guiding it toward the desired type of response or solution. This method leverages the model’s pre-trained knowledge and ability to infer patterns from limited data. In this study, a few paper [55, 46, 47] demonstrate the effectiveness of few-shot in-context learning in GPT models.

4 Discussion

4.1 Statistics

Ensuring the accuracy of the responses generated by Scispace is crucial, as it significantly impacts the tool’s reliability and effectiveness, especially in academic and research contexts. To facilitate the evaluation of Scispace’s responses, we have divided the questions into two categories: objective and subjective. In the Appendix A, we have set the background for objective questions in blue and for subjective questions in grey.

Objective questions are straightforward with definitive, factual answers that can be directly retrieved from the paper. In this study, 24 questions are classified as objective questions. We find that 50% of SciSpace’s responses to objective questions agree with the human reviewer’s answers. Shown in Figure 2 a), the informed evaluator GPT-4 also gives a higher score in accuracy for the human reviewer’s answers. GPT-4 also gives a higher score for SciSpace’s response for structure & clarity and completeness.

While all the questions in our study are crafted to summarize the papers and are grounded in factual information, subjective questions are those that allow for a greater degree of personal interpretation. These interpretations play a crucial role in aiding uninformed readers to better understand the papers. To effectively compare the performance of Scispace against that of the human reviewer, we plot the ratings on these subjective questions in Figure 2 b). In the case of uninformed evaluators, GPT 3.5 assigns higher scores to responses by SciSpace, whereas the crowd panel equally favors the responses by SciSpace and humans. The informed evaluator (GPT-4) equally prefers the responses by SciSpace and human in terms of accuracy and structure & clarity. However, there is a clear preference for SciSpace responses in terms of completeness because GPT-4 often interprets a lengthier answer to be more complete.

4.2 Advantages of SciSpace

Utilizing SciSpace as a tool for reviewing academic papers proves to be a significant time-saving strategy, as it can swiftly and efficiently respond to a wide array of questions. SciSpace excels at answering broad and overarching questions, such as delineating the paper’s main objectives and providing general summaries. As documented in the Appendix, SciSpace’s answers regarding the paper’s objectives are highly accurate, though they sometimes lack conciseness.

As our study demonstrates, SciSpace’s major advantage lies in its speed. Its ability to rapidly sift through extensive volumes of text and pinpoint relevant information enables reviewers to expedite their work, affording them more time and attention for the deeper, more nuanced aspects of the paper that may necessitate human expertise and critical analysis. Thus, SciSpace enhances the efficiency of the review process, ensuring a swift establishment of a foundational understanding of the paper’s content. Indeed, SciSpace can serve as a valuable supplementary tool in the paper review process, significantly reducing the time and effort required for completion.




Figure 2: Comparative evaluation of responses by SciSpace and human for a) objective and b) subjective questions. The box plots indicating the scores assigned by the different evaluators for the responses by SciSpace is shown in blue, and that for the responses by human is shown in red. We see that on objective questions an informed evaluator prefers the human response over the response by SciSpace. In the case of subjective questions, the different evaluators prefer the responses by SciSpace slightly more than, if not equally as, the human response.

4.3 Clarity and Length

Out of a total of 66 questions, the human reviewer provided longer responses in 7 instances. This implies that in approximately 90% of the cases, or 59 out of the 66 questions, Scispace provided longer responses than the human reviewer. While LLMs-based evaluators generally perceive SciSpace’s responses as more informative, the crowd panel critiques these responses for being redundant and lacking a coherent structural organization. SciSpace’s responses are typically presented in bullet points. In an effective list, bullet points are usually either parallel or progressive in nature. Parallel structure means each point focuses on explaining a different aspect of a matter, creating a consistent and easy-to-follow flow. Progressive structure, on the other hand, implies that each point

builds upon the previous one, leading the reader through a logical progression of ideas. However, in SciSpace’s responses, the bullet points often lack interconnection. They tend not to follow a parallel or progressive format, impacting the overall coherence of the response.




Figure 3: Comparison of Clarity and Length in Responses from SciSpace and Humans.

Figure 3 is an example, when we ask SciSpace what the objective of PharmacyGPT is, the bullet points given by SciSpace are not effective for several reasons:

- **Repetitiveness and Overlapping Themes:** There is considerable overlap in the content of each bullet point. For example, all points repeatedly emphasize the use of LLMs in pharmacy practices, but they do not distinctly advance the topic or provide new information in each point. As highlighted in red and blue, the themes in each bullet point overlap significantly. The first and fourth points both discuss improving patient outcomes with LLMs, while the second and third points reiterate the goal of revolutionizing pharmacy practices.
- **Verbosity:** The bullet points are wordy and include more information than necessary to convey the core idea. Phrases such as “to contribute to the ongoing discourse surrounding the integration of artificial intelligence in healthcare settings” could be more concise. The verbosity in SciSpace’s responses makes the answers harder to read than the paper’s abstract, counteracting SciSpace’s goal of simplifying information comprehension.
- **Lack of Clear Logical Flow:** Each bullet point seems to restate the project’s goals with slight variations, instead of introducing new aspects or details in a structured manner. This results in a lack of logical flow from one point to the next, hindering the reader’s ability to comprehend distinct aspects or the full scope of the paper.

On the other hand, the human response is notably more succinct and straightforward. This brevity and directness can make it easier for readers to quickly grasp the primary intentions of paper. Despite being less detailed, the human response effectively conveys the essential information and usually demonstrates a clear and logical presentation of the main ideas.

4.4 Structural Comprehension

Academic papers frequently employ the use of subtitles to clearly define and separate different sections. This structural element is crucial for readers to follow the argument, comprehend the methodology, and grasp the results presented. When a paper offers an analysis of a specific model from three distinct perspectives, a human reader can efficiently utilize the subtitles to navigate the sections and develop a comprehensive understanding of the content within each part. However, SciSpace, in its current form, faces challenges in accurately capturing and reflecting this cohesive structure in its responses.

For instance, in the experimental sections of the paper on ChatDrug [44], the authors verify the effectiveness of ChatDrug for drug editing on three types of drugs: small molecules, peptides, and proteins. The discussion of each drug type is allocated to separate sections — section 4.1 for small molecules, section 4.2 for peptides, and section 4.3 for proteins — allowing a reader to follow and comprehend each category in a structured and segmented manner.




Figure 4: Comparison of Structural Comprehension in Responses from SciSpace and Humans.

As shown in Figure 4, the response from the human reviewer successfully captures the structure of the paper as organized by its subtitles. SciSpace, on the other hand, tends to struggle with this task. SciSpace’s response provides a general summary of ChatDrug’s performance. However, it does this without following the structural divisions indicated by the paper’s subtitles. The result is a comprehensive but vague overview. It merges the distinct analyses for different drugs into a single narrative. The answer from SciSpace overlooks the subtitles of the paper uses, leading to a summary that lacks the detailed segmentation presented in the original paper.

SciSpace’s responses might not clearly distinguish the unique contributions of each paper section, leading to a lack of depth and clarity. Improving its ability to use the structure indicated by subtitles would help produce more comprehensive and coherent summaries, offering users a better understanding of the paper’s content.

4.5 Interpreting Graphical Information

SciSpace’s performance is hindered by its lack of capability to interpret graphical data, leading to significant oversights in its responses. Graphs, charts, and other visual representations in scientific papers are critical, as they often convey key examples and insights essential for understanding the paper. Neglecting this information means that users miss out on these essential parts of the paper,

especially when trying to grasp complex topics or nuanced details.

In several papers analyzed in this study, model architectures are depicted through figures. While these figures are typically accompanied by explanatory subtitles, not including the visual content itself results in the loss of important details. This issue is particularly evident in responses to questions about how models function in papers like AutoML-APT [43], ChatDrug [44], and GPT for surface engineering [54]. When asked about the workflow of these models, the human reviewer provides answers that effectively translate the visual information from workflow diagrams into textual descriptions. Conversely, SciSpace’s responses do not effectively convey the information presented in these graphical formats. It becomes clear that SciSpace’s textual summaries alone are insufficient for capturing the intricate details and nuances often communicated through these visual representations, highlighting a significant gap in its ability to fully interpret and relay information from such crucial graphical data.

4.6 Completeness and Relevance

SciSpace struggles to interpret complex model structures and theoretical frameworks, often providing overly broad or imprecise responses that don’t fully address the question. Additionally, SciSpace sometimes avoids directly answering a question, which notably impacts the completeness and relevance of its responses. For example, when asked to explain a model’s structure with an example, it typically focuses on the model’s objectives instead.




Figure 5: Comparison of Completeness and Relevance in Responses from SciSpace and Humans.

In response to the question “How does GeoGPT work? Give an example,” SciSpace’s answer illustrates its struggle to provide precise and direct responses to complex questions (Figure 5). While it offers a general overview of GeoGPT as an LLM-based framework that automates geospatial tasks, the response predominantly outlines the model’s objectives. It touches upon the integration of large language models with GIS tools and the Langchain framework’s role but does not delve

deeply into specific model structures or processes. Furthermore, the provided example of how GeoGPT executes a spatial query, although somewhat relevant, still remains on a surface level. It mentions the use of various GIS tools like Buffer, Intersect, and Clip, but this description lacks the depth or detailed insight into the GeoGPT’s intricate structure or the underlying theoretical framework. On the other hand, the human response delves deeper into the operational aspects of GeoGPT. It explains how the LLM interprets user demands through a chain-of-thought process to select appropriate tools from the GIS Tool Pool. The human answer also provides a more concrete and step-by-step example of how GeoGPT assists users in locating hotels near supermarkets and subway stations. This response breaks down the task into distinct steps, clearly illustrating how LLMs choose suitable geospatial tools for each phase.

4.7 Perturbation Test

In our study, we also implemented a perturbation test (Figure 6). Considering that most papers in our dataset focus on enhancing or adapting one version of GPT for specific domains, our initial question was designed to identify which version of GPT each model was based on. However, for PharmacyGPT [52], which uniquely utilizes both GPT-3 and GPT-4 at different stages, this question required refinement. Initially, SciSpace identified PharmacyGPT as solely based on GPT-4. Recognizing a potential bias in our question phrasing, which might imply the use of only one GPT version, we modified the question from “Which version of GPT is PharmacyGPT based on?” to “Which versions of GPT are PharmacyGPT based on?”. After this adjustment, SciSpace’s response changed to “PharmacyGPT is based on ChatGPT and GPT-4,” which, while still incorrect, showed an adaptive response to the revised question. This indicates that SciSpace’s ability to interpret and respond to questions can be influenced by the specific phrasing used. This test revealed two key findings: first, SciSpace’s responses can be sensitive to the phrasing of questions, indicating a responsiveness to linguistic nuances; second, despite this adaptability, SciSpace still showed limitations in accurately processing and conveying detailed, multifaceted information.




Figure 6: Perturbation Test on SciSpace’s Responses.

5 Limitations

GPT-4 as an informed evaluator comes with certain limitations:

- **Depth of Technical Analysis:** While GPT-4 with a plugin can process and analyze text, its understanding is based on patterns in data rather than human-like comprehension. Although GPT-4 can provide a general analysis of academic papers, it may not match the depth and detail that a subject matter expert in specialized fields can offer.
- **Data Currency:** GPT-4’s knowledge is limited to the data on which it was trained, which may not include the most recent publications or the latest research developments. However, in this study, all the papers are published after 2023, potentially containing timely information. Papers introducing novel concepts that aren’t well-represented in the training data may pose challenges for GPT-4’s analysis.
- **Subjectivity and Bias:** GPT-4’s interpretations are influenced by the data it has been trained on, which can introduce biases or a lack of understanding of cultural or contextual subtleties.

6 Summary

We explored the utilization of large language models (LLMs), particularly the GPT series (GPT-2, GPT-3, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4) from OpenAI. We discussed how integrating iterative questioning, chain-of-thought workflows, domain-specific databases, external tools, and few-shot in-context learning with ChatGPT has led to more accurate and relevant responses in scientific areas. Additionally, we introduced several platforms currently facilitating the development of customized GPT models for scientific research.

Our study summarized academic papers aiming to enhance and tailor GPT models for specific scientific disciplines, including medicine, machine learning, engineering, and geography. These papers are presented in a question-answer format for clear and accessible communication, with responses compiled from SciSpace, a large language model, and a human reviewer. This dual-source approach allowed for a critical discussion on the performance of LLMs versus human reviewers in literature reviews, offering insights into the integration of AI in academic research. We found that 50% of SciSpace’s responses to objective questions align with those of a human reviewer, with GPT-4 often rating the human reviewer higher in accuracy and SciSpace higher in structure, clarity, and completeness. In subjective questions, uninformed evaluators and the crowd panel showed varying preferences between SciSpace and human responses, with the crowd panel showing a preference for the human responses. Meanwhile, GPT-4 rated them equally in accuracy and structure but favored SciSpace for completeness.

Our study noted that SciSpace’s responses are often repetitive, verbose, and lack a coherent structure, with a tendency to miss the essence of the articles and evade challenging questions by reiterating the paper’s objectives. Additionally, while SciSpace’s answers can adjust to the question’s wording, a notable limitation is its inability to interpret graphical data. Additionally, SciSpace’s answers demonstrate adaptability to the specific wording of questions. However, a notable limitation of SciSpace is its inability to interpret graphical data, which restricts its effectiveness in contexts where visual information plays a crucial role. Our research provides both qualitative and quantitative analysis of the comprehension levels of SciSpace, an LLM-based system, and a human reviewer regarding contemporary scientific articles, incorporating assessments from evaluators with varying levels of information.

7 Acknowledgments

We sincerely thank the 25 members of the Crunch Group at Brown University for their vital role as the crowd panel in our study. Their contributions and insights have greatly enhanced our research, and we deeply appreciate their dedication and support. This work was supported by the ONR Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship (N00014-22-1-2795)

References

- [1] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine*, 29(8):1930–1940, 2023.
- [2] Yiheng Liu, Tianle Han, Siyuan Ma, Jiayue Zhang, Yuanyuan Yang, Jiaming Tian, Hao He, Antong Li, Mengshen He, Zhengliang Liu, et al. Summary of chatgpt-related research and perspective towards the future of large language models. *Meta-Radiology*, page 100017, 2023.
- [3] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhajan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564*, 2023.
- [4] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Yue Liu, Zhou Yang, Kailong Wang, Li Li, Xiapu Luo, David Lo, John Grundy, and Haoyu Wang. Large language models for software engineering: A systematic literature review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10620*, 2023.
- [5] Zeming Lin, Halil Akin, Roshan Rao, Brian Hie, Zhongkai Zhu, Wenting Lu, Nikita Smetanin, Robert Verkuil, Ori Kabeli, Yaniv Shmueli, et al. Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science*, 379(6637):1123–1130, 2023.
- [6] Joshua Meier, Roshan Rao, Robert Verkuil, Jason Liu, Tom Sercu, and Alex Rives. Language models enable zero-shot prediction of the effects of mutations on protein function. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:29287–29303, 2021.
- [7] Humza Naveed, Asad Ullah Khan, Shi Qiu, Muhammad Saqib, Saeed Anwar, Muhammad Usman, Nick Barnes, and Ajmal Mian. A comprehensive overview of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06435*, 2023.
- [8] Jaeho Jeon, Seongyong Lee, and Seongyune Choi. A systematic review of research on speech-recognition chatbots for language learning: Implications for future directions in the era of large language models. *Interactive Learning Environments*, pages 1–19, 2023.
- [9] Dong Zhang, Shimin Li, Xin Zhang, Jun Zhan, Pengyu Wang, Yaqian Zhou, and Xipeng Qiu. Speechgpt: Empowering large language models with intrinsic cross-modal conversational abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11000*, 2023.
- [10] KunChang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355*, 2023.
- [11] Chenfei Wu, Shengming Yin, Weizhen Qi, Xiaodong Wang, Zecheng Tang, and Nan Duan. Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671*, 2023.

- [12] Russell A Poldrack, Thomas Lu, and Gašper Beguš. Ai-assisted coding: Experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13187*, 2023.
- [13] Daniel Martin Katz, Michael James Bommarito, Shang Gao, and Pablo Arredondo. Gpt-4 passes the bar exam. *Available at SSRN 4389233*, 2023.
- [14] Vinay Pursnani, Yusuf Sermet, Musa Kurt, and Ibrahim Demir. Performance of chatgpt on the us fundamentals of engineering exam: Comprehensive assessment of proficiency and potential implications for professional environmental engineering practice. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, page 100183, 2023.
- [15] Yiran Wu, Feiran Jia, Shaokun Zhang, Qingyun Wu, Hangyu Li, Erkang Zhu, Yue Wang, Yin Tat Lee, Richard Peng, and Chi Wang. An empirical study on challenging math problem solving with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01337*, 2023.
- [16] Microsoft Research AI4Science and Microsoft Azure Quantum. The impact of large language models on scientific discovery: a preliminary study using gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07361*, 2023.
- [17] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- [18] Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*, 2023.
- [19] Claude 2. <https://www.anthropic.com/index/claude-2>, 2023.
- [20] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [21] Som S Biswas. Role of chat gpt in public health. *Annals of biomedical engineering*, 51(5):868–869, 2023.
- [22] Malik Sallam. The utility of chatgpt as an example of large language models in healthcare education, research and practice: Systematic review on the future perspectives and potential limitations. *medRxiv*, pages 2023–02, 2023.
- [23] Ridwan Islam Sifat. Chatgpt and the future of health policy analysis: potential and pitfalls of using chatgpt in policymaking. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, pages 1–3, 2023.
- [24] Yuqing Wang, Yun Zhao, and Linda Petzold. Are large language models ready for healthcare? a comparative study on clinical language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05368*, 2023.
- [25] Asser Abou Elkassem and Andrew D Smith. Potential use cases for chatgpt in radiology reporting. *American Journal of Roentgenology*, 2023.
- [26] Ahmed Ismail, Nima S Ghorashi, and Ramin Javan. New horizons: the potential role of openai’s chatgpt in clinical radiology. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, 2023.
- [27] Peter Lee, Sebastien Bubeck, and Joseph Petro. Benefits, limits, and risks of gpt-4 as an ai chatbot for medicine. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 388(13):1233–1239, 2023.

- [28] Harsha Nori, Nicholas King, Scott Mayer McKinney, Dean Carignan, and Eric Horvitz. Capabilities of gpt-4 on medical challenge problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13375*, 2023.
- [29] Ethan Waisberg, Joshua Ong, Mouayad Masalkhi, Sharif Amit Kamran, Nasif Zaman, Prithul Sarker, Andrew G Lee, and Alireza Tavakkoli. Gpt-4: a new era of artificial intelligence in medicine. *Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971-)*, pages 1–4, 2023.
- [30] Shahab Saquib Sohail. A promising start and not a panacea: Chatgpt’s early impact and potential in medical science and biomedical engineering research. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, pages 1–5, 2023.
- [31] Zhengliang Liu, Aoxiao Zhong, Yiwei Li, Longtao Yang, Chao Ju, Zihao Wu, Chong Ma, Peng Shu, Cheng Chen, Sekeun Kim, et al. Radiology-gpt: A large language model for radiology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08666*, 2023.
- [32] Youwei Liang, Ruiyi Zhang, Li Zhang, and Pengtao Xie. Drugchat: towards enabling chatgpt-like capabilities on drug molecule graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03907*, 2023.
- [33] Hyunsu Lee. The rise of chatgpt: Exploring its potential in medical education. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 2023.
- [34] Tufan Adiguzel, Mehmet Haldun Kaya, and Fatih Kürşat Cansu. Revolutionizing education with ai: Exploring the transformative potential of chatgpt. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15(3):ep429, 2023.
- [35] David Baidoo-Anu and Leticia Owusu Ansah. Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (ai): Understanding the potential benefits of chatgpt in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*, 7(1):52–62, 2023.
- [36] Simone Grassini. Shaping the future of education: exploring the potential and consequences of ai and chatgpt in educational settings. *Education Sciences*, 13(7):692, 2023.
- [37] Md Mostafizer Rahman and Yutaka Watanobe. Chatgpt for education and research: Opportunities, threats, and strategies. *Applied Sciences*, 13(9):5783, 2023.
- [38] Shunsuke Koga. The potential of chatgpt in medical education: Focusing on usmle preparation. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, pages 1–2, 2023.
- [39] Henner Gimpel, Kristina Hall, Stefan Decker, Torsten Eymann, Luis Lämmermann, Alexander Mädche, Maximilian Röglinger, Caroline Ruiner, Manfred Schoch, Mareike Schoop, et al. Unlocking the power of generative ai models and systems such as gpt-4 and chatgpt for higher education: A guide for students and lecturers. Technical report, Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences, 2023.
- [40] Som S Biswas. Potential use of chat gpt in global warming. *Annals of biomedical engineering*, 51(6):1126–1127, 2023.
- [41] Giuseppe Orlando. Assessing chatgpt for coding finite element methods. *Journal of Machine Learning for Modeling and Computing*, 4(2), 2023.
- [42] Haixing Dai, Yiwei Li, Zhengliang Liu, Lin Zhao, Zihao Wu, Suhang Song, Ye Shen, Dajiang Zhu, Xiang Li, Sheng Li, et al. Ad-autogpt: An autonomous gpt for alzheimer’s disease infodemiology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.10095*, 2023.

- [43] Shujian Zhang, Chengyue Gong, Lemeng Wu, Xingchao Liu, and Mingyuan Zhou. Automl-gpt: Automatic machine learning with gpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02499*, 2023.
- [44] Shengchao Liu, Jiong Xiao Wang, Yijin Yang, Chengpeng Wang, Ling Liu, Hongyu Guo, and Chaowei Xiao. Chatgpt-powered conversational drug editing using retrieval and domain feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18090*, 2023.
- [45] Andres M Bran, Sam Cox, Oliver Schilter, Carlo Baldassari, Andrew White, and Philippe Schwaller. Augmenting large language models with chemistry tools. In *NeurIPS 2023 AI for Science Workshop*, 2023.
- [46] Tianhao Li, Sandesh Shetty, Advait Kamath, Ajay Jaiswal, Xiaoqian Jiang, Ying Ding, and Yejin Kim. Cancergpt: Few-shot drug pair synergy prediction using large pre-trained language models. *ArXiv*, 2023.
- [47] Zihan Guan, Zihao Wu, Zhengliang Liu, Dufan Wu, Hui Ren, Quanzheng Li, Xiang Li, and Ninghao Liu. Cohortgpt: An enhanced gpt for participant recruitment in clinical study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11346*, 2023.
- [48] Qiao Jin, Yifan Yang, Qingyu Chen, and Zhiyong Lu. Genegpt: Augmenting large language models with domain tools for improved access to biomedical information. *ArXiv*, 2023.
- [49] Yifan Zhang, Cheng Wei, Shangyou Wu, Zhengting He, and Wenhao Yu. Geogpt: Understanding and processing geospatial tasks through an autonomous gpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07930*, 2023.
- [50] Krishna Kumar. Geotechnical parrot tales (gpt): Harnessing large language models in geotechnical engineering. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 150(1):02523001, 2024.
- [51] Varun Kumar, Leonard Gleyzer, Adar Kahana, Khemraj Shukla, and George Em Karniadakis. Mycrunchgpt: A llm assisted framework for scientific machine learning. *Journal of Machine Learning for Modeling and Computing*, 4(4), 2023.
- [52] Zhengliang Liu, Zihao Wu, Mengxuan Hu, Bokai Zhao, Lin Zhao, Tianyi Zhang, Haixing Dai, Xianyan Chen, Ye Shen, Sheng Li, et al. Pharmacygpt: The ai pharmacist. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10432*, 2023.
- [53] Sai Vemprala, Rogerio Bonatti, Arthur Bucker, and Ashish Kapoor. Chatgpt for robotics: Design principles and model abilities. *Microsoft Auton. Syst. Robot. Res*, 2:20, 2023.
- [54] Spyros Kamnis. Generative pre-trained transformers (gpt) for surface engineering. *Surface and Coatings Technology*, page 129680, 2023.
- [55] Carl N Edwards, Aakanksha Naik, Tushar Khot, Martin D Burke, Heng Ji, and Tom Hope. Synergpt: In-context learning for personalized drug synergy prediction and drug design. *bioRxiv*, pages 2023–07, 2023.
- [56] Yeonghun Kang and Jihan Kim. Chatmof: An autonomous ai system for predicting and generating metal-organic frameworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01423*, 2023.
- [57] Yang Jeong Park, Daniel Kaplan, Zhichu Ren, Chia-Wei Hsu, Changhao Li, Haowei Xu, Sipei Li, and Ju Li. Can chatgpt be used to generate scientific hypotheses? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12208*, 2023.

- [58] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Linyi Yang, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03109*, 2023.
- [59] James Boyko, Joseph Cohen, Nathan Fox, Maria Han Veiga, Jennifer I Li, Jing Liu, Bernardo Modenesi, Andreas H Rauch, Kenneth N Reid, Soumi Tribedi, et al. An interdisciplinary outlook on large language models for scientific research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04929*, 2023.
- [60] Ai chat for scientific pdfs — scispace, Nov 2023. Available at <https://typeset.io/t/about/>.
- [61] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [62] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022.
- [63] Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Hugginggpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in huggingface. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17580*, 2023.
- [64] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Shaokun Zhang, Erkang Zhu, Beibin Li, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, and Chi Wang. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155*, 2023.

A Appendix

Medicines:

SynerGPT: In-Context Learning for Personalized Drug Synergy Prediction and Drug Design [55]

What is the objective of SynerGPT?

Scispace:

The objective of SynerGPT is to predict synergistic drug combinations in the context of specific cancer cell targets, using a few-shot learning approach. SynerGPT aims to enable the discovery of personalized cancer treatments by predicting additional drug synergy relationships based on a small "personalized dataset" of 10-20 drug synergy relationships. The model is trained to learn "drug synergy functions" without using any textual corpora, molecular fingerprints, protein interaction, or any other domain-specific knowledge. SynerGPT integrates an in-context learning approach with a genetic algorithm to optimize model prompts and select synergy candidates to test after conducting a patient biopsy. Additionally, SynerGPT explores the task of inverse drug design, which involves designing drugs that synergize specifically to target a given patient's "personalized dataset". The findings of SynerGPT have the potential to impact precision cancer medicine and raise questions about non-textual pre-training for language models.

Human response:

The SynerGPT is designed to predict drug synergy. For complex diseases such as cancer and HIV, patients often require treatment with multiple drugs. Combination therapy is particularly important in these cases. However, because of genetic variations, a specific drug combination may be effective for some patients but not for others. The objective of SynerGPT is to predict whether combining two drugs will yield positive or negative outcomes, as well as how these combinations will interact with individual genes.

Which version of GPT is SynerGPT based on?

Scispace:

SynerGPT is based on the GPT-2 model. The paper mentions that they use a GPT-2 family decoder-only language model, which they refer to as SynerGPT. The model is trained to predict the synergy value using a linear transformation of the contextualized output representation of the drugs and cell lines. The authors also mention that they take inspiration from recent work that showed how a GPT model architecture can be trained to in-context learn function classes, such as linear functions and neural networks. Additionally, the paper refers to the success of models like GPT-3 and GPT-4, which indicates that SynerGPT is based on the GPT series of models.

Human response:

The SynerGPT is based on GPT-2.

Did SynerGPT fine-tune the GPT-2?

Scispace:

SynerGPT did not fine-tune the GPT-2 model. The authors of the paper propose novel pre-training schemes that enable a GPT model to in-context learn "drug synergy functions" without using any textual corpora or domain-specific knowledge. They train a GPT-2 model in the few-shot setting, similar to SynerGPT's training settings, using random context and the same hyperparameters. The performance of the model suggests that the transformer architecture may be the dominant factor explaining BERT's performance on the task. The input for the encoder-only language models is modified to be in natural language using a simple formulation, and the model is trained to predict the output value from the token representation. The study also finds that transformer language models without enriching drug-cell information from external knowledge bases can achieve competitive results, even using randomized tokens instead of drug-cell names.

Human response:

No. SynerGPT utilized In-Context Learning for Drug Synergy (ICL-DS). Trained model parameters are never explicitly updated after pre-training. ICL is appealing in settings where it is prohibitively costly to perform parameter updates for each incoming new task and context.

How does the SynerGPT work? Please explain with an example.

Scispace:

SynerGPT works through the following steps:

1. In-Context Learning: The model is trained to predict drug synergy relationships in the context of specific cancer cell targets using a small "personalized dataset" of drug synergy relationships. This personalized dataset serves as the context for predicting additional drug synergy relationships.
2. GPT-2 Language Model: SynerGPT is based on the GPT-2 family of decoder-only language models. It utilizes a GPT-2 model architecture, which is pre-trained to learn drug synergy functions without relying on textual corpora or domain-specific knowledge.
3. Linear Transformation: To predict the synergy value, SynerGPT uses a linear transformation of the contextualized output representation of the drugs and cell lines. This includes the information of the drugs and cell lines due to self-attention.
4. Genetic Algorithm: The model integrates a genetic algorithm to optimize the selection of model prompts and select synergy candidates to test after conducting a patient biopsy. This optimization process helps improve the model's performance in predicting drug synergy relationships.
5. Inverse Drug Design: SynerGPT also explores the task of inverse drug design, where it retrieves or generates drug molecules that are synergistic in the context of a specific cancer patient's information. This has potential implications for personalized drug candidate discovery.

Human response:

SynerGPT uses 'information cards,' each containing the names of two drugs and a cell line, which represents genetic information. Each card also indicates with a 'True' or 'False' whether the drug combination is effective for that particular cell line. For instance, if the card says 'True,' it means combining these two drugs is more effective than using either drug alone on that cell line. If it says 'False,' the combination therapy is less effective.

Here's an example: If we want to know how Drug A and Drug B interact with Cell Line C, SynerGPT has an algorithm to select information cards containing relevant information about Drug A, Drug B, or Cell Line C. These selected cards are then fed into the GPT model, which will try to identify hidden relationships among the data and make a prediction about whether the combination of Drug A and Drug B will be synergistic or not in Cell Line C.

What are the limitations of SynerGPT?

Scispace:

Limitations of SynerGPT:

SynerGPT does not fine-tune the GPT-2 model, instead it uses novel pre-training schemes to enable the GPT model to in-context learn "drug synergy functions".

The model does not use any textual corpora, molecular fingerprints, protein interaction, or any other domain-specific knowledge.

The study finds that transformer language models without enriching drug-cell information from external knowledge bases can achieve competitive results, even using randomized tokens instead of drug-cell names.

While the model achieves competitive results, it is important to note that it is evaluated in the few-shot setting and its generalization to novel unseen drugs and patient cell lines needs further exploration.

The impact of pretraining knowledge on the model's performance is also evaluated by replacing drug and cell names with 'random' tokens, suggesting that external information from pre-training on scientific corpora has negligible impact in this setting.

Overall, SynerGPT shows promise in personalized drug synergy prediction and drug design, but further research is needed to address its limitations and evaluate its generalization capabilities.

Human response:

SynerGPT utilizes deep learning approaches to identify synergetic effects, akin to a black box. Integrating more external database features can offer insights into cellular pathway interactions. While SynerGPT currently separates model performance by tissue type, it might be overly simplistic for future research to categorize cell lines solely based on tissue types.

What is the objective of CancerGPT?

Scispace:

The objective of CancerGPT is to predict the synergy of drug pairs in rare tissues that lack structured data and features, using large pre-trained language models (LLMs) as a few-shot learning approach. The researchers aim to leverage the potential of LLMs in few-shot learning to extract prior knowledge from text corpora and make predictions in complex fields like biology, where structured data and sample size are limited. The experiments conducted by the researchers involved seven rare tissues from different cancer types, and the results showed that the LLM-based prediction model achieved significant accuracy with very few or zero samples. The proposed model, CancerGPT, with approximately 124 million parameters, was even comparable to the larger fine-tuned GPT-3 model with approximately 175 billion parameters. This research is the first to address drug pair synergy prediction in rare tissues with limited data and to utilize an LLM-based prediction model for biological reaction prediction tasks.

Human response:

The objective of CancerGPT is to predict drug pair synergy, particularly in rare tissues. Drug pair synergy refers to the enhancement of the therapeutic effects when two drugs are used together, as opposed to when each drug is used individually. In various diseases, including cancer, infectious diseases, and neurological disorders, combination therapy often yields better treatment outcomes. While many machine learning models have shown promising results in tissues with abundant data, they are less effective for tissues with limited datasets, such as bone and soft tissues. CancerGPT aims to overcome this limitation by focusing on drug pair synergy prediction in rare tissues with scarce data.

Which version of GPT is CancerGPT based on?

Scispace:

CancerGPT is based on the GPT-3 model. The researchers mention that their proposed model, CancerGPT, with approximately 124 million parameters, was even comparable to the larger fine-tuned GPT-3 model with approximately 175 billion parameters. However, it is important to note that the specific version of GPT-3 used in CancerGPT is not explicitly mentioned in the provided sources.

Human response:

CancerGPT is based on GPT-2.

How is the performance of CancerGPT?

Scispace:

The performance of CancerGPT is significant, achieving high accuracy with very few or zero samples in predicting the synergy of drug pairs in rare tissues. The experiments conducted by the researchers involved seven rare tissues from different cancer types, and the results demonstrated the effectiveness of the LLM-based prediction model. CancerGPT, with approximately 124 million parameters, was even comparable to the larger fine-tuned GPT-3 model with approximately 175 billion parameters. The model's ability to generalize to unseen tasks in the complex field of biology, where structured data and sample size are limited, showcases its potential for biological inference. This research is the first to tackle drug pair synergy prediction in rare tissues with limited data and to utilize an LLM-based prediction model for biological reaction prediction tasks.

Human response:

The performance of CancerGPT depends on the number of training data points and the types of tissues involved.

When the number of training data points is fixed, LLM-based models (such as CancerGPT, GPT-2, and GPT-3) achieve comparable or better accuracy in most cases compared to baseline models like XGBoost and TabTransformer. These LLM-based models particularly excel in zero-shot scenarios. When additional data ('more shots') are introduced, TabTransformer consistently improves its performance, while CancerGPT and GPT-3 do not always show improvement across all tissue types.

In terms of tissue types, GPT-3 demonstrates higher generalizability and achieves greater accuracy when predicting issues with unique characteristics or in tissues with limited data. Models trained on more common tissues, like TabTransformer and CancerGPT, perform best in tissues that have less distinctive characteristics. However, CancerGPT, which has a smaller parameter count of 124M, often achieves accuracy comparable to that of GPT-3, which has a much larger parameter count of 175B.

What are the baselines used for comparison with CancerGPT?

Scispace:

Baselines used for comparison with CancerGPT are not mentioned in the provided sources. The sources do not provide specific information about the baselines used for comparison with CancerGPT. The focus of the research paper is on the development and evaluation of CancerGPT, a few-shot learning approach using large pre-trained language models for drug pair synergy prediction in rare tissues. The researchers compare the performance of CancerGPT with the larger fine-tuned GPT-3 model, but they do not mention any specific baselines used for comparison. Therefore, the baselines used for comparison with CancerGPT are not addressed in the provided sources.

Human response:

To compare with CancerGPT, the paper uses the baseline models including XGBoost and TabTransformer, and also LLM-base models including GPT-2 and GPT-3.

How does the CancerGPT finetune?

Scispace:

CancerGPT finetunes through a few-shot learning approach using large pre-trained language models (LLMs) for drug pair synergy prediction in rare tissues. The model leverages the prior knowledge extracted from text corpora to make predictions in cases where structured data and sample size are limited. The researchers propose CancerGPT, which has approximately 124 million parameters, and compare its performance with the larger fine-tuned GPT-3 model with approximately 175 billion parameters. The experiments conducted on seven rare tissues from different cancer types demonstrate that CancerGPT achieves significant accuracy with very few or zero samples. This approach is the first to tackle drug pair synergy prediction in rare tissues with limited data and to utilize an LLM-based prediction model for biological reaction prediction tasks.

Human response:

CancerGPT was first fine-tuned with pre-trained regular GPT-2 for 4 epochs on common tissues. The learning rate was set to be $5e-5$ and weight decay was set to be 0.01. Then the model was fine-tuned for k shots in rare tissues. A linear layer was added to the top of GPT-2, which uses the last token of the GPT-2 output to predict the label. The cross-entropy loss was used to optimize the model.

PharmacyGPT: The AI Pharmacist [52]

What is the objective of PharmacyGPT?

Scispace:

- The objective of PharmacyGPT is to assess the capabilities of large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT and GPT-4 in emulating the role of clinical pharmacists. It aims to generate comprehensible patient clusters, formulate medication plans, and forecast patient outcomes using LLMs.
- PharmacyGPT aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse surrounding the integration of artificial intelligence in healthcare settings and promote the responsible and efficacious use of such technologies.
- The goal of PharmacyGPT is to revolutionize pharmacy practices, enhance the overall quality of healthcare services, and contribute to a deeper understanding and more effective use of LLMs in specialized domains.
- By leveraging LLMs, PharmacyGPT aims to enhance the accuracy, personalization, and efficiency of medication plan generation, leading to improved patient outcomes and streamlined pharmaceutical operations.

Human response:

The objective of PharmacyGPT is to generate patient clusters, formulate medication plans, and forecast patient outcomes.

Which version of GPT is PharmacyGPT based on?

Scispace:

PharmacyGPT is based on GPT-4.

Human response:

PharmacyGPT is based on both GPT-3 and GPT-4. GPT-3 is used to generate embedding vectors of patient information, including demographics and symptoms. GPT-4 is applied to generate medical plans.

What are the databases that are used for this study?

Scispace:

- The study utilizes real data acquired from the intensive care unit (ICU) at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill (UNC) Hospital.
- The specific databases or sources of patient information within the ICU at UNC Hospital are not explicitly mentioned in the provided sources.

Human response:

This research used health data from 5,000 adult patients who stayed in intensive care units at the University of North Carolina Hospital. They looked at ICU stays between 2015 and 2020. The data covered patient demographics, medication administration record (MAR) information, and patient outcomes.

Demographics include age, sex, admission diagnosis, ICU type, MRC-ICU score at 24 hours, and APACHE II score at 24 hours. MAR information consists of drug, dose, route, duration, and timing of administration. Patient outcomes in the dataset include mortality, hospital length of stay, and indicators that measure disease severity.

How does the PharmacyGPT work?

Scispace:

PharmacyGPT works through the following steps:

- Utilization of large language models (LLMs): PharmacyGPT is based on large language models such as ChatGPT and GPT-4, which are used to emulate the role of clinical pharmacists.
- Generation of patient clusters: LLMs are employed to generate comprehensible patient clusters, which helps in organizing and categorizing patient data.
- Formulation of medication plans: PharmacyGPT utilizes LLMs to formulate medication plans for patients based on the generated patient clusters.
- Forecasting patient outcomes: LLMs are used to forecast patient outcomes, providing insights into the potential effects of medication plans.
- Real data from ICU: The investigation is conducted using real data acquired from the intensive care unit (ICU) at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill (UNC) Hospital.
- Insights into applications and limitations: The analysis offers valuable insights into the potential applications and limitations of LLMs in the field of clinical pharmacy, contributing to the development of AI-driven healthcare solutions.
- Promoting responsible use of AI: By evaluating the performance of PharmacyGPT, the study aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse surrounding the integration of artificial intelligence in healthcare settings, promoting responsible and efficacious use of such technologies.

Human response:

PharmacyGPT used GPT-3 to convert patient information into embedding vectors. These vectors capture the essence of each patient's information. Next, PharmacyGPT used these vectors to group patients together based on their similarities. This clustering makes it easier for doctors to make decisions by looking at these clusters of similar patients.

Based on the group, GPT-3 will create a medication plan and predict an APACHE score, which measures disease severity based on current age and health conditions, as well as mortality. PharmacyGPT is optimized by using a feedback loop that adjusts the prompt based on how well PharmacyGPT answered previous questions.

How is the performance of PharmacyGPT?

Scispace:

- PharmacyGPT demonstrates promising avenues for future development in the application of large language models in pharmacy, enhancing the accuracy, personalization, and efficiency of medication plan generation.
- Leveraging LLMs can lead to improved patient outcomes and streamlined pharmaceutical operations.
- The study aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse surrounding the integration of artificial intelligence in healthcare settings, promoting responsible and efficacious use of such technologies.
- The analysis offers valuable insights into the potential applications and limitations of LLMs in the field of clinical pharmacy, with implications for both patient care and the development of future AI-driven healthcare solutions.
- However, the specific performance metrics or quantitative evaluation of PharmacyGPT's performance are not explicitly mentioned in the provided sources.

Human response:

PharmacyGPT can group patients who share a common underlying condition, specifically neurological disorders, thereby demonstrating its capability to identify meaningful connections between patients with seemingly disparate symptom presentations. However, PharmacyGPT's accuracy is not high when predicting hospital mortality and APACHE II scores. The accuracy in predicting mortality rates ranges from 64% to 75%. A potential explanation for the low accuracy in predicting hospital mortality is that the data is imbalanced, whereas ChatGPT tends to make predictions in a more balanced manner. The accuracy in predicting APACHE II scores ranges from 18% to 43%. The paper compares a medical plan generated by GPT-4 with an actual medication plan but refrains from drawing additional conclusions.

What is the objective of ChatDrug?

Scispace:

Objective of ChatDrug:

- The objective of ChatDrug is to facilitate the systematic investigation of drug editing using conversational large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT.
- ChatDrug aims to streamline effective drug editing by leveraging a prompt module, a retrieval and domain feedback (ReDF) module, and a conversation module.
- It focuses on improving the performance of drug editing tasks, including small molecules, peptides, and proteins.
- ChatDrug aims to identify key substructures for manipulation in drugs, such as molecule functional groups, peptide motifs, and protein structures, and generate diverse and valid suggestions for drug editing.
- It also aims to enhance interpretability and enable informed decision-making by offering insightful explanations from a domain-specific perspective.
- The objective of ChatDrug is to contribute to the advancement of pharmaceutical research and development by harnessing the potential of ChatGPT and conversational LLMs for drug editing.

Human response:

ChatDrug aims to provide useful suggestions for drug editing, focusing on high-level properties such as solubility, binding, and permeability, rather than on exact substructure replacements. ChatDrug emphasizes high-level properties because questions related to these properties can inspire domain experts in the drug discovery process.

Which version of GPT is ChatDrug based on?

Scispace:

ChatDrug is based on ChatGPT, a conversational large language model (LLM). However, the specific version of GPT that ChatDrug is based on is not mentioned in the provided sources.

Human response:

The ChatDrug is based on GPT-3.5.

How does the ChatDrug work? Give an example.

Scispace:

- ChatDrug is a framework that combines different modules to facilitate effective drug editing using conversational large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT.
- It consists of a prompt module, a retrieval and domain feedback (ReDF) module, and a conversation module.
- The prompt module sets the context and provides initial information for drug editing tasks.
- The retrieval and domain feedback (ReDF) module helps in retrieving relevant information and providing domain-specific feedback to guide the drug editing process.
- The conversation module enables interactive and dynamic conversations with ChatDrug, allowing users to ask questions, provide feedback, and receive suggestions for drug editing.
- ChatDrug has been empirically shown to achieve the best performance on various drug editing tasks, including small molecules, peptides, and proteins.
- It can successfully identify key substructures for manipulation in drugs and generate diverse and valid suggestions for drug editing.
- ChatDrug also offers insightful explanations from a domain-specific perspective, enhancing interpretability and enabling informed decision-making.
- Overall, ChatDrug leverages the potential of ChatGPT and conversational LLMs to streamline and improve the drug editing process, contributing to the advancement of pharmaceutical research and development.

Human response:

- ChatDrug consists of three main components:
- **Prompt Design for Domain Specific (PDDS) Module:** This part takes the user's question and reformats it into a format that the language model can understand.
 - **Retrieval and Domain Feedback (ReDF) Module:** This module helps by pulling similar examples from a database to guide the answer. It also verifies the answer based on existing knowledge.
 - **Conversation Module:** This component allows the system to ask follow-up questions, iterating until it arrives at a satisfactory drug suggestion.

For example, a user can ask ChatDrug, 'Can you make molecule A more soluble in water?' The PDDS Module interprets the question for ChatDrug, while the ReDF Module evaluates the answers provided by ChatDrug. If the system doesn't get it right the first time, it returns to the database to find another similar yet correct drug. The prompt is then updated to say, 'This is incorrect. We found molecule B, which is similar to molecule A. Can you suggest a new one?' ChatDrug employs these modules to better guide and verifies its answers by iteratively updating the prompt, ensuring that the drug suggestions are creative and accurate.

What are the baselines used for comparison with ChatDrug?

Scispace:

Baselines used for comparison with ChatDrug:

The baselines used for comparison with ChatDrug are not mentioned in the provided sources.

Human response:

ChatDrug has been tested on three main types of drugs: small molecules, peptides, and proteins. The baseline models for small molecule drugs include Random, PCA, High-Variance, GS-Mutate, and MoleculeSTM, with either SMILES or Graph used for molecule representation. For peptides and protein editing, random mutation is chosen as the baseline. This is because there are no existing approaches for text-guided binding peptide editing or text-guided protein structure editing.

How is the performance of ChatDrug?

Scispace:

Performance of ChatDrug:

- ChatDrug has demonstrated the best performance on 33 out of 39 drug editing tasks, covering small molecules, peptides, and proteins.
- It successfully identifies key substructures for manipulation in drugs and generates diverse and valid suggestions for drug editing.
- ChatDrug offers insightful explanations from a domain-specific perspective, enhancing interpretability and enabling informed decision-making.
- The framework leverages the potential of ChatGPT and conversational LLMs, showcasing their effectiveness in drug editing tasks.
- The empirical results highlight the efficiency and collaborative nature of ChatDrug, contributing to the advancement of pharmaceutical research and development.

Human response:

ChatDrug has been tested on three main types of drugs: small molecules, peptides, and proteins.

- For editing small molecules, ChatDrug outperforms baseline models in 22 out of 28 tasks.
- When it comes to editing binding peptides, ChatDrug achieves the best performance across all nine tasks, compared to random mutation baselines.
- In two tasks focused on editing protein secondary structure, ChatDrug shows better performance than random mutations.

Augmenting large language models with chemistry tools [45]

What is the objective of ChemCrow?

Scispace:

Objective of ChemCrow:
The objective of ChemCrow is to augment large-language models (LLMs) with chemistry tools to improve their performance in chemistry-related problems. ChemCrow integrates 17 expert-designed tools to enhance the LLM's capabilities in tasks such as organic synthesis, drug discovery, and materials design. It aims to automate a diverse set of chemical tasks and bridge the gap between experimental and computational chemistry.

Human response:

ChemCrow serves as an assistant to expert chemists while also lowering the entry barrier for non-experts. Furthermore, it fosters scientific advancement by bridging the gap between experimental and computational chemistry.

Which version of GPT is ChemCrow based on?

Scispace:

ChemCrow is not based on a specific version of GPT. The paper mentions the use of GPT-4 as an evaluator, but it does not specify that ChemCrow is based on any particular version of GPT. Instead, ChemCrow is an LLM chemistry agent that integrates 17 expert-designed tools to enhance the performance of large-language models in chemistry-related tasks. The objective of ChemCrow is to bridge the gap between experimental and computational chemistry by automating diverse chemical tasks, such as organic synthesis, drug discovery, and materials design. While the paper discusses the performance of GPT-4 as an evaluator, it does not indicate that ChemCrow is built on GPT-4 or any other specific version of GPT.

Human response:

ChemCrow is based on GPT-4.

What is the baseline model used for comparison with ChemCrow?

Scispace:

Baseline Model for Comparison with ChemCrow:
The paper does not explicitly mention a specific baseline model used for comparison with ChemCrow. However, it states that large-language models (LLMs) have shown strong performance in tasks across domains but struggle with chemistry-related problems. ChemCrow is designed to augment LLMs with chemistry tools to improve their performance in chemistry tasks. Therefore, it can be inferred that the baseline model for comparison would be a standard LLM without the integration of the 17 expert-designed tools provided by ChemCrow. The paper focuses on evaluating ChemCrow's effectiveness in automating a diverse set of chemical tasks, comparing its performance with both LLM and expert assessments.

Human response:

The baseline model for ChemCrow is GPT-4. Expert chemists develop a set of chemistry-specific tools and tasks, which are executed by both ChemCrow and GPT-4. The answers provided by both are then evaluated by human experts and GPT-4.

How is the performance of ChemCrow?

Scispace:

Performance of ChemCrow:

- ChemCrow demonstrates effectiveness in automating a diverse set of chemical tasks, including organic synthesis, drug discovery, and materials design.
- It integrates 17 expert-designed tools to augment the performance of large-language models (LLMs) in chemistry-related problems.
- ChemCrow autonomously plans the syntheses of various molecules, such as an insect repellent and three organocatalysts.
- Evaluation, including both LLM and expert assessments, confirms the effectiveness of ChemCrow in accomplishing tasks across different domains in chemistry.
- GPT-4, used as an evaluator, cannot distinguish between clearly wrong GPT-4 completions and ChemCrow's performance, highlighting the capabilities of ChemCrow.
- Responsible use of tools like ChemCrow is emphasized due to the potential risk of misuse, and the paper discusses the potential harms associated with such tools.
- ChemCrow not only aids expert chemists but also lowers barriers for non-experts, fostering scientific advancement by bridging the gap between experimental and computational chemistry.

Human response:

ChemCrow outperforms the tool-less GPT-4, especially in more complex tasks that demand grounded chemical reasoning. While GPT-4 excels over ChemCrow in simpler tasks—where the objective is clear and the necessary information is within its training data, relying largely on memorization—ChemCrow consistently delivers superior solutions across various objectives and levels of difficulty. This has led expert chemists to strongly prefer ChemCrow, highlighting its potential as a tool for practicing chemists.

What are the external tools that are integrated into ChemCrow?

Scispace:

External Tools Integrated into ChemCrow:

- The paper mentions that ChemCrow integrates 17 expert-designed tools to augment the performance of large-language models (LLMs) in chemistry-related problems.
- However, the specific details about the external tools integrated into ChemCrow are not provided in the available sources.
- To obtain more information about the external tools integrated into ChemCrow, it would be necessary to refer to the complete research paper or any additional sources that provide a detailed description of these tools.

Human response:

The external tools in ChemCrow can be categorized into general tools, molecular tools, chemical reaction tools, and safety tools.

General Tools include:

- WebSearch: Fetches relevant information from the web.
- LitSearch: Extracts data from scientific documents.
- PythonREPL: Provides an interactive Python shell to run Python code.
- Human: Provides an interface for direct human interaction.

Molecular Tools include:

- Name2SMILES: Converts molecule names to their SMILES representation.
- SMILES2Price: Gives the commercial cost of a molecule.
- Name2CAS: Identifies the CAS number of a molecule.
- Similarity: Measures the similarity between two molecules.
- ModifyMol: Alters a molecule's structure using synthesis rules.
- PatentCheck: Checks if a molecule has been patented.
- FuncGroups: Identifies functional groups within a molecule.
- SMILES2Weight: Computes the molecular weight from a SMILES string.

Safety Tools include:

- ControlledChemicalCheck: Checks a molecule against recognized Chemical Weapons and Precursors lists.
- ExplosiveCheck: Identifies explosive molecules.
- SafetySummary: Gives a safety overview of a molecule.

Chemical Reaction Tools include:

- NameRXN: Identifies and classifies a chemical reaction.
- ReactionPredict: Predicts reaction outcomes.
- ReactionPlanner: Assists in planning synthetic routes for a target molecule.
- ReactionExecute: Interfaces with a robotic chemistry lab platform for actual chemical experiments.

How does ChemCrow work? Give an example.

Scispace:

- ChemCrow is an LLM (large-language model) chemistry agent that integrates 17 expert-designed tools to enhance its performance in chemistry-related tasks.
- It leverages the capabilities of LLMs and combines them with the specialized knowledge and functionality of these external tools.
- By integrating these tools, ChemCrow gains new capabilities and becomes capable of accomplishing tasks across organic synthesis, drug discovery, and materials design.
- ChemCrow autonomously plans the syntheses of various molecules, such as an insect repellent and three organocatalysts, demonstrating its ability to generate solutions to complex chemical problems.
- The evaluation of ChemCrow's performance, including assessments from both LLMs and experts, confirms its effectiveness in automating a diverse set of chemical tasks.
- The specific details about the external tools integrated into ChemCrow are not provided in the available sources. For more information, it is necessary to refer to the complete research paper or additional sources that provide a detailed description of these tools.

Human response:

The LLM is provided with a list of tool names, descriptions of their utility, and details about the expected input/output. It is then instructed to answer a user-given prompt using the tools provided when necessary. The model is guided to follow the Thought, Action, Action Input, Observation format, which requires it to reason about the current state of the task, consider its relevance to the final goal, and plan the next steps accordingly, demonstrating its level of understanding.

For example, the user wants to synthesize safinamide and knows the cost and purchasability of the reactant. ChemCrow will first use a tool to find the SMILE structure of safinamide. In the next step, ChemCrow will call the tool synthesis planner to find out the synthesis procedures. In the following step, ChemCrow will find the SMILE structure of all the reactants. Then ChemCrow will use a tool to find the prices of reactants and the total cost.

What is the objective of AD-AutoGPT?

Scispace:

- The objective of AD-AutoGPT is to develop an autonomous tool for conducting data collection, processing, and analysis of complex health narratives related to Alzheimer's Disease (AD) through users' textual prompts. It aims to collate comprehensive data from various news sources and provide robust trend analyses, intertopic distance maps visualization, and identification of salient terms pertinent to AD.
- AD-AutoGPT automates and optimizes complex data extraction and analysis tasks, enabling researchers and professionals across different fields to access and engage with large language models efficiently, regardless of their technical expertise. It has the potential to be applied in various disciplines beyond the public health domain.
- AD-AutoGPT performs new text summary and LDA topic modeling to extract critical information from a large amount of news text. It utilizes the powerful text summarization ability of GPT-4 and employs web crawler scripts to save and summarize news text. It also incorporates spatiotemporal information extraction to enhance its capabilities.
- AD-AutoGPT aims to overcome the limitations of AutoGPT for AD Infodemiology tasks by providing specific prompting mechanisms, tailored spatiotemporal information extraction, improved text summarization ability, in-depth analysis of generated summaries, and effective visualization capabilities. It transforms the traditional labor-intensive data collection, processing, and analysis paradigm into a prompt-based automated and optimized analytical framework.

Human response:

The aim of AD-AutoGPT is to collect data and analyze health narratives related to Alzheimer's disease.

Which version of GPT is AD-AutoGPT?

Scispace:

AD-AutoGPT is based on GPT-4, which is a large language model used for conducting data collection, processing, and analysis of complex health narratives related to Alzheimer's Disease (AD) in an autonomous manner. It builds on the successes of previous large language models like GPT-3 and takes automation a step further by providing a more user-friendly interface for non-expert users. AD-AutoGPT utilizes the powerful text summarization ability of GPT-4 and applies Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) to extract pertinent keywords from text summaries, offering users a succinct understanding of the central themes in the AD domain. It also integrates dynamic visualization techniques to create plots of news occurrences over time and highlight locations where news events are happening. AD-AutoGPT is refined through the application of domain-specific knowledge and technical adjustments to optimize its relevance and effectiveness for public health researchers and practitioners.

Human response:

AD-AutoGPT is based on GPT-4.

How does AD-AutoGPT work? Give an example.

Scispace:

- AD-AutoGPT is an autonomous tool that conducts data collection, processing, and analysis of complex health narratives related to Alzheimer's Disease (AD) through users' textual prompts.
- It utilizes the GPT-4 large language model and incorporates the powerful text summarization ability of GPT-4 to extract critical information from a large amount of news text .
- AD-AutoGPT accesses news URLs, saves the text from websites using web crawler scripts, and then uses ChatGPT or GPT-4 to summarize the news text .
- It employs the map reduce method to process the text and overcome the token limit of GPT-4, ensuring complete news text summarization.
- AD-AutoGPT applies LDA topic modeling to extract salient terms and conducts trend analyses and intertopic distance maps visualization to provide valuable insights into public focus on AD.
- It also incorporates spatiotemporal information extraction to analyze the spatial distribution and development of AD-related news over time.
- AD-AutoGPT follows a chain thinking pattern, where it judges the achievement of goals based on running results and provides a final answer to the initial question.

Human response:

AD-AutoGPT will use GPT-4 to divide the target task into several small tasks and process them separately using iterative chain-of-thought processes. They provide AD-AutoGPT with an instruction library, which contains customized functions and tools including searching and saving news, summarizing news, and visualizing results. After operating every small task, AD-AutoGPT will judge whether the overall goal has been achieved or not. For example, if the user inputs would like to know something new about Alzheimer's Disease and visualize the result. In the first cycle, AD-AutoGPT will first use the search and save news tool to find the latest news about Alzheimer's disease. Next, it will use the summarize news tool to summarize the news found. Finally, it will use the draw plots tool to visualize the results.

How is the performance of AD-AutoGPT?

Scispace:

- AD-AutoGPT demonstrates improved performance compared to its predecessor, AutoGPT, by addressing limitations and incorporating additional features.
- It segments and processes text chunks independently, creating comprehensive summaries that capture essential information from news articles.
- AD-AutoGPT applies Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) to extract pertinent keywords from text summaries, providing a succinct understanding of central themes in the Alzheimer's disease domain.
- It integrates dynamic visualization techniques, creating plots of news occurrences over time and illustrating the evolution of research keywords, enhancing its robust visualization capabilities.
- AD-AutoGPT's refined design, domain-specific knowledge, and technical adjustments optimize its relevance and effectiveness for public health researchers and practitioners.
- It enables the extraction of useful spatiotemporal information from a wide range of news sources, improving the efficiency of researchers' work.

Human response:

The paper demonstrates the performance of AD-AutoGPT in information retrieval and data analysis with several case studies. This includes showing the spatial distribution of the Alzheimer's disease news, finding the temporal change in the number of news occurrences from 2022 to 2023, and identifying five hot topics related to Alzheimer's disease.

What are the external tools that are integrated into AD-AutoGPT?

Scispace:

- AD-AutoGPT utilizes the Langchain framework to establish a connection with the GPT-4 and ChatGPT API, enabling the autonomous framework for Alzheimer's Disease infodemiology.
- It accesses ChatGPT or GPT-4 API for text summarization, leveraging the powerful text summarization ability of GPT-4 .
- AD-AutoGPT incorporates web crawler scripts to save text from news websites for further analysis .
- It applies the map reduce method to process text and overcome the token limit of GPT-4 for complete news text summarization.
- AD-AutoGPT employs Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) for topic modeling to extract salient terms and identify central themes related to Alzheimer's Disease.
- The tool also integrates dynamic visualization techniques to create trend analyses, intertopic distance maps, and visual representations of news occurrences over time.

Human response:

Several external tools have been implemented into AD-AutoGPT. The first one is 'Search and Save News,' which uses the Google API to search for the latest news on reputable websites and save the URLs to a local device. The second tool is 'Summarize News,' which employs GPT-4 to condense the main content of a news article. The third tool is 'Visualize Results,' which creates visual representations of the collected data, essentially generating plots that visualize the news. Specifically, they use the unsupervised learning algorithm known as LDA for analysis. By the LDA, AD-AutoGPT can highlight topics that are the subject of active debate in the field of Alzheimer's disease. Other tools include the "Extract Spatial Data" tool and the "Extract Temporal Data" tool, which is to extract the places where these news articles mentioned and the timestamps when these news articles were posted online.

GeneGPT: Augmenting Large Language Models with Domain Tools for Improved Access to Biomedical Information [48]

What is the objective of GeneGPT?

Scispace:

Objective of GeneGPT:

- The objective of GeneGPT is to augment large language models (LLMs) with domain-specific tools, specifically the Web APIs of the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), to improve access to biomedical information.
- GeneGPT aims to teach LLMs to use the NCBI Web APIs for answering genomics questions by employing in-context learning and an augmented decoding algorithm that can detect and execute API calls.
- The goal is to enhance the performance of LLMs in answering genomics questions, particularly in the GeneTuring benchmark. GeneGPT achieves state-of-the-art performance on eight tasks in the benchmark, surpassing retrieval-augmented LLMs, biomedical LLMs, GPT-3, and ChatGPT.
- GeneGPT also demonstrates the ability to generalize to longer chains of API calls and answer multi-hop questions in the GeneHop dataset.
- The objective of GeneGPT is to provide easier and more precise access to specialized biomedical knowledge by leveraging domain-specific tools and APIs.

Human response:

GeneGPT is designed to answer questions of biomedical science and genomics.

Which version of GPT is GeneGPT?

Scispace:

GeneGPT is not explicitly mentioned in the provided sources.

Human response:

GeneGPT is used OpenAI codex, which is a descendant of GPT-3.

How does GeneGPT work? Give an example.

Scispace:

GeneGPT is a method that enhances large language models (LLMs) with domain-specific tools to improve access to biomedical information. It uses the Web APIs of the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) to answer genomics questions. GeneGPT employs in-context learning and an augmented decoding algorithm to prompt Codex to solve the GeneTuring tests with NCBI Web APIs. Experimental results show that GeneGPT achieves state-of-the-art performance on eight tasks in the GeneTuring benchmark, surpassing retrieval-augmented LLMs, biomedical LLMs, GPT-3, and ChatGPT. It also demonstrates good cross-task generalizability and can answer multi-hop questions in the GeneHop dataset. GeneGPT's ability to detect and execute API calls allows for more precise access to specialized knowledge in the biomedical domain.

Human response:

GeneGPT is configured to access two specific APIs: BLAST and EUtils. To guide the model in navigating these APIs, four examples are provided as initial prompts. These examples act as teaching guidelines to inform GeneGPT on which API to use. When a query is received, the model is directed to dissect it into smaller, more digestible sub-questions, addressing them in sequence. For instance, if a user inquires about the function of the gene associated with SNP rs1241371358, GeneGPT will break this down into two sub-questions. The first is: which gene is associated with SNP rs1241371358? By selecting the right API, GeneGPT determines that the gene is LRRC23. The subsequent question is: what is the function of LRRC23? Once more, by consulting the relevant API, GeneGPT retrieves the answer.

How is the performance of GeneGPT?

Scispace:

Performance of GeneGPT:

- GeneGPT achieves state-of-the-art performance on eight tasks in the GeneTuring benchmark with an average score of 0.83, surpassing retrieval-augmented LLMs, biomedical LLMs, GPT-3, and ChatGPT.
- Experimental results show that GeneGPT outperforms other models such as the new Bing (0.44), biomedical LLMs like BioMedLM (0.08) and BioGPT (0.04), as well as GPT-3 (0.16) and ChatGPT (0.12).
- GeneGPT's performance is evaluated based on its ability to answer genomics questions using the Web APIs of the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI).
- The method demonstrates good cross-task generalizability and can answer multi-hop questions in the GeneHop dataset.
- GeneGPT's augmented decoding algorithm and in-context learning enable it to detect and execute API calls, facilitating more precise access to specialized knowledge in the biomedical domain.
- Overall, GeneGPT achieves impressive performance on genomics tasks, surpassing other models and demonstrating its effectiveness in utilizing domain-specific tools for improved access to biomedical information.

Human response:

The paper evaluated the proposed GeneGPT model using 9 GeneTuring tasks. These tasks can be categorized into the following: nomenclature, genomic location, functional analysis, and sequence alignment. The baseline models for comparison include GPT-2, BioGPT, BioMedLM, GPT-3, ChatGPT, and New Bing. While New Bing outperforms GeneGPT in functional analysis tasks, GeneGPT scores higher in all other tasks compared to the other baseline models.

What are the external tools that are integrated into GeneGPT?

Scispace:

- GeneGPT integrates external tools in the form of Web APIs from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) to access biomedical information .
- The specific external tool used by GeneGPT is the NCBI Web APIs, which provide access to specialized knowledge in genomics and biomedical domains .
- These Web APIs allow GeneGPT to retrieve information from the NCBI database and use it to answer genomics questions.

Human response:

GeneGPT is configured to access two specific APIs: BLAST and EUtils. Each of these APIs serves a distinct but complementary role. BLAST specializes in comparing an input sequence against databases to find similarities, often used in tasks like gene identification. On the other hand, EUtils offers a broader range of functionalities that include sequence data and a wide range of biological data, ideal for data retrieval and database searches.

CohortGPT: An Enhanced GPT for Participant Recruitment in Clinical Study [47]

What is the objective of CohortGPT?

Scispace:

- The objective of CohortGPT is to enhance participant recruitment in clinical studies by utilizing Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT and GPT-4 for medical text classification.
- CohortGPT aims to address the challenges of understanding decision-making by human experts and accurately identifying disease labels in medical text.
- It integrates ChatGPT and GPT-4's language understanding and reasoning abilities with specially designed prompting for medical domain tasks.
- CohortGPT embeds medical and clinical knowledge into the ChatGPT model using a clinical-domain knowledge graph in the prompt design.
- It employs Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting to guide the model to think step by step, bridging the domain knowledge gap.
- The framework achieved competitive results compared to other deep learning-based methods using less labeled data and can be extended to other medical NLP tasks.

Human response:

CohortGPT is a GPT that can read medical reports and figure out what diseases are mentioned or implied. If a medical report says everything is normal, the GPT should categorize it as "Normal/No Disease." But if the report mentions specific conditions, then the program would classify the report under a certain category. The idea is to automatically sort medical reports into different disease categories based on their contents.

Which version of GPT is CohortGPT based on?

Scispace:

CohortGPT is based on the GPT-4 version.

Human response:

CohortGPT is based on GPT-4.

How does the CohortGPT work?

Scispace:

- CohortGPT is an LLM-driven participant recruitment framework for clinical studies that integrates ChatGPT and GPT-4's language understanding and reasoning abilities with specially designed prompting for medical domain tasks.
- It embeds medical and clinical knowledge into the ChatGPT model using a clinical-domain knowledge graph in the prompt design.
- CohortGPT employs Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting, which guides the model to think step by step, bridging the domain knowledge gap.
- The framework aims to maximize the performance of the LLM in the medical report classification task by optimizing the reward function.
- CohortGPT achieved competitive results compared to other deep learning-based methods using less labeled data and can be extended to other medical NLP tasks.

Human response:

CohortGPT initially trains a policy model using a small number of training samples. This policy model's responsibility is to select relevant samples from a larger sample pool based on user input. Additionally, CohortGPT features a "knowledge graph" that illustrates the relationships between different diseases. This graph is transformed into straightforward, actionable rules. Both these unique samples and the rules are then utilized to develop another model known as the "prompt model". When a medical report is input into CohortGPT, the prompt model can classify and summarize the report.

How is the performance of CohortGPT?

Scispace:

- CohortGPT demonstrates promising performance in participant recruitment for clinical studies by leveraging Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT and GPT-4.
- When compared to traditional fine-tuning strategies with BioBERT and BioGPT, CohortGPT outperforms them in the few-shot setting, achieving higher F1-Scores on the IU-RR dataset (0.69 for ChatGPT and 0.81 for GPT-4).
- The framework of CohortGPT integrates medical and clinical knowledge into the LLMs using a clinical-domain knowledge graph and employs Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting to bridge the domain knowledge gap.]
- CohortGPT's performance is attributed to its ability to embed medical and clinical knowledge into the LLMs, optimizing the reward function, and maximizing the model's language understanding and reasoning abilities.

Human response:

The study evaluates CohortGPT and compares it with traditional fine-tuning methods like BioBERT and BioGPT using the IU-RR and MIMIC-CXR datasets. For the IU-RR dataset, when limited training samples are available (e.g., 185), CohortGPT outperforms traditional fine-tuning methods. However, as the amount of training data increases (e.g., 1000), the traditional methods prove superior. This trend is consistent with findings from the MIMIC-CXR dataset. Essentially, CohortGPT excels in situations with limited training data.

How does the knowledge graph work in CohortGPT?

Scispace:

The knowledge graph used in CohortGPT is a hierarchical graph that represents relationships between disease labels, organs, and tissues. Each node in the solid box represents a disease label, each node in the dotted box represents corresponding organs or tissues, and the edges linking the nodes represent the relationships between disease keywords. Disease labels that are linked to the same tissue or organ form a cluster.

The knowledge graph is used as auxiliary information to guide the Large Language Models (LLMs) in making predictions. It helps enhance the reasoning ability of LLMs in the specific-domain downstream task of medical text classification.

The knowledge graph is transformed into a series of executable rules, which are used along with dynamic Chain-of-Thought (CoT) samples to construct a prompt model. During the inference stage, the LLMs are queried with the medical reports and the prompt model, utilizing the information from the knowledge graph to improve the accuracy of disease label identification.

Human response:

CohortGPT utilizes a "knowledge graph" to describe the relationships between diseases, organs, and tissues. Visualize each disease as a node (or point) on a graph, as is each organ or tissue. For instance, a node representing heart disease might connect to a node for heart tissue. This study proposes three methods to train large language models to interpret this knowledge graph: KG-as-Tree, KG-as-Relation, and KG-as-Rule.

- KG-as-Tree: This method endeavors to make the language model perceive the graph as a tree, wherein some diseases act as 'branches' stemming from other more general diseases. Symbols like "#" are employed to denote different tiers of disease categories.
- KG-as-Relation: This approach breaks down the knowledge graph into sets of relationships that explain how each disease is related to an organ or another disease.
- KG-as-Rule: In this approach, the knowledge graph is converted into a sequence of actionable rules.

The research paper compares different strategies for embedding the KG into prompts. Among them, the KG-as-Rule approach demonstrates superior performance.

Machine Learning:

AutoML-GPT: Automatic Machine Learning with GPT [43]

What is the objective of AutoML-GPT?

Scispace:

The objective of AutoML-GPT is to automate the training pipeline for AI tasks by utilizing large language models (LLMs) like GPT. AutoML-GPT aims to reduce the human effort required in finding the right model architecture, optimization algorithm, and hyperparameters for specific tasks and applications. It achieves this by developing task-oriented prompts and dynamically training models with optimized hyperparameters using GPT as the bridge to diverse AI models. AutoML-GPT takes user requests and data cards to compose prompt paragraphs, which are used to automatically conduct experiments from data processing to model architecture, hyperparameter tuning, and predicted training log. By leveraging the robust language capabilities of GPT and the available AI models, AutoML-GPT can tackle intricate AI tasks across various domains and achieve remarkable results in computer vision, natural language processing, and other challenging areas.

Human response:

The objective of the AutoML-GPT is a language model that can preprocess data, recommend model architectures, and conduct hyperparameter tuning.

Which version of GPT is AutoML-GPT based on?

Scispace:

AutoML-GPT is based on the GPT (Generative Pre-trained Transformer) model. The paper mentions that AutoML-GPT employs GPT as the bridge to diverse AI models and dynamically trains models with optimized hyperparameters. It utilizes the robust language capabilities of GPT to automate the training pipeline for AI tasks, including tasks in computer vision, natural language processing, and other challenging areas. However, the specific version of GPT that AutoML-GPT is based on is not mentioned in the provided sources.

Human response:

AutoML-GPT is based on GPT-4.

How does the AutoML-GPT work?

Scispace:

AutoML-GPT works by utilizing large language models (LLMs) like GPT to automate the training pipeline for AI tasks. Here is a step-by-step overview of how AutoML-GPT operates:

- **Task-oriented prompts:** AutoML-GPT develops task-oriented prompts based on user requests and data cards. These prompts are used to compose a corresponding prompt paragraph that guides the training process.
- **Dynamic training:** AutoML-GPT dynamically trains models with optimized hyperparameters. It leverages GPT as the bridge to diverse AI models, allowing for flexibility and adaptability in the training process.
- **Automated experiments:** With the prompt paragraph, AutoML-GPT automatically conducts experiments, including data processing, model architecture selection, hyperparameter tuning, and predicted training log. This automation reduces the need for manual intervention and human effort.
- **Leveraging language capabilities:** AutoML-GPT leverages the robust language capabilities of GPT and the available AI models to tackle intricate AI tasks across various domains. It achieves remarkable results in computer vision, natural language processing, and other challenging areas.
- **Overall,** AutoML-GPT aims to streamline the training pipeline for AI tasks by automating various stages, from data processing to model architecture selection and hyperparameter tuning, using GPT as a powerful tool.

Human response:

There are two important components: data cards and model cards. A data card includes the dataset name, input dataset type (e.g., image or text data), label space (e.g., class types or resolution), and default evaluation metric. Data cards serve as ID cards for datasets.

Model cards comprise model names, structures, descriptions, and architecture hyperparameters. Model cards act like resumes for the machine learning models, telling the system what tasks each model is good at and what settings should be used.

The AutoML-GPT uses it to special prompts to ensure it understands exactly what the user wants. Users can also add extra instructions for more specific needs, such as adding specific metrics or constraints. AutoML-GPT first conducts data processing. For computer vision, this includes image resizing, normalization, augmentation, and filtering. For natural language processing, techniques such as tokenization, stopword removal, and lowercasing are used. AutoML-GPT then assigns a suitable model for the task based on the user's descriptions. For hyperparameter tuning, AutoML-GPT automates the process by generating predictive training logs based on user-provided data and model cards, without requiring actual training.

How is the performance of AutoML-GPT?

Scispace:

Performance of AutoML-GPT:

- AutoML-GPT achieves remarkable results in various AI tasks, including computer vision, natural language processing, and other challenging areas.
- Extensive experiments and ablation studies demonstrate that AutoML-GPT is general, effective, and beneficial for many AI tasks.
- The paper highlights the ability of AutoML-GPT to automate the training pipeline, reducing the need for considerable human efforts in finding the right model architecture, optimization algorithm, and hyperparameters.
- AutoML-GPT leverages the robust language capabilities of GPT and the available AI models to tackle intricate AI tasks across various domains.
- The specific quantitative performance metrics or comparisons with other methods are not mentioned in the provided sources.

Human response:

The paper demonstrates examples across computer vision, natural question answering, classification, and cases with unseen datasets. The AutoML-GPT is not compared against certain baseline models. However, the paper shows that AutoML-GPT is effective because of its high accuracy across various tasks.

How does the AutoML-GPT deal with unseen datasets?

Scispace:

AutoML-GPT's approach of utilizing large language models (LLMs) like GPT allows it to handle unseen datasets effectively.

By leveraging the robust language capabilities of GPT, AutoML-GPT can comprehend and reason with new data, even if it hasn't been encountered during training . The dynamic training process of AutoML-GPT, which includes data processing and model architecture selection, enables it to adapt to new datasets and tasks.

AutoML-GPT's ability to automatically conduct experiments and optimize hyperparameters further enhances its performance on unseen datasets . While the specific details of how AutoML-GPT deals with unseen datasets are not explicitly mentioned, the paper highlights its general effectiveness and benefits for a wide range of AI tasks, indicating its potential to handle new and challenging datasets.

Human response:

AutoML-GPT will identify the correlation between the unseen dataset and the existing ones. Based on the correlation, AutoML-GPT will transfer the hyperparameter settings from the existing datasets to the new unseen dataset. Therefore, it can recommend a hyperparameter configuration that is likely to be effective for the unseen dataset.

Engineering:

Generative pre-trained transformers (GPT) for surface engineering [54]

What is the objective of GPT for surface engineering?

Scispace:

The objective of GPT (Generative Pre-trained Transformers) for surface engineering is to enhance its performance as a scientific assistant tool by improving domain knowledge, providing up-to-date information, reducing ambiguity and errors, performing customized tasks, and offering enhanced search capabilities. GPT models can be fine-tuned with specialized domain knowledge in thermal spray technology to improve query response performance, providing more accurate, coherent, and relevant responses.

By utilizing domain adaptation and data indexing techniques, a fine-tuned data indexed GPT model can specialize in the desired task and improve its performance on domain-specific data while retaining the general language understanding learned during pre-training.

The construction of a custom GPT model with specialized domain knowledge in thermal spray technology requires a comprehensive and up-to-date collection of documents, including research articles, conference proceedings, technical reports, patents, books, industry standards, reputable websites, and educational materials.

Human response:

The objective of the GPT for surface engineering is a custom data-driven GPT that can efficiently retrieve specific information and provide accurate and relevant responses in surface engineering.

Which version of GPT is GPT for surface engineering based on?

Scispace:

GPT for surface engineering is not based on a specific version of GPT. The paper mentions the use of "Generative Pre-trained Transformers (GPT)" as a general term to refer to the concept of pre-trained transformer models for natural language processing tasks. It does not specify a particular version of GPT. The focus of the paper is on the application of GPT models in the field of surface engineering, specifically in the domain of thermal spray technology. The paper highlights the importance of custom data-driven GPT models that are fine-tuned with specialized domain knowledge to enhance their performance as scientific assistant tools. Therefore, the paper does not mention a specific version of GPT but emphasizes the use of GPT models in the context of surface engineering.

Human response:

GPT for surface engineering is based on GPT-3.

How does the GPT for surface engineering work?

Scispace:

GPT for surface engineering works by utilizing custom data-driven models that are fine-tuned with specialized domain knowledge in thermal spray technology. These models are trained on a diverse and rich dataset that includes research articles published in reputable journals related to thermal spray technology, materials science, and surface engineering. Open access peer-reviewed articles offer valuable insights into the latest findings and advancements in the field. Academic databases or specialized databases like ASM International's can be employed to search for relevant articles. By incorporating this domain knowledge into the GPT models, they are able to provide more accurate, coherent, and relevant responses to queries in the surface engineering domain. The use of data indexing techniques further enhances the performance of the models by organizing and storing data in a way that makes it easier and faster to search and retrieve relevant information.

Human response:

GPT for surface engineering utilizes two key frameworks within LlamaIndex: an indexing framework and an evaluation framework. Initially, a small selection of peer-reviewed published thermal spray articles is indexed using LlamaIndex's indexing framework. The study experimented with both vector and tree index methods. When a query is submitted to the GPT for surface engineering, it first identifies possible relevant indexed information that could address the inquiry. This information is then passed on to the evaluation module. The module assesses whether or not the sourced information can adequately answer the query, providing a 'yes/no' response accordingly. If the answer is 'yes,' GPT for surface engineering will generate a reply based on the relevant information.

Which library does GPT for surface engineering use?

Scispace:

GPT for surface engineering does not specify a specific library. The paper focuses on the use of custom data-driven GPT models that are fine-tuned with specialized domain knowledge in thermal spray technology. It emphasizes the importance of incorporating a comprehensive and up-to-date collection of documents pertaining to the subject, including research articles published in reputable journals related to thermal spray technology, materials science, and surface engineering. The paper suggests that academic databases or specialized databases like ASM International's can be employed to search for relevant articles. However, it does not mention a specific library that is used for implementing GPT models in the context of surface engineering.

Human response:

GPT for surface engineering uses a library called LlamaIndex. More specifically, it utilizes both an indexing framework and an evaluation framework within LlamaIndex. The indexing framework is employed to index articles on thermal spray, thereby aiding in information retrieval. The evaluation component serves to assess whether the model's confidence in a given answer to a query is high or not.

What are the differences between vector store index and tree index methods?

Scispace:

- **Vector Store Index:** This method stores nodes along with their corresponding embeddings in a vector space, enabling efficient similarity-based retrieval of data. It is particularly useful for large-scale datasets where semantic similarity between the query and nodes is important. It efficiently retrieves articles with similar content and context, making it helpful for users looking for articles related to a specific topic or research area.
- **Tree Index Method:** This method is suitable when documents have a hierarchical structure, such as categories, subcategories, or topics. It improves search efficiency and helps users explore related articles in a structured manner. It organizes data based on the hierarchical relationships between nodes, allowing for more structured exploration of related articles.
- Both methods have their strengths and can be used based on specific requirements, available resources, and the desired level of complexity and interpretability. As research in natural language processing progresses, it will be important to develop hybrid solutions that combine the strengths of both methodologies.

Human response:

Vector store index and tree store index are different methods used for indexing data in information retrieval. The Vector store index is designed to store nodes along with their corresponding embeddings in a vector space. These embeddings are compact representations that capture the semantic meaning of the text. On the other hand, the Tree Index method employs tree-like data structures, which can be used if the documents have a hierarchical structure, such as categories, subcategories, or topics.

Both methods have their pros and cons. The Vector Index is useful for large datasets and excels in locating data that are semantically similar to the query. Conversely, the Tree Index is more suitable for data with hierarchical structures, like the categories or topics found in scientific articles. However, the study concluded that for GPT in surface engineering, the Vector store index method performed better.

What is the objective of this paper?

Scispace:

The objective of this paper is to investigate the abilities of ChatGPT and its potential for robotics applications. It aims to demonstrate how ChatGPT can be applied to robotics tasks by creating a high-level function library and using prompt engineering techniques. The paper also evaluates ChatGPT's performance in executing various robotics tasks, ranging from logical and geometrical reasoning to complex scenarios like aerial navigation, manipulation, and embodied agents. Additionally, the paper introduces a collaborative platform called PromptCraft for researchers to share examples of effective prompting strategies in the robotics context. It also releases a simulation tool that integrates ChatGPT with Microsoft AirSim for easier experimentation with ChatGPT in robotics.

Human response:

The objective of the paper is to explore the potential of ChatGPT for robotics applications. The paper proposes design principles and prompting strategies that can be used for robotics applications with ChatGPT. It also introduces a collaborative open-source platform, PromptCraft, where researchers can work together to provide examples of both positive and negative prompting strategies.

Which version of GPT is ChatGPT for robotics based on?

Scispace:

ChatGPT for robotics is based on the GPT-3 model. GPT-3, or Generative Pre-trained Transformer 3, is a state-of-the-art language model developed by OpenAI. It is known for its ability to generate human-like text responses based on given prompts. ChatGPT for robotics leverages the capabilities of GPT-3 to enable natural language interaction between humans and robots. By integrating ChatGPT with robotics, researchers aim to create robots that can understand and respond to natural language commands and queries, making human-robot interaction more intuitive and user-friendly.

Human response:

The paper shows examples of using the ChatGPT web interface.

What is the proposed pipeline for effectively using ChatGPT in robotics?

Scispace:

Proposed Pipeline for Effectively Using ChatGPT in Robotics:

- Create a high-level function library that allows ChatGPT to handle robotics applications by converting user intent from natural dialog into a logical chaining of high-level function calls. This library can be linked to the actual APIs for different platforms, enabling ChatGPT to adapt to multiple form factors and scenarios.
- Implement prompt engineering techniques to enhance ChatGPT's performance in solving robotics tasks. These techniques involve designing effective prompts and dialog strategies that enable ChatGPT to effectively execute various types of robotics tasks, including logical reasoning, geometrical reasoning, aerial navigation, manipulation, and embodied agents.
- Leverage ChatGPT's ability to engage in free-form dialog and capture long context, allowing users to interact with the model naturally and provide behavior corrections. This flexibility enables fluid interactions and behavior corrections based on user feedback.

Human response:

The paper proposes a four-step pipeline for effectively using ChatGPT in robotics: 1) Create a high-level robot function library that is descriptive and specific to the scenario; 2) Build a prompt for ChatGPT that states the objective and identifies allowed functions from the library; 3) Evaluate the code generated by ChatGPT for quality and safety; 4) Deploy the final code onto the robot after iterations.

How can non-technical users evaluate the code given by the ChatGPT?

Scispace:

Non-technical users can evaluate the code given by ChatGPT in the following ways:

- **Readability and understandability:** Non-technical users can assess the code's readability and understandability by checking if it is well-documented, uses clear variable names, and follows standard coding conventions.
- **Testing and validation:** Users can evaluate the code by running it and observing the output. They can compare the results with their expectations and verify if the code behaves as intended.
- **User feedback and reviews:** Non-technical users can seek feedback from other users who have experience with the code. They can read reviews or join online communities to gather insights and opinions about the code's reliability and effectiveness.
- **Consultation with experts:** Users can consult with technical experts or developers who have expertise in the specific programming language or domain. Experts can provide guidance and evaluate the code based on their knowledge and experience.
- **Code analysis tools:** Non-technical users can utilize code analysis tools or linters to identify potential issues or vulnerabilities in the code. These tools can provide automated feedback on code quality and adherence to best practices.

Human response:

The paper suggests that non-technical users can stay in the loop to evaluate ChatGPT's code output, either through direct inspection or by using a simulator. If needed, the user can use natural language to provide feedback to ChatGPT on the answer's quality and safety.

What are some prompting strategies of ChatGPT in the context of robotics?

Scispace:

Prompting strategies of ChatGPT in the context of robotics include:

- Clarification prompts: ChatGPT can ask for clarification when faced with ambiguous or unclear instructions from the user, improving the accuracy of its responses.
- Suggestion prompts: ChatGPT can provide suggestions or options to the user, helping them make decisions or choose from a set of possibilities.
- Error handling prompts: ChatGPT can handle errors and failures gracefully by providing appropriate responses or requesting further assistance when needed.
- Confirmation prompts: ChatGPT can ask for confirmation from the user before taking certain actions, ensuring that the user agrees with the proposed course of action.
- Fallback prompts: ChatGPT can use fallback prompts when it encounters unknown or out-of-scope queries, guiding the user to provide more relevant information or redirecting them to appropriate resources.

Human response:

The paper discusses several prompting techniques in the field of robotics:

- Free-Form Natural Language Dialogue: Users can communicate with ChatGPT using natural, conversational language;
- Code Prompting: Users can directly prompt the model to generate specific pieces of code;
- Extensible Markup Language (XML) Tags: XML is a markup language used to encode documents in a format that is both human-readable and machine-readable;
- Closed-Loop Reasoning: An interactive, iterative approach where the model's output might be evaluated, feedback is provided, and the model adjusts its reasoning or actions accordingly.

Geography:

GeoGPT: Understanding and Processing Geospatial Tasks through An Autonomous GPT [49]

What is the objective of GeoGPT?

Scispace:

- The objective of GeoGPT is to lower the threshold for non-professional users to solve geospatial tasks by integrating the semantic understanding ability inherent in large language models (LLMs) with mature tools within the GIS community.
- GeoGPT aims to understand the demands of non-professional users based on input natural language descriptions and then think, plan, and execute defined GIS tools to output effective results.
- The framework of GeoGPT connects an LLM with various mature tools within the GIS community, allowing it to automatically choose appropriate GIS tools for geospatial data collection, spatial data analysis, and mapping.
- GeoGPT can be extended to various tasks by equipping it with more GIS tools, providing an effective way to develop next-generation GIS.

Human response:

GeoGPT attains natural language descriptions from non-professionals to select and execute appropriate geographical tools, delivering effective outcomes.

Which version of GPT is GeoGPT based on?

Scispace:

GeoGPT is based on the gpt-3.5-turbo version of the Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) model.

Human response:

GeoGPT is based on GPT-3.5.

How does GeoGPT work? Give an example.

Scispace:

- GeoGPT is an LLM-based framework that automates the process of solving geospatial tasks by integrating the understanding ability of large language models with mature tools within the GIS community.
- It uses the Langchain framework to connect the gpt-3.5-turbo LLM with various GIS tools, allowing it to choose appropriate tools for geospatial data collection, spatial data analysis, and mapping.
- GeoGPT understands the demands of non-professional users based on natural language descriptions and then thinks, plans, and executes defined GIS tools to produce effective results.
- An example of how GeoGPT works is in the task of spatial query. It successfully interprets the demand by using the Buffer tool for two datasets, the Intersect tool to obtain areas within both datasets, and the Clip tool to obtain specific data within those areas.
- GeoGPT's framework can be extended by adding more GIS tools, providing an effective way to develop next-generation GIS applications.

Human response:

In GeoGPT, an LLM is employed to understand the demands of non-professional users based on input natural language descriptions. The LLM will interpret and reason about the demands implied in the text through an iterative chain-of-thought process. It selects appropriate tools from the GIS Tool Pool to address geospatial tasks sequentially.

For instance, the user can request GeoGPT to locate a restaurant in a specific city, generate a virtual map of a road, or pinpoint a location using latitude and longitude. An example the paper discusses is how GeoGPT assists users in finding hotels near supermarkets and subway stations in a city. LLMs deconstruct this task into distinct steps: load the hotel data, load the subway station data, load the supermarket data, determine the vicinity of the subway station, ascertain the neighboring range of the supermarket, identify the overlap of these two areas, and subsequently locate hotels within this intersection. For each step, LLMs will select the most suitable geospatial tool.

How is the performance of GeoGPT?

Scispace:

- GeoGPT demonstrates strong performance in understanding and processing geospatial tasks, making it accessible for non-professional users to solve complex problems.
- It leverages the capabilities of large language models (LLMs) like gpt-3.5-turbo to reason and call externally defined GIS tools, enabling autonomous execution of geospatial data collection, processing, and analysis based on natural language instructions.
- GeoGPT has been validated through several cases, including geospatial data crawling, spatial query, facility siting, and mapping, showcasing its effectiveness in delivering accurate results.
- In the task of spatial query, GeoGPT successfully interprets user demands and utilizes appropriate GIS tools like the Buffer, Intersect, and Clip tools to obtain desired outcomes.
- The framework of GeoGPT can be further extended by incorporating more GIS tools, offering a promising approach to develop next-generation GIS applications.

Human response:

The paper highlights GeoGPT's performance through case studies encompassing geospatial data crawling, facility siting, spatial queries, and mapping. While GeoGPT demonstrates the potential to understand user demands based on non-professional descriptions and enables users to perform various tasks, concerns persist. A main concern is that LLMs can sometimes be inconsistent, which may compromise the stability of GeoGPT's analysis. Additionally, LLMs might confuse certain geospatial terminologies with other similar terms. Furthermore, GeoGPT might select a "hallucinated" tool that doesn't exist in the tool lists. Despite its successes, challenges remain in aligning and harmonizing external tools with domain-specific knowledge and LLMs. Furthermore, considerable effort is required to manage GeoGPT's uncertainties.

What are the external tools that are integrated into GeoGPT?

Scispace:

- GeoGPT integrates various mature tools within the GIS community to automate the process of solving geospatial tasks.
- The framework includes a GIS tool pool that contains a range of GIS tools to support geospatial applications.
- These tools are designed to handle geospatial data collection, processing and analysis, and visualization.
- Some examples of the tools used in GeoGPT include the Buffer tool for locating areas close or away from specific entities, the Intersect tool for selecting candidate areas that satisfy multiple requirements, and the Erase tool for further selection.
- The specific tools used in GeoGPT are not explicitly mentioned in the provided sources, but they are designed to be easily extended by adding more tools to cater to different demands.

Human response:

The external tools utilized by GeoGPT are categorized as follows:

- **Data Collection Tools:** These are designed to gather geospatial data, such as Points of Interest (POI), road networks, and remote sensing images.
- **Data Loader Tools:** These tools assist in locally loading various types of geospatial datasets.
- **Spatial Analysis Tools:** These tools perform various spatial analyses on geospatial data.
- **Tools for RS Image Processing:** These are focused on the processing and manipulation of remote-sensing images.
- **Cartography Tool:** This is used for creating and drawing maps with geospatial data.

Geotechnical Parrot Tales (GPT): Harnessing Large Language Models in geotechnical engineering [50]

What is the objective of ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering?

Scispace:

- The objective of ChatGPT in geotechnical engineering is to harness the full potential of large language models (LLMs) like OpenAI's ChatGPT to revolutionize the industry and improve geotechnical applications.
- ChatGPT can be integrated into geotechnical engineering workflows to streamline work and develop sustainable and resilient infrastructure systems for the future.
- It aims to provide a natural language interface for complex tasks such as data analysis and design in geotechnical engineering.
- Prompt engineering is important in mitigating the risks of false outputs and hallucinations generated by GPT models, ensuring accurate and valuable responses.
- Context-specific search engines are being developed to enhance the accuracy and relevance of ChatGPT's responses in geotechnical engineering.

Human response:

The authors aim to introduce a 'calculator of words' for geotechnical engineering, with the goal of speeding up both design and research in the field.

Which version of GPT is ChatGPT in geotechnical engineering based on?

Scispace:

ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering is based on OpenAI's ChatGPT, a large language model (LLM) that has the potential to revolutionize the industry. The specific version of GPT used for ChatGPT in geotechnical engineering is not mentioned in the provided sources. However, it is important to note that ChatGPT is a variant of the GPT model developed by OpenAI. The focus of the sources is on the application and potential of ChatGPT in geotechnical engineering, rather than the specific version of GPT it is based on. The sources discuss the challenges and pitfalls associated with LLMs, the importance of prompt engineering to mitigate risks, and the development of context-specific search engines to enhance accuracy and relevance. By integrating ChatGPT into geotechnical engineering workflows, professionals can streamline their work and develop sustainable infrastructure systems for the future.

Human response:

ChatGPT in geotechnical engineering is based on GPT-3.5.

How does ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering work? Give an example.

Scispace:

- ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering harnesses the power of large language models (LLMs) like OpenAI's ChatGPT to provide a natural language interface for complex tasks in geotechnical engineering.
- It integrates GPT into geotechnical engineering workflows, allowing professionals to streamline their work and develop sustainable infrastructure systems for the future.
- Prompt engineering is crucial in mitigating the risks of false outputs and hallucinations generated by GPT models, ensuring accurate and valuable responses.
- Context-specific search engines are being developed to enhance the accuracy and relevance of ChatGPT's responses in geotechnical engineering. These search engines consider the context of the query to provide more precise answers.
- By leveraging the capabilities of ChatGPT, geotechnical engineers can perform tasks such as data analysis and design using natural language, making the process more efficient and accessible.

Example:

- User Query: "What are the key factors to consider in slope stability analysis?"
- ChatGPT Response: "In slope stability analysis, some key factors to consider are the soil properties, slope geometry, groundwater conditions, and external loads. The soil properties, such as shear strength and cohesion, play a significant role in determining the stability of the slope. The geometry of the slope, including its height, angle, and shape, also affects stability. Groundwater conditions, such as the water table level and pore water pressure, can influence slope stability by affecting the effective stress in the soil. External loads, such as surcharge loads or seismic forces, need to be considered as they can induce additional stresses on the slope."

Human response:

ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering united the GPT with high-level function libraries (actions tools) through iterative chain-of-thought processes. ChatGPT is to solve the problem step by step, using domain-specific tools.

For example, a user wants to calculate the maximum load on the clay layer of the Tower of Pisa. In the first cycle, ChatGPT will extract soil parameters from the relevant report using a tool called 'Soil Report.' Next, it will employ a tool named 'Bearing Capacity' to calculate the bearing capacity based on the given soil parameters. Finally, ChatGPT will calculate the maximum load using another "Max load" tool.

How is the performance of ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering?

Scispace:

Performance of ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering:

- ChatGPT has the potential to revolutionize the geotechnical engineering industry by providing a natural language interface for complex tasks.
- The sources do not provide specific information about the performance metrics or evaluations of ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering.
- However, the sources highlight the importance of prompt engineering in mitigating risks associated with false outputs and hallucinations generated by GPT models, ensuring accurate and valuable responses.
- The development of context-specific search engines aims to enhance the accuracy and relevance of ChatGPT's responses in geotechnical engineering.
- By integrating ChatGPT into geotechnical engineering workflows, professionals can streamline their work and develop sustainable infrastructure systems for the future.

Human response:

The article gave an example where ChatGPT was used in geotechnical engineering to determine the Tower of Pisa's maximum load. However, no additional evaluation was mentioned.

What are the external tools that are integrated into ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering?

Scispace:

External tools integrated into ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering:

- The provided sources do not mention any specific external tools that are integrated into ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering.
- However, the sources highlight the importance of prompt engineering in mitigating risks associated with false outputs and hallucinations generated by GPT models, ensuring accurate and valuable responses.
- The development of context-specific search engines is mentioned, which aims to enhance the accuracy and relevance of ChatGPT's responses in geotechnical engineering.
- These search engines consider the context of the query to provide more precise answers.
- By leveraging the capabilities of ChatGPT, geotechnical engineers can perform tasks such as data analysis and design using natural language, making the process more efficient and accessible.

Human response:

The external tools that are integrated into ChatGPT for geotechnical engineering include Calculator, Bearing Capacity, Foundation Dimension, Soil Report, Max Load, and Shape Factor.