

specific knowledge, offering valuable insights to experts.

Knowledge injection has emerged as a crucial technique for empowering LLMs to produce dependable responses and grasp domain-specific knowledge (Lewis et al., 2020; Guu et al., 2020). Applying *Domain-specific Retrieval-Augmented Knowledge (DRAK)* to real-world scenarios poses main challenges: 1) *improving LLMs’ proficiency in leveraging background knowledge for content generation that meets specific criteria*; 2) *comprehensively evaluating DRAK variants for optimal benefit*. Essentially, these challenges revolve around the fundamental issue of LLMs’ understanding of domain-specific knowledge. Taking the field of biomolecules as an example, we have designed a non-parametric, training-free domain knowledge injection framework as a general paradigm to address the inherent domain-specific QA challenges in practical LLM applications. Additionally, we analyze the advantages of injecting different forms of DRAK (**DRAK-S**, **DRAK-K**) and elucidate how to achieve optimal augmentation of domain knowledge by integrating domain knowledge into the model’s reasoning using knowledge-aware prompts and golden label induction, thereby enhancing its effectiveness and accuracy in domain-specific applications and providing tangible support for experts.

The main contributions are as follows:

- **DRAK Impact Analysis:** Highlights the distinct impacts of various DRAK forms in improving LLMs’ mastery of knowledge, particularly in understanding and responding accurately to domain-specific queries.
- **Knowledge Graphs Integration:** Explores integrating DRAK with knowledge graphs (KGs) in the biomolecular domain, employing structured non-parametric knowledge injection to enhance LLMs’ understanding and generative capabilities in specialized areas.
- **Universal Application Framework:** Presents a scalable and adaptable framework for implementing domain-expert LLMs in areas characterized by distinct syntactic structures (such as molecules, materials, and chemistry), leading to significant advancements in inference capabilities.

2 Methodology

2.1 Definition of Concepts and Problems

Knowledge Graph Definition. Following Chen et al. (2024), a KG is defined as $\mathcal{G} = \{(e, r, e') | e, e' \in \mathcal{E}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ consists of entities \mathcal{E} , relations \mathcal{R} , and triples (e, r, e') representing factual relationships. It provides a structured background knowledge base for molecular tasks, enriching LLMs with domain-specific information.

Problem Definition. We propose DRAK as $DRAK = \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, integrated into the objective \mathcal{F} , defined as $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$, aiming to enhance LLMs’ understanding and accuracy in molecular tasks. Here, \mathcal{Q} represents the set of queries, \mathcal{G} denotes the background knowledge, \mathcal{A} is the set of answers, \mathcal{T} is the set of molecular tasks, \mathcal{L} indicates the collection of LLMs, \mathcal{D} is the set of *DRAK*, and \mathcal{O} is the output set for tasks. This unified framework seeks to utilize DRAK to deepen the comprehension and improve the predictive accuracy of Large Language Models in tasks related to the molecular domain, successfully addressing the shortcomings of conventional approaches.

2.2 Prompt Construction

Instructions \mathcal{I} and Input \mathcal{M} . For AI-aided generation in biomolecules, we leverage PubMed (White, 2020) scientific abstracts to create open-ended question prompts \mathcal{I} . Consistent with Mol-Instruction (Fang et al., 2023a), gpt-3.5-turbo is adopted to enrich the form of Instruction. For input \mathcal{M} , we integrate external knowledge and \mathcal{M} into prompt through templates.

Demonstration \mathcal{D} . Initially, we utilize DRAK to acquire a demonstration set \mathcal{D} tailored for each test case. To explore the sensitivity of LLMs towards molecular strings, we design two distinct variants of in context learning (ICL) demonstrations. The aim is to determine the LLM’s ability to accurately understand molecular structures. Each demonstration (x_i, y_i) is augmented with gold label data from the training set, abstracted into a new set (x_i, y_i, r_i) , designated as \mathcal{D}_i , where x_i and y_i represent the input and output, respectively, and r_i embodies the inferred association between them.

2.3 Retrieval-Augmented Knowledge

Retrieval-augmented techniques, leveraging textual similarity embeddings close to test samples, enhance consistency and robustness across diverse




Figure 2: **The overview of our proposed framework DRAK. Part 1:** Top-K demonstration retrieval for enhanced molecular insight. **Part 2:** Gold-label induced reasoning.

scenarios (Liu et al., 2022). However, LLMs lack sufficient accuracy in predicting entities with subtle structural differences, such as chemical molecular formulas represented by SMILES (Weininger, 1988) or SELFIES (Krenn et al., 2020). To address this challenge, we consider two core aspects: 1) The format of prompts inspired by chain-of-thought (Wei et al., 2022). We incorporate textual reasoning chains to introduce external knowledge for generating reliable and specific reasoning processes. 2) Inspired by triple structures in KG (Zhang et al., 2023c), we enhance prompts with structured features. We examine the positive influences of utilizing *Sentence-centric Knowledge Injection* (**DRAK-S**) and *KG-driven Knowledge Injection* (**DRAK-K**) on LLMs, as detailed in §2.3.1 and §2.3.2, respectively.

2.3.1 Sentence-Centric Knowledge Injection

Acknowledging the pivotal role that molecular entity information plays in sentence comprehension, we have formulated a **DRAK-S** strategy for the integration of entity-level weakly labeled information to facilitate context reconstruction. Utilizing the task of text-described molecular generation as an illustrative example, envisage the scenario: *The molecule is a natural product discovered in *Cytophaga*, with data accessible*. This scenario aligns with the molecule’s SELFIES structural representation: “[C][C][Branch1][C][C][Branch1][Ri

ng1][C][S][S]”. This is transmuted into a natural language assertion: *The molecular structure corresponding to the aforementioned description is:* “[C][C][Branch1][C][C][Branch1][Ring1][C][S][S]”. The objective is to assess the adeptness of LLMs in proficiently comprehending and parsing a confluence of natural textual content and molecular representations. Specifically, by introducing quotation-marked SELFIES (Krenn et al., 2020) strings, we provide LLM with intuitive cues for molecular structure. This method preserves both the sentence’s semantic integrity and the accuracy of information related to entity pairs. Finally, the vector similarity of sentence embedding is calculated to achieve accurate knowledge recall.

We set the similarity score threshold filtering (SF) method to recall the gold label data closest to the query, and the formula is as follows:

$$SF = \underset{i=1}{\operatorname{argmax}} \{ \operatorname{sim}(x, x_i) \} \quad (1)$$

where $\operatorname{sim}(x, x_i) \geq \theta$. The formula identifies the instance i maximizing the similarity $\operatorname{sim}(x, x_i)$, provided that this similarity exceeds a predefined threshold θ . This ensures that only the data closely aligned with the query, in terms of content and context, is considered for recall, enhancing the precision of our retrieval process.

2.3.2 KG-driven Knowledge Injection

Reasoning within existing knowledge systems is adeptly captured through induction and deduction, mirroring the human approach of employing mental maps for problem-solving (Chen et al., 2021, 2024). The triplet structure of knowledge bases (*subject, relation, object*) methodically formalizes this reasoning process. Unlike sentence-level knowledge representation, **DRAK-K** approach endeavors to furnish LLMs with data prompts that are more structured and meticulously refined. Entity matching retrieval is performed through querying and task instructions, recalling the top-k most relevant KG, delineated as a list of triplets \mathcal{G}_k .

For example, for the triplet (“*The molecule is a natural product found in Cytophaga with data available.*”, “*description guided molecule design*”, “[C][C][Branch1][C][C][Branch1][Ring1][C][S][S]”), the instruction \mathcal{I} “*Generate a molecule based on this description.*” is mapped to “*description guided molecule design*”. The knowledge graph \mathcal{G} is transformed into structured background context for LLMs, clearly describing the task-relevant molecular structures and their application contexts.

2.4 Language Model Reasoning

We employ a vector database to construct expert knowledge priors, safeguarding domain-specific data’s security and confidentiality. This endows the LLM with non-parametric memory capabilities, and it is easily portable and updatable.

Gold Label-Induced. We explored a gold-label-induced (GLI) reasoning method aimed at providing LLMs with a carefully curated set of a few demonstrations by extracting the most similar examples from the training set for each test input based on data distribution (Wan et al., 2023).

Specifically, for each test input x , we define a similarity function $sim(x, x_i)$, where x_i is an instance in the training set, and sim quantifies the similarity between two instances. We select k instances $\{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ik}\}$ exhibiting the highest similarity scores and furnish their corresponding gold labels $\{y_{i1}, y_{i2}, \dots, y_{ik}\}$ as essential background information to the LLMs. This process can be represented by the following formula:

$$GLI(x) = \underset{\{x_{i1}, \dots, x_{iN}\} \subseteq X}{\operatorname{argmax}} \sum_{j=1}^N sim(x, x_{ij}) \quad (2)$$

where X represents the set of all instances in the training set, and $GLI(x)$ represents the set of k most similar instances retrieved for input x .

This method enables Large Language Models (LLMs) to utilize exact, contextually pertinent gold label data prior to formulating responses, thereby guaranteeing both precision and contextual appropriateness. The GLI method stands out in knowledge-dense areas such as legal consulting and medical diagnosis by refining LLM responses through similarity matching against a constrained training dataset. DRAK enhances LLMs by conducting top-k gold standard data similarity retrieval using directive and input pairs $\langle inst, Inp \rangle$, aiding in producing accurate and contextually relevant answers while minimizing hallucinations.

3 Experiment

3.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets and Metrics. We leverage the Mol-Instructions (Fang et al., 2023a) training set as gold-label data, evaluating model performance across tasks with 1k test samples from its test set.

To assess molecular understanding, we employ BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), ROUGE (Lin, 2004), and METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005) metrics for evaluating output quality against reference answers. In molecule generation, validity is checked with RDKit (Landrum et al., 2013), followed by exact match comparisons. Given the variability of molecular structures, we also measure molecular similarity using RDKit/MACCS/Morgan fingerprints (Tanimoto, 1958; Schneider et al., 2015; Durant et al., 2002), alongside Levenshtein (Li and Liu, 2007) and BLEU scores. For molecular property prediction, MAE (mean absolute error) quantifies prediction accuracy of continuous values.

Implementation Details. The DRAK injection strategy is applied to a Mol-Instructions (Fang et al., 2023a) fine-tuned LLaMA-7B model, operating efficiently on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU, demonstrating its practicality for resource-constrained environments. Leveraging the LangChain framework, we have refined our retrieval strategy with a threshold-based filtering mechanism, calibrated at a threshold of 0.8, to meticulously extract the top-k most relevant examples housed within our ChromaDB vector database. Regarding the realization of KG, we use networkx framework to build and manage complex knowl-

MODEL	EXACT \uparrow	BLEU \uparrow	LEVENSHTEIN \downarrow	RDk FTS \uparrow	MACCS FTS \uparrow	MORGAN FTS \uparrow	VALIDITY \uparrow
Description-guided Molecule Design							
<i>Specialist Models</i>							
TEXT+CHEM T5	0.097	0.508	41.819	0.352	0.474	0.353	0.721
MOLT5	0.112	0.546	38.276	0.400	0.538	0.295	0.773
<i>LLM Based Generalist Models</i>							
ALPACA	0.000	0.004	51.088	0.006	0.029	0.000	0.022
BAIZE	0.000	0.006	53.796	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.017
CHATGLM	0.000	0.004	53.157	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.046
LLAMA	0.000	0.003	59.864	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.026
VICUNA	0.000	0.006	60.356	0.006	0.001	0.000	0.011
GALACTICA	0.000	0.192	44.152	0.135	0.248	0.088	0.992
MOL-INSTRUCTIONS	0.002	0.345	41.367	0.231	0.412	0.147	1.000
DRak-S (ours)	0.049	0.392	35.726	0.341	0.497	0.235	1.000
DRak-K (ours)	0.104	0.515	32.641	0.455	0.600	0.326	1.000
Reagent Prediction							
<i>Specialist Models</i>							
TEXT+CHEM T5	0.000	0.225	49.323	0.039	0.186	0.052	0.313
<i>LLM Based Generalist Models</i>							
ALPACA	0.000	0.026	29.037	0.029	0.016	0.001	0.186
BAIZE	0.000	0.051	30.628	0.022	0.018	0.004	0.099
CHATGLM	0.019	0.019	29.169	0.017	0.006	0.002	0.074
LLAMA	0.000	0.013	28.040	0.037	0.001	0.001	0.001
VICUNA	0.000	0.003	27.948	0.038	0.002	0.001	0.007
GALACTICA	0.000	0.141	30.760	0.036	0.127	0.051	0.995
MOL-INSTRUCTIONS	0.044	0.224	23.167	0.237	0.364	0.213	1.000
DRak-S (ours)	0.023	0.450	25.223	0.187	0.245	0.187	1.000
DRak-K (ours)	0.049	0.487	22.87	0.238	0.331	0.207	1.000
Forward Reaction Prediction							
<i>Specialist Models</i>							
TEXT+CHEM T5	0.239	0.782	20.413	0.705	0.789	0.652	0.762
<i>LLM Based Generalist Models</i>							
ALPACA	0.000	0.065	41.989	0.004	0.024	0.008	0.138
BAIZE	0.000	0.044	41.500	0.004	0.025	0.009	0.097
CHATGLM	0.000	0.183	40.008	0.050	0.044	0.108	0.039
LLAMA	0.000	0.020	42.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.059
VICUNA	0.000	0.057	41.690	0.016	0.006	0.001	0.059
GALACTICA	0.000	0.468	35.021	0.156	0.257	0.097	0.946
MOL-INSTRUCTIONS	0.045	0.654	27.262	0.313	0.509	0.262	1.000
DRak-S (ours)	0.038	0.739	26.090	0.418	0.546	0.325	1.000
DRak-K (ours)	0.254	0.778	18.649	0.602	0.741	0.546	1.000
Retrosynthesis							
<i>Specialist Models</i>							
TEXT+CHEM T5	0.141	0.765	24.043	0.685	0.765	0.585	0.698
<i>LLM Based Generalist Models</i>							
ALPACA	0.000	0.065	41.989	0.004	0.024	0.008	0.138
BAIZE	0.000	0.044	41.500	0.004	0.025	0.009	0.097
CHATGLM	0.000	0.183	40.008	0.050	0.044	0.108	0.039
LLAMA	0.000	0.020	42.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.059
VICUNA	0.000	0.057	41.690	0.016	0.006	0.001	0.059
GALACTICA	0.000	0.452	34.940	0.167	0.274	0.134	0.986
MOL-INSTRUCTIONS	0.009	0.705	31.227	0.283	0.364	0.213	1.000
DRak-S (ours)	0.400	0.760	31.118	0.339	0.507	0.265	1.000
DRak-K (ours)	0.319	0.793	20.779	0.625	0.758	0.565	1.000

Table 1: Results of molecular generation tasks. These tasks encompass description-guided molecule design, reagent prediction, forward reaction prediction, and retrosynthesis.




Figure 3: Ablation Study of DRAK Across Different Knowledge Representation Formats




Figure 4: Results of molecular-description generation tasks. From top to bottom: DRAK-K, DRAK-S, Mol-Instructions.

edge structure, so that our model can effectively use structured knowledge to enhance reasoning ability.

3.2 Overall Results

We conducted a comprehensive comparison across six molecular tasks between Alpaca-LoRA (Tloen, 2023), Baize-7B (Xu et al., 2023), ChatGLM-6B (Zeng et al., 2023), LLama-7B (Touvron et al., 2023), Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023), Mol-Instructions (Fang et al., 2023a), and two variants of DRAK proposed by us.

DRAK-S utilizes sentence-level prompts, while DRAK-K uses a KG for structured prompting. Table 1 presents a comparison of DRAK-S and DRAK-K against benchmarks based on LLMs and expert models. 1) The DRAK-S and DRAK-K models consistently outperform various LLM-based benchmarks on metrics such as BLEU scores, molecular similarity, and exact match. DRAK-K demonstrated superior exact match scores compared to Mol-Instructions (Fang et al., 2023a)

Model	MAE ↓
<i>Property Prediction</i>	
Alpaca	322.109
Baize	261.343
ChatGLM	-
LLama	5.553
Vicuna	860.051
Galactica	0.568
Mol-Instructions	0.013
DRAK-S (Ours)	0.019
DRAK-K (Ours)	0.00096

Table 2: Results of molecular property prediction tasks.

across four molecular generation tasks, achieving improvements of $\uparrow 0.102$, $\uparrow 0.005$, $\uparrow 0.209$, and $\uparrow 0.310$, respectively. 2) Compared to specialized small models that compromise on generalizability, DRAK, as a general model, exhibits competitive molecular generation capabilities and even surpasses expert models in the Reagent Prediction task comprehensively. 3) The GLI inference strategy improves the model’s understanding in data-limited domains by enriching the context.

Similarly, DRAK exhibits remarkable capabilities in molecular understanding and property prediction. The property prediction outcomes depicted in Table 2 reveal DRAK-K’s significant reduction in MAE scores by two orders of magnitude relative to baseline models, decreasing from 0.013 to 0.00096, a reduction of $\downarrow 0.012$. In the molecular understanding task shown in Figure In the molecular understanding task illustrated in Figure 4, compared to the Mol-Instructions (Fang et al., 2023a), DRAK-K achieved increases of $\uparrow 0.363$, $\uparrow 0.278$, and $\uparrow 0.200$ in BLEU-2, Meteor, and ROUGE scores, respectively. The structured triplets of the KG help improve the model’s understanding of complex molecular structures.

In conclusion, DRAK combines retrieval-enhanced prompting and GLI strategy, excelling




Figure 5: Comparison of Description-guided Molecule Design and Chemical Reaction Task Results: (a) Demonstrates DRAK’s precision in molecular structure responses. (b-c) Highlight DRAK’s accurate generation of reaction-related compounds.




Figure 6: Comparison of molecular description generation task and property prediction results. (a) reveals DRAK’s caption aligning closely with the ground truth. The colored text represents the exact match between the output and the ground truth. (b) DRAK’s accuracy in property prediction.

in molecular tasks and highlighting its precision in complex domains.

3.3 Ablation Studies

Q1: Is the result consistent with better templates? Beyond our minimalist KG triplet template, we also explored KG representations in JSON format. Figure 3 (a) depicts this trend, demonstrating that changes in KG representation have a minimal impact on performance, maintaining competitive results overall. Notably, the use

of detailed templates does not always surpass minimalist templates, highlighting the sensitivity of LLMs to prompts.

Q2: Is the gold label improving the quality of RAK? Figure 3 (b) illustrates the retrieved labels at varying thresholds (0.5, 0.7, 0.8). As the threshold increases, vector retrieval brings back ICL examples with distributions that more closely resemble the test set. We observe a corresponding incremental enhancement in the model’s response quality and evaluation metric scores with the rising

threshold.

Q3: Is the result consistent with varying k ?

Contrary to conventional NLP tasks, Figure 3 (c) shows DRAK’s limited improvement in molecular insight with a minimal number of examples ($k = 1$). This may be due to the model’s tendency to overly rely on a single instance based on ICL, failing to flexibly address the diversity of molecular structures and functions. As the number of instances increases, the model begins to grasp the common structural features of molecules under the same data distribution by analyzing a broader range of instances. This indicates that by incorporating more gold-label instances, DRAK can guide LLMs to discern molecular structures’ common features, leading to high-quality responses.

3.4 Case Studies

Several examples of results across different tasks are illustrated in Figures 5 and 6. Figure 5 emphasizes the accuracy and comprehensiveness of DRAK in case studies involving description-guided molecule design, reagent prediction, and retrosynthesis prediction. The precise prediction of molecular reaction structures further demonstrates DRAK’s effective capture of the intricate relationships between molecules and their functionalities, validating its profound understanding of complex molecular structures. In Figure 6, part (a) showcases the molecule description generation task, where DRAK generates captions closely aligned with factual information, accurately identifying the molecular chemical structure (i.e., “*naphthoic acid with the carboxy group at position 2*”), functions (i.e., “*2-naphthoic acid, 1-hydroxy-2-naphthoate*”), and origins and production (i.e., “*microorganisms breaking down phenanthrene*”). Part (b) pertains to the property prediction task, wherein DRAK relatively accurately predicts the molecule’s *HOMO-LUMO* gap energies based on its structure. In comparison, the results produced by Mol-Instructions demonstrate substantial discrepancies from the factual values.

4 Related Work

4.1 Molecule-Related LLMs

LLMs fine-tuning has demonstrated significant potential in transforming interactions with complex molecular data (Zhang et al., 2023a,b; Hu et al., 2022). MolT5 (Edwards et al., 2022) illustrates LLMs’ ability for cross-modal translation,

molecular caption generation and text-driven design. Mol-Instructions (Fang et al., 2023a) employs SELFIES descriptors to develop biomolecular-specific datasets, equipping general-domain LLMs with biomolecular expertise. InstructMol (Cao et al., 2023), leveraging modality alignment strategies (Liu et al., 2023; Su et al., 2022), integrates 2D molecular graphs into LLMs with a pretrained encoder and cross-modal learning, bridging the gap between molecular structures and text. This fine-tuning often prioritizes output format mimicry over complex structure comprehension, limiting generalization and elevating “hallucination” risks. Conversely, our DRAK approach seamlessly integrates knowledge, blending parametric and non-parametric insights to effectively overcome these limitations.

4.2 Retrieval-Augmented Knowledge

LLMs falter in deep-knowledge domains such as open-domain QA and reasoning, hindered by insufficiently encoded implicit knowledge. The ICL mechanism avoids updating model parameters and improves performance with a few annotated examples (Dong et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2022, 2023). However, it struggles in fields like molecular science with unique linguistic structures. Our work addresses the challenges LLMs face in specialized fields like molecular science, where data often features unique syntax beyond natural language texts (Guo et al., 2023; Fang et al., 2022b, 2023c,b). Acknowledging LLMs’ proficiency with basic texts yet struggles with advanced expertise, our non-parametric DRAK strategy, encompassing template design, sample selection, and retrieval, adeptly navigates ICL limitations.

5 Conclusion

This study presents a non-parametric knowledge injection approach to bolster LLMs’ performance in the biomolecular sector, integrating domain-specific insights for a better understanding and application of biomolecular science. We analyzed the LLMs’ understanding of different forms of molecular data and their sensitivity to context through two prompting techniques. Demonstrated by significant enhancements in six molecular tasks within the Mol-Instructions dataset, our method highlights the benefits of tailored knowledge integration for LLMs in drug discovery and molecular studies.

Limitations

We introduce a new paradigm for molecular LLMs in question-answering, grounded in Domain-Specific Retrieval-Augmented Knowledge. However, “the light of science, though bright, is not without its flaws.” We acknowledge the necessity to discuss these potential limitations and constraints:

Dependence on External Databases and Tools: DRAK’s operation is intertwined with external databases (e.g., ChromaDB) and tools (e.g., RD-Kit, networkx). Any limitations, inaccuracies, or updates in these external resources directly impact DRAK’s performance. Ensuring the continuous accuracy and relevance of these tools and databases is crucial for maintaining DRAK’s effectiveness.

Adaptability to Rapidly Evolving Fields: The biomolecular field is rapidly evolving, with new discoveries and insights emerging regularly. DRAK’s current framework may not be agile enough to incorporate the latest research findings or changes in domain knowledge without significant updates or retraining, potentially leading to outdated or less accurate responses over time.

Generalization Across Domains: DRAK has been primarily tested and validated in the context of biomolecules. Its ability to generalize across other knowledge-intensive domains, such as physics, engineering, or even within subdomains of biology, remains to be thoroughly explored. Each domain has its unique challenges, terminologies, and data formats, which may require adaptations to the DRAK framework for optimal performance.

Data Bias and Representation: The model’s performance is inherently tied to the quality and diversity of the training data. Biases present in the datasets—such as overrepresentation of certain molecule types or underrepresentation of rare molecular structures—can lead to skewed model outputs, potentially impacting the reliability of generated molecules or predictions.

Bioengineering Misuse: The ability of DRAK to design new molecules and predict their functions could be exploited for the creation of harmful substances or bioweapons. Ensuring that such powerful capabilities are not misused is of utmost importance.

Mitigating Strategies

Regulated Access and Usage Monitoring: Implementing controlled access to DRAK for verified entities and monitoring usage patterns can help prevent misuse. Developing algorithms to detect and flag explorations into sensitive or potentially harmful domains is crucial.

Enhancing Data Quality and Diversity: Efforts should be made to curate and diversify the datasets used for training DRAK. This includes addressing biases and ensuring a broad representation of molecular structures to improve the model’s accuracy and generalizability.

Transparency in Model Development: Adopting practices that increase the transparency of the AI’s decision-making processes can enhance trust and reliability. This might involve developing more interpretable models or providing detailed documentation of the model’s training data and algorithms.

In conclusion, while DRAK presents a significant advancement in applying LLMs to the domain of biomolecules, moving forward with an awareness of its limitations and potential ethical implications is essential. By implementing robust measures to mitigate risks and ensure ethical use, the benefits of such technologies can be realized while minimizing potential harms.

References

- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: an automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *IEEValuation@ACL*, pages 65–72. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrew Blair-Stanek, Nils Holzenberger, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2023. Can GPT-3 perform statutory reasoning? In *ICAIL*, pages 22–31. ACM.
- He Cao, Zijing Liu, Xingyu Lu, Yuan Yao, and Yu Li. 2023. Instructmol: Multi-modal integration for building a versatile and reliable molecular assistant in drug discovery. *CoRR*, abs/2311.16208.
- Zhuo Chen, Jiaoyan Chen, Yuxia Geng, Jeff Z. Pan, Zonggang Yuan, and Huajun Chen. 2021. Zero-shot visual question answering using knowledge graph. In *ISWC*, volume 12922 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 146–162. Springer.
- Zhuo Chen, Yufeng Huang, Jiaoyan Chen, Yuxia Geng, Yin Fang, Jeff Z. Pan, Ningyu Zhang, and Wen Zhang.

2022. Lako: Knowledge-driven visual question answering via late knowledge-to-text injection. In *IJCKG*, pages 20–29. ACM.
- Zhuo Chen, Wen Zhang, Yufeng Huang, Mingyang Chen, Yuxia Geng, Hongtao Yu, Zhen Bi, Yichi Zhang, Zhen Yao, Wenting Song, Xinliang Wu, Yi Yang, Mingyi Chen, Zhaoyang Lian, Yingying Li, Lei Cheng, and Huajun Chen. 2023. Tele-knowledge pre-training for fault analysis. In *ICDE*, pages 3453–3466. IEEE.
- Zhuo Chen, Yichi Zhang, Yin Fang, Yuxia Geng, Lingbing Guo, Xiang Chen, Qian Li, Wen Zhang, Jiaoyan Chen, Yushan Zhu, Jiaqi Li, Xiaoze Liu, Jeff Z. Pan, Ningyu Zhang, and Huajun Chen. 2024. Knowledge graphs meet multi-modal learning: A comprehensive survey. *CoRR*, abs/2402.05391.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. *Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality*.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, Lei Li, and Zhifang Sui. 2023. A survey for in-context learning. *CoRR*, abs/2301.00234.
- Joseph L. Durant, Burton A. Leland, Douglas R. Henry, and James G. Nourse. 2002. Reoptimization of MDL keys for use in drug discovery. *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, 42(5):1273–1280.
- Carl Edwards, Tuan Manh Lai, Kevin Ros, Garrett Honke, Kyunghyun Cho, and Heng Ji. 2022. Translation between molecules and natural language. In *EMNLP*, pages 375–413. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yin Fang, Xiaozhuan Liang, Ningyu Zhang, Kangwei Liu, Rui Huang, Zhuo Chen, Xiaohui Fan, and Huajun Chen. 2023a. Mol-instructions: A large-scale biomolecular instruction dataset for large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2306.08018.
- Yin Fang, Ningyu Zhang, Zhuo Chen, Xiaohui Fan, and Huajun Chen. 2023b. Domain-agnostic molecular generation with self-feedback. *CoRR*, abs/2301.11259.
- Yin Fang, Qiang Zhang, Zhuo Chen, Xiaohui Fan, and Huajun Chen. 2022a. Knowledge-informed molecular learning: A survey on paradigm transfer. *CoRR*, abs/2202.10587.
- Yin Fang, Qiang Zhang, Haihong Yang, Xiang Zhuang, Shumin Deng, Wen Zhang, Ming Qin, Zhuo Chen, Xiaohui Fan, and Huajun Chen. 2022b. Molecular contrastive learning with chemical element knowledge graph. In *AAAI*, pages 3968–3976. AAAI Press.
- Yin Fang, Qiang Zhang, Ningyu Zhang, Zhuo Chen, Xiang Zhuang, Xin Shao, Xiaohui Fan, and Huajun Chen. 2023c. Knowledge graph-enhanced molecular contrastive learning with functional prompt. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–12.
- Suzanne Fergus, Michelle Botha, and Mehrnoosh Ostovar. 2023. Evaluating academic answers generated using chatgpt. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 100(4):1672–1675.
- Lingbing Guo, Weiqing Wang, Zhuo Chen, Ningyu Zhang, Zequn Sun, Yixuan Lai, Qiang Zhang, and Huajun Chen. 2023. Newton-cotes graph neural networks: On the time evolution of dynamic systems. *CoRR*, abs/2305.14642.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2020. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *ICML*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3929–3938. PMLR.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *CoRR*, abs/2311.05232.
- Mario Krenn, Florian Häse, AkshatKumar Nigam, Pascal Friederich, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. 2020. Self-referencing embedded strings (SELFIES): A 100% robust molecular string representation. *Mach. Learn. Sci. Technol.*, 1(4):45024.
- Greg Landrum et al. 2013. Rdkit: A software suite for cheminformatics, computational chemistry, and predictive modeling. *Greg Landrum*, 8:31.
- Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks. In *NeurIPS*.
- Yujian Li and Bi Liu. 2007. A normalized levenshtein distance metric. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 29(6):1091–1095.
- Youwei Liang, Ruiyi Zhang, Li Zhang, and Pengtao Xie. 2023. Drugchat: Towards enabling chatgpt-like capabilities on drug molecule graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2309.03907.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.

- Ji Lin, Jiaming Tang, Haotian Tang, Shang Yang, Xingyu Dang, and Song Han. 2023. AWQ: activation-aware weight quantization for LLM compression and acceleration. *CoRR*, abs/2306.00978.
- Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. What makes good in-context examples for gpt-3? In *DeeLIO@ACL*, pages 100–114. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shengchao Liu, Weili Nie, Chengpeng Wang, Jiarui Lu, Zhuoran Qiao, Ling Liu, Jian Tang, Chaowei Xiao, and Animashree Anandkumar. 2023. Multi-modal molecule structure-text model for text-based retrieval and editing. *Nat. Mac. Intell.*, 5(12):1447–1457.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *ACL*, pages 311–318. ACL.
- Chen Qian, Huayi Tang, Zhirui Yang, Hong Liang, and Yong Liu. 2023. Can large language models empower molecular property prediction? *CoRR*, abs/2307.07443.
- Nadine Schneider, Roger A. Sayle, and Gregory A. Landrum. 2015. Get your atoms in order - an open-source implementation of a novel and robust molecular canonicalization algorithm. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 55(10):2111–2120.
- Bing Su, Dazhao Du, Zhao Yang, Yujie Zhou, Jiang-meng Li, Anyi Rao, Hao Sun, Zhiwu Lu, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. A molecular multimodal foundation model associating molecule graphs with natural language. *CoRR*, abs/2209.05481.
- Taffee T Tanimoto. 1958. Elementary mathematical theory of classification and prediction.
- Tloen. 2023. Alpaca-lora. <https://github.com/tloen/alpaca-lora>.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurélien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *CoRR*, abs/2302.13971.
- Zhen Wan, Fei Cheng, Zhuoyuan Mao, Qianying Liu, Haiyue Song, Jiwei Li, and Sadao Kurohashi. 2023. GPT-RE: in-context learning for relation extraction using large language models. In *EMNLP*, pages 3534–3547. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *NeurIPS*.
- Jerry W. Wei, Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Dustin Tran, Albert Webson, Yifeng Lu, Xinyun Chen, Hanxiao Liu, Da Huang, Denny Zhou, and Tengyu Ma. 2023. Larger language models do in-context learning differently. *CoRR*, abs/2303.03846.
- David Weininger. 1988. Smiles, a chemical language and information system. 1. introduction to methodology and encoding rules. *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, 28(1):31–36.
- Jacob White. 2020. Pubmed 2.0. *Medical reference services quarterly*, 39(4):382–387.
- Canwen Xu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, and Julian J. McAuley. 2023. Baize: An open-source chat model with parameter-efficient tuning on self-chat data. In *EMNLP*, pages 6268–6278. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, Weng Lam Tam, Zixuan Ma, Yufei Xue, Jidong Zhai, Wenguang Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2023. GLM-130B: an open bilingual pre-trained model. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tianwei Zhang, Fei Wu, and Guoyin Wang. 2023a. Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey. *CoRR*, abs/2308.10792.
- Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tianwei Zhang, Fei Wu, and Guoyin Wang. 2023b. Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey. *CoRR*, abs/2308.10792.
- Yichi Zhang, Zhuo Chen, Yin Fang, Lei Cheng, Yanxi Lu, Fangming Li, Wen Zhang, and Huajun Chen. 2023c. Knowledgeable preference alignment for llms in domain-specific question answering. *CoRR*, abs/2311.06503.
- Yichi Zhang, Zhuo Chen, Wen Zhang, and Huajun Chen. 2023d. Making large language models perform better in knowledge graph completion. *CoRR*, abs/2310.06671.
- Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, Longyue Wang, Anh Tuan Luu, Wei Bi, Freda Shi, and Shuming Shi. 2023e. Siren’s song in the AI ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2309.01219.