

Open FinLLM Leaderboard: Towards Financial AI Readiness

Shengyuan Colin Lin*
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
USA
lins10@rpi.edu

Felix Tian†
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
USA
tianf2@rpi.edu

Keyi Wang‡
Columbia University
USA
kw2914@columbia.edu

Xingjian Zhao§
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
USA
zhaox8@rpi.edu

Jimin Huang
FinAI
Singapore
jimmin.huang@thefin.ai

Qianqian Xie
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut, USA
qianqian.xie@yale.edu

Luca Borella
Linux Foundation
New York, USA
luca.borella@finos.org

Matt White
GM of AI, Linux Foundation;
Executive Director, PyTorch
Foundation; UC Berkeley
Berkeley, USA

Christina Dan Wang
New York University Shanghai
Shanghai, China
christina.wang@nyu.edu

Kairong Xiao
Business School, Columbia University
New York, NY, USA
kx2139@columbia.edu

Xiao-Yang Liu Yanglet¶
Columbia University and Rensselaer
Polytechnic Institute
New York, NY, USA
XL2427@columbia.edu

Li Deng
Vatic Investments
New York, NY, USA
deng629@gmail.com




Figure 1: Overview of the open FinLLM leaderboard, from leaderboard, demos to financial AI readiness.

*Shengyuan Colin Lin worked as a RA at Columbia University during Fall 2024.

†Felix Tian contributed equally to this project.

‡Keyi Wang contributed equally to this project. She worked as a RA at Columbia University.

§Xingjian Zhao contributed equally to this project.

¶Corresponding author

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or

ABSTRACT

Financial large language models (FinLLMs) with multimodal capabilities are envisioned to revolutionize applications across business, finance, accounting, and auditing. However, real-world adoption

republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

ICAIF 24, Nov. 15, NY, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

requires robust benchmarks of FinLLMs' and agents' performance. Maintaining an open leaderboard of models is crucial for encouraging innovative adoption and improving model effectiveness. In collaboration with Linux Foundation and Hugging Face, we create an open FinLLM leaderboard, which serves as an open platform for assessing and comparing LLMs' performance on a wide spectrum of financial tasks. By democratizing access to advanced AI tools and financial knowledge, a chatbot or agent may enhance the analytical capabilities of the general public to a professional-level within a few months of usage. This open leaderboard welcomes contributions from academia, open-source community, industry, and stakeholders. In particular, we encourage contributions of new datasets, tasks, and models for continual update. Through fostering a collaborative and open ecosystem, we seek to ensure the long-term sustainability and relevance of LLMs and agents as they evolve with the financial sector's needs.

KEYWORDS

FinLLM, leaderboard, FinGPT, search agent, financial AI readiness,

ACM Reference Format:

Shengyuan Colin Lin, Felix Tian, Keyi Wang, Xingjian Zhao, Jimin Huang, Qianqian Xie, Luca Borella, Matt White, Christina Dan Wang, Kairong Xiao, Xiao-Yang Liu Yanglet, and Li Deng. 2024. Open FinLLM Leaderboard: Towards Financial AI Readiness. In *International Workshop on Multimodal Financial Foundation Models (MFFMs) at 5th ACM International Conference on AI in Finance (MFFM at ICAIF '24), November 14–17, 2024, Brooklyn, NY, USA*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 24 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn>. nnnnnnn

1 INTRODUCTION

Financial large language models (FinLLMs) with multimodal capabilities are rapidly advancing, poised to revolutionize a wide range of applications across business, finance, accounting, auditing, etc. FinLLM-enabled agents streamline XBRL file analysis [5], automating financial filings and enhancing transparency across financial processes. FinGPT Search Agents [12], based on FinGPT [9, 10, 23], help decision-makers retrieve financial information with verified sources. FinLLMs show promise in social network analysis, such as understanding online interactions during the GameStop short squeeze event [8]. These models can also improve credit scoring, fraud detection, and regulatory compliance [11, 20], enhancing risk assessments, fraud identification, and legal document processing in response to evolving regulatory demands [15, 16, 27]. More financial tasks can be found in [19].

Although FinLLMs have great potentials, there are several major challenges to be addressed. One of the most impactful issues is "hallucination" [7], where models generate plausible but inaccurate information. Unreliable performance is unacceptable when it comes to financial decision-making as it would imply serious risks. LLMs also struggle to meet the complex demands of financial professionals who require high levels of precision, reliability, and advanced capabilities in quantitative reasoning and contextual accuracy. Privacy-preserving of training data, testing data, and model weights is another critical issue. Addressing these limitations requires advancements in multimodal FinLLMs, which are essential for financial tasks such as trading, risk management, and regulatory compliance [3].

In order to continually develop and fine-tune open multimodal LLMs, a well-accepted leaderboard with a standardized evaluation framework and continuous maintenance is essential. However, existing benchmarks, such as FinBen [19] and FinanceBench [6], are mostly static and lack the momentum to continuously adapt to and evaluate emerging FinLLMs, thereby limiting their utility for real-world applications and innovations.

In this paper, we present a platform, *open FinLLM leaderboard*, that evaluates and compares FinLLMs and agents across a wide spectrum of financial tasks. It is a collaborative project with FinOS at Linux Foundation and Hugging Face. This leaderboard provides a transparent and standardized framework that ranks models based on their (multimodal) performance in areas such as financial reporting, sentiment analysis, and stock prediction. It also serves as an open platform for the community to evaluate, interact with, and compare FinLLMs in real-world scenarios. Beyond numeric scores, we showcase the integration with FinGPT Search Agent [12], a promising use case of personalized financial advisor. Users can explore, interact with, and compare models through demos. Additionally, we encourage contributions of models, datasets, and tasks to keep the leaderboard dynamic and responsive to the evolving needs of the financial industry. The leaderboard is continuously evolving, ensuring that it remains up-to-date with the latest FinLLMs and agents and adapts to more professional-level financial tasks. We aim to foster an open collaborative ecosystem for long-term maintenance by following the Model Openness Framework [17] ¹.

The open FinLLM leaderboard and associated codes are available on Hugging Face² and Github³, respectively. The open-source version of FinGPT Search Agent [12] is available on Github⁴.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews related works. Section 3 provides an overview of the open FinLLM leaderboard. Section 4 describes two types of demos, in particular, an app demo of FinGPT Search Agent and a web demo of model evaluations, as well as several use scenarios. Section 5 discusses the hurdles towards financial AI readiness.

2 RELATED WORKS

2.1 Development of FinLLMs

The proprietary BloombergGPT [18] was trained on a mixture of general data and financial data. It reported good performance on tasks such as sentiment analysis, question answering, and report summarization.

The open-source FinGPT [9, 10, 12, 23] aims to democratize access to FinLLMs and agents by offering an automatic data curation pipeline and releasing fine-tuned model weights. These FinLLMs emphasize transparency and community-driven development, offering open alternatives to proprietary models. Multimodal FinLLMs and agents, capable of integrating text, tables, and time-series data, have shown notable improvements in stock movement forecasting and risk management tasks [21].

¹<https://isitopen.ai/>

²<https://huggingface.co/spaces/finosfoundation/Open-Financial-LLM-Leaderboard>

³<https://github.com/finos-labs/Open-Financial-LLMs-Leaderboard>

⁴<https://github.com/YangletLiu/FinGPT-Search-Agent>

Model	Average	Average IE	Average TA	Average QA	Average TG	Average RM	Average FO
GPT-4	100	100	100	100	51.3	99.9	96.7
LLaMA3.1-70B	90.4	44.9	98.5	28.9	46.2	0	13.3
Qwen2-72B	85.3	35.9	90.8	0.7	56.4	0	90
Xuanyuan-70B	84.6	26.5	94.4	1.3	64.1	0	70
LLaMA3.1-8B	84.2	44.5	84.6	2.6	51.3	0	96.7
Gemini	78	63.3	88.8	40.1	100	100	90
ChatGPT	67.5	75.5	89.9	77.6	43.6	88	80
meta-llama/llama-2-70b	56.4	30.2	91.6	21.1	64.1	96.6	43.3
Duxiaoman-DI/XuanYuan-6B-Chat	56	31.8	80.9	7.2	61.5	97.9	56.7
Qwen/Qwen2-7B-Instruct	46.9	28.2	78.1	0	56.4	99.7	76.7
TheFinAI/finma-7b-full	42.2	35.9	70.6	15.8	33.3	95.9	60

Figure 2: A screenshot of the open FinLLM leaderborad. The top 11 models are ranked across 7 financial tasks.

2.2 Benchmarking FinLLMs

Various benchmarks have been developed to evaluate FinLLMs performance on financial tasks. One of the most comprehensive benchmarks is FinBen [19]. The FinBen spans 24 tasks across 46 datasets, providing a robust framework for evaluating models like GPT-4 and Gemini. Tasks within FinBen cover information extraction, question answering, stock trading, and so on. Another notable benchmark is FinanceBench [6] that focused on financial question answering and released 150 questions. Moreover, computational benchmarks such as FinGPT-HPC [10] aimed to improve the efficiency of pretraining and fine-tuning LLMs for financial applications, emphasizing GPU memory optimization and training scalability in high-performance computing environments. Although tasks covering can be considerably comprehensive at the moment, benchmarks like FinanceBench are static in nature and lack interactive capabilities. Therefore, less likely to be well accepted and continuously contribute to the community.

Our open FinLLM leaderboard is not designed to compete with these benchmarks. We are moving one step further to complement them by offering an open platform for continuous contributions. We encourage collaboration with the open source communities and benchmark developers and integrate FinBen [19] and FinanceBench [6], creating an evaluation ecosystem.

3 OPEN FINLLM LEADERBOARD

First, we provide an overview of the open FinLLM leaderboard. Then, we describe the financial tasks and testing pipeline.

3.1 Overview

Our work extends beyond setting up a leaderboard demo to provide benchmark results. In Fig. 1 shows three stages of this leaderboard. We believe that the leaderboard serves as a crucial step towards financial AI readiness.

The open FinLLM leaderboard is collecting research lab-contributed financial evaluation tasks tested with pretrained and finetuned models, such as ChatGPT, LLaMA3, and Gemini.

We have a demo hosted on HuggingFace and a FinGPT Search Agent application [12], which serves as an interactive layer where users can access the leaderboard, view model performances, and directly compare results in a side-by-side view.

This plan aims to identify financial AI readiness by delivering valuable insights for model deployment in real-world applications. It may help public users to identify models that outcompete others in certain financial tasks, giving a reliable standard for users choosing appropriate FinLLMs to address their specific needs. As a result, we can have a robust, AI-ready framework that empowers financial professionals with the right tools to enhance decision-making and operational efficiency.

3.2 Financial Tasks with Multimodal Data

We compare FinLLMs across multiple task categories including information extraction (IE), textual analysis (TA), question answering (QA), text generation (TG), risk management (RM), forecasting (FO) and Decision-Making (DM). It provides a comprehensive evaluation on tasks with multimodal data, such as text, tables, numerical data, and structured formats like XBRL. A screenshot of the scores is shown in Fig. 2.

The open FinLLM leaderboard enables users to view and compare top-performing models. As shown in Fig. 3, users have the flexibility to filter and reorder the displayed information by selecting specific categories and tasks. The current 42 financial datasets are organized into seven categories, as given in Table 1.

- **Information Extraction:** Involves transforming unstructured financial data into structured formats, such as extracting entities or identifying relationships in financial agreements. It is essential for automating information retrieval of financial documents, such as SEC 10K filings.
- **Textual Analysis:** Involves evaluating how well LLMs quantify sentiment, classify financial news, or identify argumentative structures, which are crucial for market sentiment analysis.
- **Question Answering:** Involves evaluating models on their ability to answer complex financial queries, particularly involving numerical reasoning or document comprehension.

Table 1: Financial tasks in the open FinLLM leaderboard.

Category	Tasks
Information Extraction (IE)	Named Entity Recognition (NER), Relation Extraction, Causal Classification.
Textual Analysis (TA)	Sentiment Analysis, Hawkish-Dovish Classification, Argument Unit Classification.
Question Answering (QA)	Answering financial questions from datasets like FinQA and TATQA.
Text Generation (TG)	Summarization of financial texts (e.g., reports, filings).
Risk Management (RM)	Credit Scoring, Fraud Detection, evaluating financial risks.
Forecasting (FO)	Stock Movement Prediction based on financial news and social media.
Decision-Making (DM)	Simulating decision-making tasks, e.g., M&A transactions, trading tasks.




Figure 3: Example of task selection, allowing users to browse tasks under different financial categories.

- **Text Generation:** Involves summarization tasks focus on generating coherent, concise representations of financial documents. It is important for creating reports or summaries from lengthy financial articles.
- **Risk Management:** Involves predicting credit risk or detecting fraudulent behavior, which is critical in assessing the likelihood of default or fraud.
- **Forecasting:** Involves tasks such as stock movement prediction which challenge models to anticipate market trends based on financial data. Effective forecasting has a direct impact on financial decision-making.
- **Decision-Making:** Involves tasks that pertain to trading decisions or M&A deal completeness and the ability to simulate and support decision-making in financial environments.

Users can easily explore these categories and customize the displayed results based on their interests, ensuring relevant and practical insights for financial analysis, as shown in Fig. 3.

3.3 Testing Pipeline

Fig. 4 is an overview of our testing pipeline. We applies a zero-shot evaluation setting on testing expert-validated datasets, assessing models in multimodal settings across various financial tasks. Models are compared fairly based on their ability to handle unseen tasks in finance. The evaluation code is available On Github ⁵.

The following popular models were evaluated in the current pipeline: GPT-4 (standard version) [1], LLaMA 3.1 (both 8B and 70B versions) [4], Gemini [2], Qwen2 (72B and 7B-Instruct versions) [22], Xuanyuan-70B [26].

Testing pipeline:

⁵<https://github.com/finos-labs/Open-Financial-LLMs-Leaderboard>

- **Model downloading:** Models are either downloaded from Huggingface or accessed via APIs.
- **Preprocessing and tokenization:** Financial documents are tokenized to meet each model’s format and token limit requirements.
- **Zero-shot evaluation:** Models are evaluated without prior fine-tuning on the task-specific datasets, focusing on their generalization ability in financial contexts.
- **Expert-validated datasets:** The datasets are selected and validated by financial professionals, ensuring their relevance to real-world financial applications.
- **Metric calculation and normalization:** Each model’s performance is measured across different metrics based on task requirements (Accuracy, F1 Score, ROUGE, BERTScore, MCC, etc.). For fair comparison, all scores are normalized into the range [0, 100] using min-max scaling:

$$\bar{S} = \frac{S - \min}{\max - \min} \times 100, \quad (1)$$

where S is the raw score, and $[\min, \max]$ is the original range. For example, a score of 0 in $[-3, 3]$ normalizes to 50, while 0.5 in $[0, 1]$ also normalizes to 50.

- **Ranking:** After normalization, models are ranked based on their scores across different tasks, providing an aggregate performance metric for comparison.

Evaluation metrics. The models’ performance is measured using the following metrics:

- **Accuracy:** Used for Credit Scoring and Hawkish-Dovish Classification tasks.
- **F1 score:** Used for Sentiment Analysis, Named Entity Recognition (NER), and Relation Extraction tasks.
- **ROUGE score:** Used for summarization task, measuring the quality of generated text by comparing it with reference summaries.
- **BERTScore:** Measures the similarity between the generated and reference summaries at a more granular, contextual level.
- **Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC):** Used in binary classification tasks, such as Fraud Detection and Credit Scoring.

4 DEMOS AND USE SCENARIOS

We present two types of demos for users to explore, utilize, and compare FinLLM models in various use scenarios.




Figure 4: Testing pipeline currently used in the FinLLM leaderboard.




Figure 5: Demo of FinGPT Search Agent [12]: users could check information sources.

4.1 App Demo: FinGPT Search Agent

The FinGPT Search Agent [12] demonstrates advanced capabilities in financial data retrieval and analysis by leveraging Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG). RAG integrates real-time information retrieval into the generative process, enabling the model to incorporate relevant, up-to-date data from sources such as Yahoo Finance, Bloomberg, or local documents like PDFs and Excel sheets [28]. Fig. 5 illustrates the FinGPT Search Agent’s capability of performing RAG and online search, ensuring that its responses are enriched with up-to-date and most relevant financial information.

Fig. 6 shows a side-by-side comparison mode of two selected models from the open FinLLM leaderboard. Both models utilize the

same set of verifiable sources, enabling users to directly compare their results. This integration not only allows for a comparative analysis using performance metrics from the open FinLLM leaderboard but also facilitates source verification, ensuring that the generated responses are grounded in reliable, up-to-date information. The demo provides a hands-on experience, allowing users to assess the strengths and weaknesses of different models in real-world financial contexts.

Side-by-Side Comparison Mode. Fig. 6 showcases FinGPT search agent’s side-by-side comparison feature [12], displaying responses from Model 1 and Model 2 to the prompt, "How is the world of finance going today?". This format enables users to qualitatively assess differences in response style, depth, and relevance, providing insights beyond traditional evaluation scores. While standard metrics like accuracy offer limited insights, our open-box evaluation allows users to explore model outputs directly. By presenting responses side-by-side, FinGPT’s leaderboard goes “beyond the scores,” helping users evaluate practical aspects such as clarity, factual accuracy, and relevance in real-world contexts. This approach opens the black box of model evaluation, aligning metrics with real-world utility.

Fig. 9 demonstrates the unique workflow of the Open Financial LLM Leaderboard. Beyond presenting task-specific scores, it includes a powerful side-by-side comparison feature. This functionality allows users to:

- Select two models to compare.
- Provide a single test input to both models.
- Observe and evaluate the outputs generated by the models side by side.

4.2 Web Demo

The open FinLLM leaderboard demo, hosted on Huggingface with support from the Linux Foundation, provides users an intuitive way to interact with a variety of financial tasks and an easy-to-navigate environment for evaluating financial language models. Users can select tasks from multiple categories, such as Information Extraction, Risk Management, and Forecasting, and assess the performance of various models across these tasks. Fig. 3 provides a screenshot of the task selection interface.

Once a task is selected, users can view a comprehensive table summarizing model performance using relevant metrics. This setup




Figure 6: The side-by-side comparison mode of FinGPT Search Agent [12]. Both Model #1 and Model #2 respond to the prompt "How is the world of finance going today?".

enables direct comparisons across different models and tasks, helping users identify the most suitable models for their specific needs. Fig. 2 illustrates an example of the result table, presenting the performance metrics for easy comparison and reference.

4.3 Use Scenarios

The open FinLLM leaderboard would potentially benefit the following financial applications. Here, we provide exploration and analysis of real-world use scenarios, inspired by [24].

4.3.1 Refining Questions for Legal Consultations. FinLLMs can help users refine their inquiries before meeting with legal counsel, leading to significant time and cost savings. By generating focused and precise questions in advance, clients reduce consultation time, thereby enhancing the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of legal interactions. On the service provider side, lawyers benefit from streamlined case preparation, allowing for the rapid identification

of pertinent cases and regulations, which ultimately enhances productivity. This approach can be generalized to other domains, including medical consultations, exam preparation, and the analysis of records. An illustrative example of this application is provided in Appendix Fig. 14.

4.3.2 General Public vs. LLM-Assisted Financial Document Analysis.

FinLLMs empower the general public to comprehend complex financial documents, such as earnings reports or regulatory filings, with a level of proficiency comparable to that of financial professionals. By simplifying, summarizing, and contextualizing information, these models enable users to make more informed decisions. Whether analyzing investment opportunities or assessing corporate financial health, FinLLMs help demystify intricate financial data, thereby bridging the knowledge gap between professionals and non-specialists. An illustrative example is provided in appendix Fig. 17

4.3.3 Simplifying Financial Analysis for Everyday Users. Platforms such as Yahoo Finance, Bloomberg, The Wall Street Journal, Business Insider, MarketWatch, and CNBC frequently present vast and often overwhelming amounts of financial information. FinLLMs assist users by extracting key data points and insights, effectively addressing questions such as, 'What are the most critical elements on this page to consider if I am evaluating potential investments?' This functionality not only saves users time but also enhances their comprehension of complex financial content, thereby empowering more informed investment decisions. An illustrative example of this application is provided in Appendix Fig. 17

5 TOWARDS FINANCIAL AI READINESS

Our goal would be to build an open community that pushes the financial AI ready for real-world applications. In this section, we discuss critical aspects and how this leaderboard and the surrounding community will contribute to FinLLMs' readiness.

5.1 Evaluating Financial Performance

Financial AI readiness requires FinLLM models that not only perform technically well but also integrate with existing workflows, provide useful insights, and comply with industry regulations. The open FinLLM leaderboard assesses how models perform on financial tasks like risk management, sentiment analysis, and regulatory compliance. These evaluations help developers and practitioners select models for deployment and identify aspects to be improved.

By including a range of tasks that reflect real financial challenges, this leaderboard ensures models are capable of handling financial analytical problems, not just standard text tasks. This supports the potential integration of models into financial decision-making processes, such as investment analysis, compliance checks, and automated reporting.

5.2 Revealing Model Limitations: Hallucinations and Interpretability

Accuracy and reliability are crucial in terms of financial applications. However, A major challenge existed is the risk of "hallucinations," where models produce incorrect or misleading information. Affecting by AI generated misinformation, people tend to make flawed investment decisions or misunderstandings of regulations [7].

To identify whether AI is hallucinating, we include tests focused on interpretability and reliability specifically for financial services. After we evaluate models on tasks where precision is critical, we can help financial institutions identify and reduce risks. In the future, stakeholders and financial institutions can deploy models fitting well on their demands by assessing between model evaluation results.

5.3 Ethical Considerations and Transparency

High ethical standards is also essential for AI to be a part of financial decision-making. In this case, the open FinLLM leaderboard encourages transparency, fairness, and ethical compliance in deploying financial AI by providing a specialized evaluation framework in financial sector [13].

Our zero-shot evaluation method tests models on new tasks, simulating the real-world financial scenarios where models usually

given tasks without observing from examples. This approach can reveal a model's actual abilities and limitations, therefore building trust among financial institutions, regulators, and the public. The leaderboard offers transparent evaluations and can helps organizations make informed decisions and meeting regulatory and ethical standards when using AI.

5.4 Future Research

Multimodal capabilities [25]: For financial AI readiness, models need to handle different types of data, such as text, figures, tables, time-series data, and alternative data. The leaderboard will keep evolving to meet new challenges, through community involvement and continuous updates.

GPU optimization for inference: To provide personalized financial advices [12] (running locally on personal devices), it is important to reduce GPU memory consumption and response time. LoRA fine-tuning is practically useful for adapting a general purpose model to a personalized version, such as the ongoing project FinLoRA [14], while quantization into 8 bit or 4 bits is an effective technique that greatly reduce GPU memory consumption [10].

Zero-Knowledge Proofs (ZKPs): The privacy concern is critical in business and finance, while the inference process of our leaderboard is no exception. One the one hand, close-source models require the protection of model weights and training datasets (possible other artifacts). ZKPs provide a verifiable auditing process for newly released model weights. On the other hand, we expect to include evaluation results on proprietary testing datasets. ZKPs allow authors to publish such results along with the generated proof-file, without revealing information of the testing dataset.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Shengyuan Colin Lin, Felix Tian, Xingjian Zhao, and Xiao-Yang Liu Yanglet acknowledge the support from NSF IUCRC CRAFT center research grant (CRAFT Grant 22017) for this research. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent the views of NSF IUCRC CRAFT. Shengyuan Colin Lin, Keyi Wang, and Xiao-Yang Liu Yanglet acknowledge the support from Columbia's SIRS and STAR Program, The Tang Family Fund for Research Innovations in FinTech, Engineering, and Business Operations.

REFERENCES

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [2] Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, et al. 2023. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805* 1 (2023).
- [3] Han Ding, Yinhe Li, Junhao Wang, and Hang Chen. 2024. Large Language Model Agent in Financial Trading: A Survey. *arXiv 2408.06361* (2024).
- [4] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [5] Shijie Han, Haoqiang Kang, Bo Jin, Xiao-Yang Liu, and Steve Yang. 2024. XBRL-Agent: Leveraging Large Language Models for Financial Report Analysis. *ACM International Conference on AI in Finance* (2024).
- [6] Pranab Islam, Anand Kannappan, Douwe Kiela, Rebecca Qian, Nino Scherrer, and Bertie Vidgen. 2023. FinanceBench: A New Benchmark for Financial Question Answering. *arXiv 2311.11944* (2023).

- [7] Haoqiang Kang and Xiao-Yang Liu. 2023. Deficiency of large language models in finance: An empirical examination of hallucination. In *I Can't Believe It's Not Better Workshop: Failure Modes in the Age of Foundation Models (NeurIPS)*.
- [8] Shengyuan Lin, Keyi Wang, and Xiao-Yang Liu. 2024. Analyzing Cascading Outbreak of GameStop Event: A Practical Approach Using Network Analysis and Large Language Models. *ACM International Conference on AI in Finance* (2024).
- [9] Xiao-Yang Liu, Guoxuan Wang, Hongyang Yang, and Daochen Zha. 2023. Data-centric FinGPT: Democratizing Internet-scale data for financial large language models. *Workshop on Instruction Tuning and Instruction Following, NeurIPS* (2023).
- [10] Xiao-Yang Liu, Jie Zhang, Guoxuan Wang, Weiqing Tong, and Anwar Walid. 2024. FinGPT-HPC: Efficient Pretraining and Finetuning Large Language Models for Financial Applications with High-Performance Computing. *arXiv 2402.13533* (2024).
- [11] Yuqi Nie, Yaxuan Kong, Xiaowen Dong, John M. Mulvey, H. Vincent Poor, Qingsong Wen, and Stefan Zohren. 2024. A Survey of Large Language Models for Financial Applications: Progress, Prospects and Challenges. *arXiv 2406.11903* (2024).
- [12] Felix Tian, Ajay Byadgi, Daniel Kim, Daochen Zha, Kairong Xiao, and Xiao-Yang Liu. 2024. Customized FinGPT Search Agents Using Foundation Models. *ACM International Conference on AI in Finance* (2024).
- [13] Ngozi Samuel Uzougbo, Chinonso Gladys Ikegwu, and Adefolake Olachi Adewusi. 2024. Legal accountability and ethical considerations of AI in financial services. *GSC Advanced Research and Reviews* 19, 02 (2024), 130–142.
- [14] Dannong Wang, Daniel Kim, Bo Jin, Xingjian Zhao, Tianfan Fu, Steve Yang, and Xiao-Yang Liu. 2024. FinLoRA: Finetuning Quantized Financial Large Language Models Using Low-Rank Adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.11378* (2024).
- [15] Keyi Wang, Sarah Huang, Charlie Shen, Kaiwen He, Felix Tian, Jaisal Patel, Christina Dan Wang, Kairong Xiao, and Xiao-Yang Liu. 2024. Professional Readiness of LLMs in Financial Regulations?. In *International Workshop on Multimodal Financial Foundation Models, ACM ICAIF*.
- [16] Keyi Wang, Jaisal Patel, Charlie Shen, Daniel Kim, Andy Zhu, Alex Lin, Luca Borella, Cailean Osborne, Matt White, Steve Yang, et al. 2024. A Report on Financial Regulations Challenge at COLING 2025. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.11159* (2024).
- [17] Matt White, Ibrahim Haddad, Cailean Osborne, Xiao-Yang Liu Yanglet, Ahmed Abdelmonsef, and Sachin Varghese. 2024. The model openness framework: Promoting completeness and openness for reproducibility, transparency and usability in Artificial Intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13784* (2024).
- [18] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhjanjan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. 2023. BloombergGPT: A Large Language Model for Finance. *arXiv 2303.17564* (2023).
- [19] Qianqian Xie, Weiguang Han, Zhengyu Chen, Ruoyu Xiang, Xiao Zhang, Yueru He, Mengxi Xiao, Dong Li, Yongfu Dai, Duanyu Feng, Yijing Xu, Haoqiang Kang, Ziyang Kuang, Chenhan Yuan, Kailai Yang, Zheheng Luo, Tianlin Zhang, Zhiwei Liu, Guojun Xiong, Zhiyang Deng, Yuechen Jiang, Zhiyuan Yao, Haohang Li, Yangyang Yu, Gang Hu, Jiajia Huang, Xiao-Yang Liu, Alejandro Lopez-Lira, Benyou Wang, Yanzhao Lai, Hao Wang, Min Peng, Sophia Ananiadou, and Jimin Huang. 2024. FinBen: A Holistic Financial Benchmark for Large Language Models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), Special Track on Datasets and Benchmarks* (2024).
- [20] Qianqian Xie, Weiguang Han, Xiao Zhang, Yanzhao Lai, Min Peng, Alejandro Lopez-Lira, and Jimin Huang. 2023. PIXIU: A Large Language Model, Instruction Data and Evaluation Benchmark for Finance. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), Special Track on Datasets and Benchmarks* (2023).
- [21] Qianqian Xie, Dong Li, Mengxi Xiao, Zihao Jiang, Ruoyu Xiang, Xiao Zhang, Zhengyu Chen, Yueru He, Weiguang Han, Yuzhe Yang, Shunian Chen, Yifei Zhang, Lihang Shen, Daniel Kim, Zhiwei Liu, Zheheng Luo, Yangyang Yu, Yupeng Cao, Zhiyang Deng, Zhiyuan Yao, Haohang Li, Duanyu Feng, Yongfu Dai, VijayaSai Somasundaram, Peng Lu, Yilun Zhao, Yitao Long, Guojun Xiong, Kaleb Smith, Honghai Yu, Yanzhao Lai, Min Peng, Jianyun Nie, Jordan W. Suchow, Xiao-Yang Liu, Benyou Wang, Alejandro Lopez-Lira, Jimin Huang, and Sophia Ananiadou. 2024. Open-FinLLMs: Open Multimodal Large Language Models for Financial Applications. *arXiv 2408.11878* (2024).
- [22] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. 2024. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671* (2024).
- [23] Hongyang Yang, Xiao-Yang Liu, and Christina Dan Wang. 2023. FinGPT: Open-Source Financial Large Language Models. *Symposium on FinLLM, IJCAI* (2023).
- [24] Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Kevin Lin, Jianfeng Wang, Chung-Ching Lin, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. 2023. The Dawn of LLMs: Preliminary Explorations with GPT-4V(ision). *arXiv:2309.17421 [cs.CV]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.17421>
- [25] Xiao-Yang Liu Yanglet and Li Deng. 2024. Multimodal Financial Foundation Models (MFFMs): Progress, Prospects, and Challenges. *International Workshop on Multimodal Financial Foundation Models (MFFMs) at 5th ACM International Conference on AI in Finance (MFFM at ICAIF '24)*, (2024).
- [26] Xuanyu Zhang and Qing Yang. 2023. Xuanyuan 2.0: A large chinese financial chat model with hundreds of billions parameters. In *ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 4435–4439.
- [27] Huaqin Zhao, Zhengliang Liu, Zihao Wu, Yiwei Li, Tianze Yang, Peng Shu, Shaochen Xu, Haixing Dai, Lin Zhao, Gengchen Mai, Ninghao Liu, and Tianming Liu. 2024. Revolutionizing Finance with LLMs: An Overview of Applications and Insights. *arXiv 2401.11641* (2024).
- [28] Penghao Zhao, Hailin Zhang, Qinhan Yu, Zhengren Wang, Yunteng Geng, Fangcheng Fu, Ling Yang, Wentao Zhang, Jie Jiang, and Bin Cui. 2024. Retrieval-augmented generation for ai-generated content: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19473* (2024).

Table 2: Overview of financial tasks, evaluation metrics, and dataset sizes.

Category	Dataset	Task	Evaluation Metric	Test Size
IE	NER	Named Entity Recognition	Entity F1	980
IE	FiNER-ORD	Named Entity Recognition	Entity F1	1080
IE	FinRED	Relation Extraction	F1, Entity F1	1068
IE	SC	Causal Classification	F1, Entity F1	864
IE	CD	Causal Detection	F1, Entity F1	226
IE	FNXL	Numeric Labeling	F1, EM Accuracy	318
IE	FSRL	Textual Analogy Parsing	F1, EM Accuracy	97
Total IE				4633
TA	FPB	Sentiment Analysis	F1, Accuracy	970
TA	FiQA-SA	Sentiment Analysis	F1	1173
TA	TSA	Sentiment Analysis	F1, Accuracy	561
TA	Headlines	News Headline Classification	Avg F1	11412
TA	FOMC	Hawkish-Dovish Classification	F1, Accuracy	496
TA	FinArg-ACC	Argument Unit Classification	F1, Accuracy	969
TA	FinArg-ARC	Argument Relation Classification	F1, Accuracy	690
TA	MultiFin	Multi-Class Classification	F1, Accuracy	546
TA	MA	Deal Completeness Classification	F1, Accuracy	500
TA	MLESG	ESG Issue Identification	F1, Accuracy	300
Total TA				17617
QA	FinQA	Question Answering	EM Accuracy	1147
QA	TATQA	Question Answering	F1, EM Accuracy	1670
QA	Regulations	Long-Form QA	ROUGE, BERTScore	200
QA	ConvFinQA	Multi-Turn QA	EM Accuracy	1490
Total QA				4507
TG	ECTSum	Text Summarization	ROUGE, BERTScore, BARTScore	495
TG	EDTSum	Text Summarization	ROUGE, BERTScore, BARTScore	2000
Total TG				2495
FO	BigData22	Stock Movement Prediction	Accuracy, MCC	1470
FO	ACL18	Stock Movement Prediction	Accuracy, MCC	27053
FO	CIKM18	Stock Movement Prediction	Accuracy, MCC	4967
Total FO				33490
RM	German	Credit Scoring	F1, MCC	1000
RM	Australian	Credit Scoring	F1, MCC	690
RM	LendingClub	Credit Scoring	F1, MCC	13453
RM	ccf	Fraud Detection	F1, MCC	11392
RM	ccfraud	Fraud Detection	F1, MCC	10485
RM	polish	Financial Distress Identification	F1, MCC	8681
RM	taiwan	Financial Distress Identification	F1, MCC	6819
RM	ProtoSeguro	Claim Analysis	F1, MCC	11904
RM	travelinsurance	Claim Analysis	F1, MCC	12665
Total RM				77089
DM	FinTrade	Stock Trading	CR, SR, DV, AV, MD	3384

A BENCHMARK DATASETS

This section provides an overview of the current financial tasks in the open FinLLM leaderboard.

Table 2 provides an overview of the datasets, tasks, evaluation metrics, and test sizes, while Table 3 provides the corresponding sources.

A.1 Insights

The categorization of datasets offers several important takeaways for the financial industry, regulators, and AI researchers.

A.1.1 Holistic Evaluation for Industry Applications. The open FinLLM leaderboard covers seven tasks: categories—Information Extraction (IE), Textual Analysis (TA), Question Answering (QA), Text Generation (TG), Risk Management (RM), Forecasting (FO), and

Table 3: Financial tasks, datasets, and sources.

Category	Dataset	Source
IE	NER	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-ner
IE	FiNER-ORD	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-finer-ord
IE	FinRED	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-finred
IE	SC	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-causal20-sc
IE	CD	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-cd
IE	FNXL	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-fnxl
IE	FSRL	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-fsrl
TA	FPB	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/en-fpb
TA	FiQA-SA	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-fiqasa
TA	TSA	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-fiqasa
TA	Headlines	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-headlines
TA	FOMC	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-fomc
TA	FinArg-ACC	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-finarg-ecc-auc
TA	FinArg-ARC	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-finarg-ecc-arc
TA	MultiFin	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-es-multifin
TA	MA	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-ma
TA	MLESG	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-mlesg
QA	FinQA	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-finqa
QA	TATQA	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-tatqa
QA	Regulations	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-regulations
QA	ConvFinQA	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-convfinqa
TG	ECTSum	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-ectsum
TG	EDTSum	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-edtsum
FO	BigData22	https://huggingface.co/datasets/TheFinAI/en-forecasting-bigdata
FO	ACL18	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-sm-acl
FO	CIKM18	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-sm-cikm
RM	German	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-german
RM	Australian	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/flare-australian
RM	LendingClub	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/cra-lendingclub
RM	ccf	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/cra-ccf
RM	ccfraud	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/cra-ccfraud
RM	Polish	https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChanceFocus/cra-polish
RM	Taiwan	https://huggingface.co/datasets/TheFinAI/cra-taiwan
RM	ProtoSeguro	https://huggingface.co/datasets/TheFinAI/en-forecasting-portoseguro
RM	Travel Insurance	https://huggingface.co/datasets/TheFinAI/en-forecasting-travelinsurance
DM	FinTrade	https://huggingface.co/datasets/TheFinAI/FinTrade_train

Decision-Making (DM). Such a broad coverage allows industry professionals to identify models suited for specific applications, such as sentiment analysis (TA) for market predictions or risk management (RM) for credit scoring and fraud detection.

A.1.2 Takeaway from Initial Evaluations. Initial results show that general-purpose models like GPT-4 often underperform in financial-specific tasks such as Relation Extraction (IE) or Financial QA (QA). In contrast, models fine-tuned on financial datasets, such as FinLLaMA, perform better in tasks like stock movement forecasting (FO), suggesting that domain-specific training is critical for financial tasks. This highlights the need for organizations to focus on models tailored to financial data for high-stakes decision-making.

A.1.3 Implications for Regulators. Regulatory bodies, such as central banks or the SEC, could use the open FinLLM leaderboard’s

evaluations to assess AI models in financial institutions. The leaderboard provides a transparent way to evaluate models for tasks like fraud detection (RM) and compliance monitoring (IE), helping regulators establish baseline performance for AI models in finance. The zero-shot evaluations also ensure models are tested on unseen tasks, providing realistic assessments for evolving market conditions.

A.1.4 AI Readiness in Finance. From a research perspective, the open FinLLM leaderboard’s comprehensive evaluations highlight areas where financial LLMs excel and where further improvements are needed. The diverse financial tasks will encourage the development of AI models that are close to real-world adoption.

B FEATURES

This section describes the features of the open FinLLM leaderboard.




Figure 7: From user experiences to AI readiness: The iterative process of evaluating FinLLMs through the open leaderboard.

B.1 Beyond Scores: Understanding Performance

Our team’s extensive experience in the financial Large Language Model (LLM) sector has inspired us to take the next step in advancing this field: the development of the Open Financial LLM Leaderboard. While traditional benchmarks provide useful numerical scores for various tasks, they often fail to explain what these scores mean in practice, especially for users unfamiliar with financial-specific tasks. This realization motivated us to design a benchmark that not only delivers scores but also provides deeper insights into model performance and usability.

B.1.1 From Experience to the Open Financial LLM Leaderboard. Fig. 7 highlights our journey from leveraging user experiences to advancing AI readiness in financial applications. User feedback has been critical in shaping this project, allowing us to create a leaderboard that evaluates FinLLMs not only on their task-specific performance but also on their readiness for real-world financial tasks.

B.1.2 Moving Beyond Scores. Traditional benchmarks typically provide tables of task-specific scores, as shown in Fig. 8. While these scores are useful for comparing models, they often lack context and practical interpretation for non-expert users. For example, users unfamiliar with financial tasks like sentiment analysis or compliance monitoring may struggle to understand how these scores relate to their specific needs.

To address this gap, we designed the Open Financial LLM Leaderboard to go beyond just delivering numerical scores. It provides insights into how models perform under specific financial scenarios, enabling users to connect scores to real-world applications.

This feature enables users to move beyond the surface-level scores and dive into qualitative aspects of LLM performance, such as accuracy, relevance, and susceptibility to errors like hallucinations or misinformation. For instance, users can identify whether a model correctly interprets financial terms or generates erroneous outputs in high-stakes scenarios.

B.1.3 Opening the Black-Box of Financial Task Evaluation. The inclusion of side-by-side comparisons helps us move beyond the black-box nature of traditional benchmarks. It allows for the identification of nuanced performance issues, such as:

- Error patterns related to hallucinations or misinformation.
- Strengths and weaknesses in interpreting financial documents.
- Practical usability for specific financial tasks like risk management or decision-making.




Figure 8: Integration of additional benchmarks: Traditional task-specific scores provide a foundation but may lack interpretability for non-expert users.




Figure 9: Evaluation workflow in the Open Financial LLM Leaderboard. Users can compare models side by side for deeper insights into their qualitative performance.

By integrating these features, the Open Financial LLM Leaderboard not only evaluates model accuracy but also enhances transparency, providing users with actionable insights for model selection and application.

C USE SCENARIOS

C.1 (Simple) Definitions and Financial Events

C.1.1 Definitions. Financial concepts are not easy to understand. A chatbot could democratize financial knowledge to users with little background.

LLMs can be a reliable source for general public to understand financial terms and definitions. Fig. 10 show how a chatbot explains: “What is a Ponzi Scheme?” The LLM responds with a definition and characteristics, where texts highlighted in green match the official definition of Ponzi scheme. Fig. 11 shows another example

Question: What is Ponzi Scheme?

GPT-4o:
A Ponzi scheme is a fraudulent investment operation where returns are paid to earlier investors using the capital from new investors, rather than from legitimate business profits or investment gains. The scheme creates the illusion of a sustainable and profitable business, enticing more people to invest. However, it relies entirely on a constant influx of new money to remain operational.

Key Characteristics:

- High Returns with Little Risk:** Promises unusually high or consistent returns regardless of market conditions.
- Lack of Transparency:** Operations or investment strategies are often vague or not disclosed.
- Dependence on New Investors:** Needs a continuous flow of new investors to pay earlier ones. If recruitment slows, the scheme collapses.
- No Legitimate Revenue Source:** Returns are not generated from actual business activities or investments.

How It Ends:

Ponzi schemes are unsustainable and typically collapse when:

- The pool of new investors dries up.
- Existing investors demand withdrawals in large numbers.
- Regulatory authorities or whistleblowers expose the fraud.

How to Avoid a Ponzi Scheme:

- Research the Business:** Ensure it has a legitimate and transparent revenue source.
- Be Wary of High Returns:** Question any investment offering unusually high and consistent profits.
- Verify Licenses:** Check if the company and individuals are registered with financial authorities.
- Avoid Pressure to Recruit:** Be cautious if returns depend on bringing in new investors.

Always approach investment opportunities with skepticism and perform due diligence.

Figure 10: A simple Q&A example where a user asks “What is a Ponzi Scheme?” Text highlighted in Green indicates correct information provided by GPT-4o.

with “Flash Crash”. The LLM provides an explanation, where texts highlighted in green match widely accepted definitions.

C.1.2 Understanding Financial Events. LLMs can explain financial events and help public users understand the overall significance of the event. In Fig. 12, the user asks about the GME event, and the LLM explains the event in ways matching the general understanding of the event’s cause and impact. Correct explanations are highlighted in green. However, when it comes to numbers, it inaccurately gives a peak price, shown in red. The actual peak price was around 95\$. While LLMs can accurately convey the core narrative of complex events, they could sometimes fail to give reliable numerical details.

C.2 Efficient Legal Consultation Prep

We illustrate how using an LLM model to refine questions before a legal consultation, which facilitates more focused and efficient communication with lawyers, and thus helps users save time and reduce costs.

Question: What is Flash Crash?

GPT-4o:
A Flash Crash is a very sudden and severe drop in the price of one or more financial assets, such as stocks, bonds, or commodities, that occurs over a very short period (usually minutes or seconds) and often rebounds just as quickly. Flash crashes are typically caused by automated trading systems, such as high-frequency trading (HFT) algorithms, and can disrupt financial markets significantly.

Key Features of a Flash Crash:

- Rapid and Extreme Price Decline:**
 - The price of an asset or group of assets drops dramatically within minutes or even seconds.
 - The drop often exceeds normal market fluctuations.
- Quick Recovery:**
 - Prices typically rebound shortly after the crash, sometimes returning to their previous levels within minutes.
- Low Trading Volume:**
 - Flash crashes often occur in conditions of low liquidity, where there aren't enough buyers or sellers to stabilize prices.
- Automated Trading:**
 - Flash crashes are often linked to algorithmic trading and high-frequency trading systems, which execute trades in milliseconds based on predefined rules.
 - One algorithm can trigger a chain reaction among others, exacerbating the price movement.

Causes of Flash Crashes:

- Algorithmic Trading:**
 - Algorithms can execute a high volume of trades in milliseconds, amplifying market moves.
- Market Liquidity Issues:**
 - Lack of buyers or sellers during critical moments can lead to exaggerated price swings.
- Human Error:**
 - Erroneous trade orders, such as a "fat-finger" error (e.g., typing in an incorrect trade size), can trigger large movements.
- Stop-Loss Orders:**
 - These automated orders to sell assets at specific prices can cascade, further driving down prices.
- Market Interconnectedness:**
 - The global and highly interconnected nature of modern markets means that issues in one area can quickly spread.

Figure 11: A Q&A example about a Flash Crash. Text in green indicates correct explanatory details provided by the LLM.

C.2.1 Lawyer Consultation Cost Comparison. Fig. 13 demonstrates the cost implications of using an LLM to refine questions before a legal consultation. In the traditional consultation workflow, the user engages in repetitive back-and-forth QA with the lawyer, which is time-consuming and leads to higher fees. By contrast, using an LLM to refine and organize questions beforehand enables more focused and efficient discussions with the lawyer, significantly reducing consultation time and associated costs. For example, without preparation, a consultation might last several hours, incurring substantial costs. However, with LLM assistance, the user can streamline the process, potentially reducing the session to a fraction of the time and lowering the overall cost.

Question: What is GME event?

GPT-4o:
The **GME event**, also known as the **GameStop short squeeze**, refers to a significant financial and social phenomenon that occurred in **early 2021**, where the stock price of **GameStop Corp.** (ticker symbol: **GME**) surged dramatically due to coordinated buying activity by retail investors. Here's an overview:

Key Points of the GME Event:

- Background:**
 - GameStop is a struggling **brick-and-mortar video game retailer**.
 - Many hedge funds and institutional investors had taken **short positions** on GameStop, betting that its stock price would fall.
- Role of Retail Investors:**
 - Retail traders on the subreddit **r/WallStreetBets** noticed the high level of short interest in GME stock.
 - They coordinated a short squeeze**, where they collectively bought GME stock, driving up its price and forcing short sellers to buy shares to cover their positions, further increasing the price.
- Stock Price Surge:**
 - GameStop's stock price surged from under **\$20 in early January 2021** to **over \$480** at its peak later that month.
- Impact on Hedge Funds:**
 - Several hedge funds suffered massive losses** because they were unable to cover their short positions at reasonable prices. For example, **Melvin Capital** reportedly lost billions of dollars.
- Market and Regulatory Response:**
 - Trading platforms like **Robinhood temporarily restricted buying** of GME and other "meme stocks," citing liquidity concerns. This led to significant backlash and accusations of protecting institutional investors at the expense of retail traders.
 - The SEC launched investigations into the event.**
- Cultural and Social Significance:**
 - The event was viewed as a **David vs. Goliath battle**, where retail investors used the power of social media to challenge Wall Street institutions.
 - It highlighted issues like **market manipulation, the role of social media in investing, and wealth inequality.**
- Aftermath:**
 - The GME event inspired a wave of retail-driven trading in other stocks and cryptocurrencies, collectively referred to as **meme stocks**.
 - GameStop remains a symbol of retail investor activism**, and its stock retains a cult following despite volatility.

Why It Matters:

- Finance:** It exposed vulnerabilities in hedge fund strategies, like over-shorting.
- Technology:** It demonstrated the power of online communities and platforms like Reddit.
- Regulation:** It raised questions about the fairness and transparency of financial markets.

The event was not just a financial anomaly but a cultural and technological turning point in how individual investors interact with the stock market.

Figure 12: An example Q&A about the GME event. Text in Green indicates correct conceptual explanations. Text in Red marks an incorrect numeric detail.

C.2.2 Example of Question Refinement. Fig. 14 provides an example use scenario where the user suspects they might be non-compliant with investment fund usage terms and wants to clarify




Figure 13: Comparison of lawyer consultation costs with and without pre-consultation question refinement using an LLM.

their position before consulting a lawyer. The LLM assists by generating a list of specific, refined questions to present to the lawyer, reducing the consultation time and ensuring that key contract compliance areas are covered.

C.2.3 Detailed Analysis of Back-and-Forth QA. Fig. 15 illustrates inefficiencies in back-and-forth QA interactions, especially when users lack financial or legal expertise. Below is a concise analysis of the example.

Key Inefficiencies:

- **Repetitive Questions:** The user repeatedly asks similar questions (e.g., misusing funds for a festival),.
- **Basic Concept Clarifications:** Queries about fundamental terms (e.g., reporting obligations) show a lack of preparation.
- **Unrealistic Proposals:** Suggestions like simply promising compliance reflect unrealistic expectations.
- **Cost Implications:** Lawyers charge for their time, making inefficient interactions expensive.

Benefits of Using an LLM:

- **Cost Savings:** LLMs handle repetitive or basic queries at no cost.
- **Preparation:** LLMs help refine user questions, streamlining subsequent lawyer consultations.
- **Availability:** Instant, 24/7 responses reduce delays.


C.3 General Publics vs. LLM-Assisted Financial Document Analysis

Fig. 16 illustrates the difference between how the general public and an LLM-assisted user approach financial documents. Without assistance, general users may struggle to understand complex financial reports, leading to confusion and limited comprehension. However, with the help of an LLM, financial documents are simplified, enabling the general public to achieve a professional-level understanding and make more informed decisions.

C.3.1 Example of Financial Report Analysis. Fig. 17 provides an example scenario where the user uploads a financial report and prompts the LLM for a summary of Tesla’s revenue and profit trends for Q2 2024. The LLM generates a summary that highlights revenue

Efficient Legal Consultation Prep

Question:
The investor thinks I'm misusing the investment funds, but I'm still working on community projects. What questions should I ask a lawyer to clarify my compliance with the contract terms?



user upload a pdf to LLM. Example on the right

INVESTMENT AGREEMENT

This Investment Agreement (the "Agreement") is entered into as of January 1, 2009, by and between [FULL NAME OF ORGANIZATION], a [STATE] state non-profit corporation (hereafter referred to as "[HOUSING LOAN FUND]") and [FULL NAME OF INVESTOR] ("Investor Bank").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, [HOUSING LOAN FUND] is a [STATE] non-profit community development financial institution established to promote community and economic development by increasing access to capital for small businesses and community development organizations engaged in economic and community development and affordable housing throughout [STATE] (the "Program").

WHEREAS, [HOUSING LOAN FUND] is not able to issue stock to raise capital to fund the Program.

WHEREAS, Investor Bank wishes to make investments which promote the public welfare in [STATE] and is willing to assist [HOUSING LOAN FUND] in the funding of the Program.

WHEREAS, in order to invest in [HOUSING LOAN FUND], Investor Bank is prepared to make an equity-equivalent investment in [HOUSING LOAN FUND], structured as an investment on the terms and conditions specified in this Agreement.

NOW THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

GPT-4o:
It sounds like a challenging situation. Here are some questions you might consider asking a lawyer to clarify your compliance with the contract terms:

1. Contract Interpretation: What specific terms in the contract address the use of funds?
Are there any clauses that could be interpreted differently based on my current projects?
2. Compliance Requirements: What are the obligations I must meet regarding the use of investment funds?
How can I demonstrate compliance?
3. Documentation: What types of documentation or evidence should I gather to support my claims about the appropriate use of funds?
4. Reporting Obligations: Am I required to provide regular updates or reports to the investor? If so, what should these reports include?
5. Breach of Contract: What constitutes a breach of contract in this context? What are the potential consequences if the investor pursues legal action?
6. Resolution Options: What are my options for resolving this dispute without going to court? Could mediation or arbitration be appropriate?
7. Investor Relations: How can I effectively communicate with the investor to clarify my position and address their concerns?
8. Future Compliance: What steps should I take to ensure I remain compliant with the contract moving forward?

Figure 14: Prompt example and LLM-generated refined questions to aid in lawyer consultation regarding investment fund usage compliance.

breakdown, profitability, and key factors affecting trends, helping the user to quickly understand complex financial document.

C.4 XBRL Analytics

A common scenario for XBRL analysis is analyzing financial statements to calculate financial ratios or to make financial forecasts.

C.4.1 Failure Case: ROA Calculation. Figs. 18, 19 and 20 show some failure cases when calculating Coca-Cola's return on assets

(ROA) in FY2023. Fig. 22 ⁶ (a) and (b) shows the parts in financial statements related to this analysis. The model used is GPT-4o.

XBRL File Parsing. As shown in Fig. 18, we send the query of Coca-Cola's ROA in FY2023 and upload the XBRL instance file (in XML format) ⁷. The model fails to parse the XBRL file and extract corresponding values. In the model's generated code, it uses the incorrect "yyyy-mm-dd" or "yyyy" format for contextRef to

⁶Obtained from 10-K filings from <https://www.sec.gov/edgar/browse/?CIK=21344&owner=exclude>

⁷<https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/21344/000002134424000009/ko-20231231.htm.xml>

Example of Back-and-Forth QA

Following the Previous Lawyer Consultation Example

User Question 1:

Can I use the investment money for something fun like organizing a local festival?"

LLM Answer:

No, the agreement specifies that the funds must be used for community development purposes, such as affordable housing, job creation, and small business support. Using the funds for unrelated activities like a festival would violate the terms of the agreement.

User Question 2:

What if I use just a small part of the money for the festival and spend the rest on the housing project?

LLM Answer:

Even using a small part of the funds for an unauthorized purpose would be a breach of the agreement. This could lead to serious consequences, including the investor demanding immediate repayment or legal action.

User Question 3:

Can I delay the quarterly report if I'm too busy to prepare it?"

LLM Answer:

No, the agreement requires you to submit quarterly reports detailing investment activity. Failure to do so may breach the contract and result in penalties or loss of investor confidence.

User Question 4:

What happens if I don't follow the rules in the agreement?

LLM Answer:

If you fail to comply with the agreement, the investor can accelerate the repayment of the investment, meaning you'll need to pay back the entire amount immediately. They could also take legal action or stop extending the investment's maturity.

User Question 5:

Can I just tell the investor I forgot to comply and promise to do better next time?

LLM Answer:

No, that's not sufficient. The agreement is legally binding, and any failure to comply could lead to serious consequences. You must address issues formally and take corrective actions as soon as possible.

Figure 15: Example of inefficient back-and-forth QA. This scenario could occur between a user and a lawyer or an LLM. However, an LLM can handle these types of repetitive or basic questions without incurring additional costs. On the other hand, lawyers charge for their time, making such interactions expensive.

extract values. In this XBRL file, contextRef is in the "c-n" format where n is the assigned sequence number.

Contexts. There are failure cases in identifying the contexts:

- **Query with full information.** With the same query and file as above, as shown in Fig. 19, although the model parses the XBRL file successfully, it fails to identify the context reference of net




Figure 16: General Public vs. LLM-Assisted Financial Document Analysis. FinLLMs will upgrade the financial analytical capability of the general public to a professional-level.

income in FY2023. In its generated code to extract the net income, the model uses the incorrect contextRef of "c-31," where the correct reference is "c-1." This mistake may be due to the noisy information in the file: "c-31" is a specific context reference used in the statement of shareholders' equity in FY2023, while "c-1" is the general context reference for FY2023.

- **Query with specific information.** To provide more specific information, as shown in Fig. 20, we concatenate the query with the income statement and balance sheet in FY2023 from the XBRL instance file in XML format. Although the model gives the correct final result, it makes a mistake in recognizing the context reference and values for total assets in FY2022 and FY2023. The correct contextRef and value for FY2023 is "c-23" and \$97,703,000,000, and "c-26" and \$92,763,000,000 for FY2022.

Concepts. We also ask the related concepts in follow-up questions, including the definition of FY2023, the meaning of "KO" in the name of the uploaded file, the tag "us-gaap:NetIncomeLoss" and "us-gaap:Assets," and the unit measure of net income and total assets. The model's responses are correct.

Financial Ratio Formula. We also ask about the source of the formula for ROA. The model derives the ROA formula from its internal knowledge base, which is built on principles of financial analysis and accounting learned during training.

Calculation. In the case when the full file is uploaded, as shown in Fig. 19, the model generates and executes code to perform the calculation. When the query concatenated with the file sections is sent as input, the model performed the calculation itself based on the data provided in the XBRL tags and the financial formula.

Other Settings. Here we show the analysis for Coca Cola's ROA in FY2023 in different settings.

- **Closed book.** We first test GPT-4o in a closed book setting, without financial statements or financial ratio formula provided in the query and without online search function. When directly asked about the ROA of Coca Cola in FY2023, GPT-4o fails to give the answer, saying that it has no access to real-time financial data for Coca-Cola. It only gives instructions to find the financial statements in the annual reports and gives a formula to calculate ROA, the net income divided by the total average assets for the period.

- **Closed book with stock ticker.** We replace the firm name "Coca Cola" with its stock ticker "KO" in the query. The model can successfully recognize the company as The Coca-Cola Company (KO), but still fails to give the answer with the same reason.
- **Online Search.** We send the same query to GPT-4o with online search function. The model returns the values of financial items, the formula, and the ROA of 10.97%, which are directly obtained from the Stock Data Online website⁸, without performing calculations. The formula for ROA on the website is to divide the net income in FY2023 (\$10,714,000) by the assets at the end of FY2023 (\$97,703,000). A more accurate formula for ROA is to divide the net income by the average total assets at the end and beginning of the year. Although all the values needed for the more accurate calculation are available on the website and the model correctly answers the formula in the closed book setting, GPT-4o still gets the inaccurate results directly from the website.
- **Online Search with formula.** We send the query and formula to GPT-4o with online search function. The model obtains the value of financial terms from Macrotrends website⁹. Then it performs the calculation itself based on the provided formula. The returned result is 11.25%, which is correct.
- **Chain of thought.** When only the query is sent to ChatGPT-o1-preview, the model follows the steps of assessing knowledge, ensuring data accuracy, assessing current financial status, assessing ROA, and assessing current data. It doesn't have knowledge about FY2023 and provides the ROA in FY2022. However, its data for FY2022 are inaccurate. We then send the query concatenated with the related segments in the XBRL file¹⁰, and the model performs the analytics correctly.

C.4.2 Failure Case: Revenue Forecasting. Fig. 21 shows a failure case of revenue forecasting for Coca-Cola. The task is to use the average revenue growth rate from FY2019 to FY2023 to predict revenues in the future 3 years. The income statements for FY2021, FY2022, and FY2023 from XBRL instance files are concatenated to the query. The model used is GPT-4o.

Context. The model correctly identifies and extracts revenues from FY2019 to FY2023. Fig. 22 (a), (c), and (d) shows the Coca-Cola's income statements.

Financial formula. The model uses the correct formulas to calculate the growth rate, the average growth rate, and the predicted revenue.

Calculation. The model makes some mistakes in its calculation process, as highlighted in gray in Fig. 21. When calculating the growth rates of FY2020 and FY2023, the model doesn't round the answers correctly. The correct roundings are -11.41% and 6.39%, respectively. In the calculation of the average growth rate, using values obtained from the previous steps, the answer 5.34% is wrong, which should be 5.84%. Furthermore, when calculating revenue for FY2025 and FY2026 using the values in the formula, the answers are wrong, where $48,197 \times (1 + 0.0534) \approx 50,770$ and $50,775 \times (1 + 0.0534) \approx 53,486$. If all calculations are correct, the


⁸Retrieved on Nov 13, 2024 from <https://stock-data.online/stock/ko/profitability-ratio/return-on-assets>

⁹Retrieved on Nov 13, 2024 from <https://www.macrotrends.net/stocks/charts/KO/cocacola/total-assets>

¹⁰ChatGPT-o1-preview currently doesn't support file uploading and online search

Financial Report Analysis

Question:
Can you summarize Tesla's revenue and profit trends for Q2 2024 compared to previous quarters?



user upload a pdf to LLM. Example on the right
The report pdf consist of only image reports, indicating LLM's capability of reading images/tables from pdf files

GPT-4o:

Revenue

- Total Revenue:** Tesla's total revenue increased by 2% year-over-year, reaching \$25.5 billion for Q2 2024.
- Segment Breakdown:**
 - Automotive Revenue:** Automotive revenue was \$19.88 billion, which reflects a decline from prior quarters due to a lower average selling price (ASP) for vehicles.
 - Energy Generation and Storage:** This segment saw significant growth, with revenue reaching \$3.014 billion, marking a 100% increase year-over-year.
 - Services and Other Revenue:** Revenue in this segment grew by 21%, amounting to \$2.608 billion.

Profitability

- Gross Profit:** Tesla's gross profit rose slightly to \$4.578 billion, resulting in a gross margin of 18%, which is consistent with recent quarters.
- Operating Income:** Tesla's operating income decreased to \$1.6 billion in Q2 2024, with an operating margin of 6.3%. This is a decline from previous quarters, largely due to reduced vehicle ASP, restructuring charges, and increased expenses driven by AI projects.
- Net Income:** GAAP net income attributable to common stockholders was \$1.478 billion, down 45% year-over-year. Non-GAAP net income, which excludes stock-based compensation and other adjustments, was \$1.812 billion.

Key Factors Impacting Trends

- Positive Drivers:**
 - Increased revenue from energy generation and storage, driven by record deployments in energy storage products.
 - Higher regulatory credit revenue and growth in services gross profit.
- Negative Drivers:**
 - Lower ASP for vehicles and a decline in vehicle deliveries.
 - Increased operating expenses related to AI and restructuring costs.

In summary, while Tesla's total revenue showed slight growth, profitability has been pressured by lower vehicle prices, restructuring costs, and higher expenses in technology initiatives, which affected operating and net income for the quarter([tsla-20240723-gen](#)).

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**
WASHINGTON, DC 20549

FORM 8-K

CURRENT REPORT
Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the
Securities Exchange Act of 1934
Date of report (Date of earliest event reported): July 23, 2024

Tesla, Inc.
(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Charter)

Texas (State or other jurisdiction of incorporation)	001-34756 (Commission File Number)	91-2197729 (I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)
1 Tesla Road Austin, Texas 78725 (Address of Principal Executive Offices, and Zip Code) (512) 516-8177 Registrant's Telephone Number, Including Area Code		

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the registrant under any of the following provisions (See General Instruction A.2. below):

- Written communication pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425)
- Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 144c2 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.144-2)
- Pre-commencement communication pursuant to Rule 144D under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.144-201)
- Pre-commencement communication pursuant to Rule 134-4(i) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.134-4(i))

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of each class	Trading Symbol(s)	Name of each exchange on which registered
Common stock	TSLA	The Nasdaq Capital Market

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is an emerging growth company as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act of 1933 (17 CFR 230.405) or Rule 12b-2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (17 CFR 240.12b-2):
Emerging growth company

If an emerging growth company, indicate by check mark if the registrant has elected not to use the extended transition period for complying with any new or revised financial accounting standards provided pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Exchange Act:

FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(Unaudited)

(\$ in millions, except percentages and per share data)

Total revenues		
Q1-2024	Q2-2024	YoY
21,301	25,500	2%

**Decline from prior year instead
Increase from prior quaters
Possibly misled by the negative YOY**

(\$ in millions, except percentages and per share data)

Total automotive revenues		
Q2-2023	Q3-2023	Q4-2023
21,268	19,625	21,563
Q1-2024	Q2-2024	YoY
17,378	19,878	-7%


Figure 17: Example of financial report analysis with highlighted errors and corrections. Text marked in *red* indicates inaccuracies in the LLM's interpretation, such as misunderstanding revenue trends or being misled by year-over-year (YOY) changes. Text marked in *green* showcases accurate information, reflecting the LLM's correct analysis of numerical data and trend direction.

predicted revenue is approximately \$48,422 million for FY2024, \$51,245 million for FY2025, and \$54,232 million for FY2026.

XBRL Analytics – ROA Calculation

Question:

I am analyzing Coca Cola's income statements and balance sheets to learn how the company performed last year. What is the return on assets (ROA) for Coca Cola in FY2023?

 ko-20231231_htm.xml
File

Answer:

The necessary financial data (Net Income, Beginning Total Assets, and Ending Total Assets for FY2023) could not be directly extracted from the uploaded file using the given XML structure. It may require further inspection or adjustment to the parsing logic.

Please let me know if you'd like me to analyze the file structure further or refine the extraction approach. Alternatively, you can provide additional details about where these values are located within the file.

Analysis:


```
python
import xml.etree.ElementTree as ET
# Load the XML file
file_path = "/mnt/data/ko-20231231_htm.xml"
tree = ET.parse(file_path)
...
# Extract values from relevant elements
for element in root.findall("./us-gaap:NetIncomeLoss", namespaces):
    if 'contextRef' in element.attrib and "2023" in element.attrib['contextRef']:
        net_income = float(element.text)
for element in root.findall("./us-gaap:Assets", namespaces):
    if 'contextRef' in element.attrib:
        if "2023-01-01" in element.attrib['contextRef']:
            assets_beginning = float(element.text)
        elif "2023-12-31" in element.attrib['contextRef']:
            assets_end = float(element.text)
net_income, assets_beginning, assets_end
```

Results
(None, None, None)

Figure 18: A failure case for XBRL analytics. The model is GPT-4o. The XBRL file is uploaded. Sentences in gray are where failure occurs. The model cannot parse the XBRL file correctly. In its code for analysis, it doesn't use contextRef correctly, which is not 'yyyy-mm-dd' or 'yyyy' format.

Question:**XBRL Analytics – ROA Calculation**

I am analyzing Coca Cola's income statements and balance sheets to learn how the company performed last year. What is the return on assets (ROA) for Coca Cola in FY2023?

 ko-20231231_htm.xml
File

Answer:

To calculate Coca-Cola's Return on Assets (ROA) for FY2023, we need the following data from the income statement and balance sheet:

1. **Net Income** for FY2023 (from the income statement).
2. **Average Total Assets** for FY2023 (from the balance sheet).

The formula for ROA is:

$$ROA = \frac{FY2023 \text{ Net Income}}{\text{Average Total Assets}}$$

I'll extract these figures from the provided file. Let me analyze the data and perform the calculation.

From the data extracted:

- **Net Income** for FY2023: Not found in the file.
- **Total Assets** at the start of FY2023: \$92,763,000,000
- **Total Assets** at the end of FY2023: \$97,703,000,000
- **Average Total Assets** for FY2023: \$95,233,000,000

Since the **Net Income** value is missing, the Return on Assets (ROA) cannot be calculated. If you can provide the net income figure for FY2023, I can complete the calculation.

Analysis:

```
python
from lxml import etree
# Load and parse the XML file
file_path = '/mnt/data/ko-20231231_htm.xml'
tree = etree.parse(file_path)
...
# Extract Net Income for 2023
net_income_path = "//us-gaap:NetIncomeLoss[@contextRef='c-31']"
net_income = tree.xpath(net_income_path, namespaces=namespaces)
...
# Calculate average total assets and ROA
average_total_assets = None
roa = None
if total_assets_start_value and total_assets_end_value:
    average_total_assets = (total_assets_start_value + total_assets_end_value) / 2
if net_income_value and average_total_assets:
    roa = (net_income_value / average_total_assets) * 100
...
net_income_value, total_assets_start_value, total_assets_end_value, average_total_assets, roa

Results
(None, 92763000000.0, 97703000000.0, 95233000000.0, None)
```

Figure 19: A failure case for XBRL analytics. The model is GPT-4o. The XBRL file is uploaded. Sentences in gray are where failure occurs. The model cannot identify the contexts for net income correctly. In its code for analysis, it uses the incorrect contextRef of "c-31", which should be "c-1"

XBRL Analytics – ROA Calculation

Question:

I am analyzing Coca Cola's income statements and balance sheets to learn how the company performed last year. What is the return on assets (ROA) for Coca Cola in FY2023?

Section of XBRL filings:

...

<us-gaap:Assets contextRef="c-23" decimals="-6" id="f-210" unitRef="usd">97703000000</us-gaap:Assets>

<us-gaap:Assets contextRef="c-26" decimals="-6" id="f-211" unitRef="usd">92763000000</us-gaap:Assets>

...

Answer:

To determine the Return on Assets (ROA) for Coca-Cola for FY2023, we need to calculate the ROA using the formula:

$$ROA = \frac{FY2023 \text{ Net Income}}{\text{Average Total Assets}}$$

From the provided XBRL data:

1. **Net Income for FY2023:** The net income for FY2023 is given as "us-gaap:NetIncomeLoss" with contextRef="c-1", which is \$10,714,000,000.

2. **Average Total Assets:**

- Total Assets for FY2023: The total assets for 2023 is given as "us-gaap:Assets" with contextRef="c-26", which is \$92,763,000,000.
- Total Assets for FY2022: The total assets for 2022 is given as "us-gaap:Assets" with contextRef="c-23", which is \$97,703,000,000.

We calculate the average total assets as:

$$\text{Average total assets} = \frac{FY2023 \text{ Total Assets} + FY2022 \text{ Total Assets}}{2} = \frac{92,763,000,000 + 97,703,000,000}{2} = 95,233,000,000$$

3. **Calculate ROA:**

$$ROA = \frac{10,714,000,000}{95,233,000,000} = 0.1125$$

Thus, the ROA for Coca-Cola for FY2023 is **11.25%**.

Figure 20: A failure case for XBRL analytics. The model is GPT-4o. Not all XBRL content is shown in the picture. Sentences in gray are where failure occurs. The contextRef and values for total assets are recognized wrongly. Fig. 22 shows the income statements in the presentation mode. The contextRef should be "c-23" and the value is \$97,703,000,000 for FY2023. The contextRef should be "c-26" and the value is \$92,763,000,000 for FY2022.

XBRL Analytics – Revenue Forecasting

Question:

I want to predict the revenue of Coca-Cola for the future 3 years. Please use the average revenue growth rate from FY2019 to FY2023 as an estimate of growth rate for the future 3 years. Please predict the revue for FY2024, FY2025, and FY2026?

FY2023 income statement from XBRL filings:

<us-gaap:Revenues contextRef="c-1" decimals="-6" id="f-92" unitRef="usd">4575400000</us-gaap:Revenues>

<us-gaap:Revenues contextRef="c-24" decimals="-6" id="f-93" unitRef="usd">43004000000</us-gaap:Revenues>

<us-gaap:Revenues contextRef="c-25" decimals="-6" id="f-94" unitRef="usd">38655000000</us-gaap:Revenues>

...

FY2022 income statement from XBRL filings: ...

FY2021 income statement from XBRL filings: ...

Answer:

To predict Coca-Cola's future revenue for FY2024, FY2025, and FY2026 using the average revenue growth rate from FY2019 to FY2023, we first need to calculate the annual growth rates over this period.

Here is the revenue data from FY2019 to FY2023:

- FY2019: \$37,266,000,000
- FY2020: \$33,014,000,000
- FY2021: \$38,655,000,000
- FY2022: \$43,004,000,000
- FY2023: \$45,754,000,000

Now, calculate the year-over-year growth rates:

1. From FY2019 to FY2020: $Growth Rate_{2019 \rightarrow 2020} = \frac{33,014 - 37,266}{37,266} = -11.40\%$
2. From FY2020 to FY2021: $Growth Rate_{2020 \rightarrow 2021} = \frac{38,655 - 33,014}{33,014} = 17.09\%$
3. From FY2021 to FY2022: $Growth Rate_{2021 \rightarrow 2022} = \frac{43,004 - 38,655}{38,655} = 11.26\%$
4. From FY2022 to FY2023: $Growth Rate_{2022 \rightarrow 2023} = \frac{45,754 - 43,004}{43,004} = 6.40\%$

Next, calculate the average growth rate over the FY2019 to FY2023 period:

$$Average Growth Rate = \frac{-11.40\% + 17.09\% + 11.26\% + 6.40\%}{4} = 5.34\%$$

Now, use this average growth rate to project revenues for FY2024, FY2025, and FY2026:

1. FY2024: $Revenues_{2024} = 45,754 \times (1 + 0.0534) = 48,197 \text{ million USD}$
2. FY2025: $Revenues_{2025} = 48,197 \times (1 + 0.0534) = 50,775 \text{ million USD}$
3. FY2026: $Revenues_{2026} = 50,775 \times (1 + 0.0534) = 53,494 \text{ million USD}$

Thus, the projected revenues are: - FY2024: \$48,197 million - FY2025: \$50,775 million - FY2026: \$53,494 million

Figure 21: A failure case of financial math calculations in XBRL filings. The model is GPT-4o and it makes mistakes when calculating the formula in gray. Fig. 22 shows the income statements.

THE COCA-COLA COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF INCOME
(In millions except per share data)

Year Ended December 31,	2023	2022	2021
Net Operating Revenues	\$ 45,754	\$ 43,004	\$ 38,655
Cost of goods sold	18,520	18,000	15,357
Gross Profit	27,234	25,004	23,298
Selling, general and administrative expenses	13,972	12,880	12,144
Other operating charges	1,951	1,215	846
Operating Income	11,311	10,909	10,308
Interest income	907	449	276
Interest expense	1,527	882	1,597
Equity income (loss) — net	1,491	1,472	1,438
Other income (loss) — net	570	(262)	2,000
Income Before Income Taxes	12,952	11,686	12,425
Income taxes	2,249	2,115	2,621
Consolidated Net Income	10,703	9,571	9,804
Less: Net income (loss) attributable to noncontrolling interests	(11)	29	33
Net Income Attributable to Shareowners of The Coca-Cola Company	\$ 10,714	\$ 9,542	\$ 9,771
Basic Net Income Per Share¹	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.26
Diluted Net Income Per Share¹	\$ 2.47	\$ 2.19	\$ 2.25
Average Shares Outstanding — Basic	4,323	4,328	4,315
Effect of dilutive securities	16	22	25
Average Shares Outstanding — Diluted	4,339	4,350	4,340

(a) FY2023 Income statement

THE COCA-COLA COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF INCOME
(In millions except per share data)

Year Ended December 31,	2022	2021	2020
Net Operating Revenues	\$ 43,004	\$ 38,655	\$ 33,014
Cost of goods sold	18,000	15,357	13,433
Gross Profit	25,004	23,298	19,581
Selling, general and administrative expenses	12,880	12,144	9,731
Other operating charges	1,215	846	853
Operating Income	10,909	10,308	8,997
Interest income	449	276	370
Interest expense	882	1,597	1,437
Equity income (loss) — net	1,472	1,438	978
Other income (loss) — net	(262)	2,000	841
Income Before Income Taxes	11,686	12,425	9,749
Income taxes	2,115	2,621	1,981
Consolidated Net Income	9,571	9,804	7,768
Less: Net income (loss) attributable to noncontrolling interests	29	33	21
Net Income Attributable to Shareowners of The Coca-Cola Company	\$ 9,542	\$ 9,771	\$ 7,747
Basic Net Income Per Share¹	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.26	\$ 1.80
Diluted Net Income Per Share¹	\$ 2.19	\$ 2.25	\$ 1.79
Average Shares Outstanding — Basic	4,328	4,315	4,295
Effect of dilutive securities	22	25	28
Average Shares Outstanding — Diluted	4,350	4,340	4,323

(c) FY2022 Income statement

THE COCA-COLA COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS
(In millions except par value)

December 31,	2023	2022
ASSETS		
Current Assets		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 9,366	\$ 9,519
Short-term investments	2,997	1,043
Total Cash, Cash Equivalents and Short-Term Investments	12,363	10,562
Marketable securities	1,300	1,069
Trade accounts receivable, less allowances of \$502 and \$516, respectively	3,410	3,487
Inventories	4,424	4,233
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	5,235	3,240
Total Current Assets	26,732	22,591
Equity method investments	19,671	18,264
Other investments	118	501
Other noncurrent assets	7,162	6,189
Deferred income tax assets	1,561	1,746
Property, plant and equipment — net	9,236	9,841
Trademarks with indefinite lives	14,349	14,214
Goodwill	18,358	18,782
Other intangible assets	516	635
Total Assets	\$ 97,703	\$ 92,763

(b) Assets in the balance sheet

THE COCA-COLA COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF INCOME
(In millions except per share data)

Year Ended December 31,	2020	2019
Net Operating Revenues	\$ 38,655	\$ 33,014
Cost of goods sold	15,357	13,433
Gross Profit	23,298	19,581
Selling, general and administrative expenses	12,144	9,731
Other operating charges	846	853
Operating Income	10,308	8,997
Interest income	276	370
Interest expense	1,597	1,437
Equity income (loss) — net	1,438	978
Other income (loss) — net	2,000	841
Income Before Income Taxes	12,425	9,749
Income taxes	2,621	1,981
Consolidated Net Income	9,804	7,768
Less: Net income (loss) attributable to noncontrolling interests	33	21
Net Income Attributable to Shareowners of The Coca-Cola Company	\$ 9,771	\$ 7,747
Basic Net Income Per Share¹	\$ 2.26	\$ 1.80
Diluted Net Income Per Share¹	\$ 2.25	\$ 1.79
Average Shares Outstanding — Basic	4,315	4,295
Effect of dilutive securities	25	28
Average Shares Outstanding — Diluted	4,340	4,323

(c) FY2021 Income statement

Figure 22: Parts from the financial statements of Coca-Cola.

Misinformation (MS)

Instruction: Answer questions regarding SEC regulations accurately, ensuring no misinterpretation or partial correctness.

Question: What does the subsection "UNLAWFUL CREDIT EXTENSION TO CUSTOMERS" under Section 7 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 discuss?

Answer:

The subsection titled "Unlawful Credit Extension to Customers" under Section 7 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 outlines prohibitions and restrictions regarding the extension of credit to customers in securities transactions. Specifically, this section is aimed at preventing the excessive use of credit in securities purchases and sales, which can lead to market instability and risk.

Key Points:

(1) **Prohibition on Excessive Credit:**

- It is unlawful for any broker, dealer, or financial institution to extend credit to customers that exceeds the limits set by the Federal Reserve Board's regulations (e.g., Regulation T).

(2) **Limitation on Buying on Margin:**

- A customer cannot purchase securities on margin beyond the established percentage of the purchase price, as determined by the Federal Reserve Board. For example, if the margin requirement is set at 50%, the customer must pay at least 50% of the purchase price of the securities upfront, while the remaining 50% can be financed through credit.

(3) **Restrictions on Lending Securities for Speculation:**

- The rule restricts lending securities to customers if the purpose is to enable speculative trading, which can amplify risk and lead to financial instability in the markets.

(4) **Exemptions and Conditions:**

- Certain exemptions and special circumstances allow credit extension beyond typical limits, such as in market-making, arbitrage transactions, or to meet liquidity needs, though these are strictly regulated.

Explanation:

Note: The information provided above is partially incorrect. Specifically, point No. 3, "Restrictions on Lending Securities for Speculation," is not actually included in the "Unlawful Credit Extension to Customers" subsection of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Reference: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/COMPS-1885/pdf/COMPS-1885.pdf> (Page 81)

Table 4: An example of the Misinformation (MS) task, regarding misinformation correction in the SEC regulation context. Texts in red indicate the non-existing information generated by the LLM.

Regulatory Compliance (RC)

Instruction: For the Rules and Regulations for the Securities and Exchange Commission and Major Securities Laws, Part 201 lists out the "Rules of Practice." Under this part, a section is dedicated to Appearance and Practice Before the Commission. List out the subsections of this section and explain them in detail.

Answer:

Under Part 201 of the Rules and Regulations for the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the "Rules of Practice" outline the procedures for conducting proceedings before the SEC. One specific section under this part addresses "Appearance and Practice Before the Commission".

Key Subsections and Details:

(1) **Rule 201.102 – Appearance and Practice Before the Commission** This rule sets forth who is permitted to appear and represent others before the SEC in any capacity and the conditions under which such representation can occur. The key subsections of this rule are as follows:

- **Eligibility to Appear and Practice (Rule 102(a))** This subsection outlines who may appear before the Commission. It permits the following individuals or groups to appear:
 - (a) **Attorneys:** Must be qualified and admitted to practice law in the highest court of any U.S. state, territory, or the District of Columbia.
 - (b) **Accountants:** Certified public accountants (CPAs) may represent clients before the SEC in matters where accounting expertise is required, such as audits, financial filings, and compliance issues.
 - (c) **Other Qualified Individuals:** The SEC may permit other professionals or experts, such as engineers, economists, or consultants, to appear before the Commission in specific circumstances when their expertise is relevant to the matter at hand.

This subsection ensures that anyone appearing before the SEC must have the appropriate credentials and be professionally qualified in the area they are representing.

Explanation:

Note: The entire answer provided above is incorrect. Rule 201.102(a) of Title 17 Chapter II actually states that in any proceeding, an individual may appear on his or her own behalf, without specifying professional qualifications. The information above regarding personnel qualifications is inaccurate.

Reference: [https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-17/part-201#p-201.102\(a\)](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-17/part-201#p-201.102(a))

Table 5: An example of the Regulatory Compliance (RC) task, regarding SEC Rules of Practice related to "Appearance and Practice before the Commission".