

Weekly Report

Wang Tianyi

October 29, 2024

### Outline

- 1 Methodology
  - Logical Evaluation of Reasoning Paths
  - Summary Standardizer

- 2 Experiments
  - Benchmark Testing Automation
  - Logging and Progress Tracking

### Outline

- 1 Methodology
  - Logical Evaluation of Reasoning Paths
  - Summary Standardizer

- 2 Experiments
  - Benchmark Testing Automation
  - Logging and Progress Tracking

## Logical Evaluation of Reasoning Paths

- Define the reasoning chain  $T = \{T_1, T_2, ..., T_m\}$ , where each  $T_i$  represents an inference step.
- Use a Natural Language Inference (NLI) model to evaluate the logical relationship between adjacent steps  $T_i$  and  $T_{i+1}$ .
- Possible relations:

$$\mathsf{NLI}(T_i, T_{i+1}) = egin{cases} \mathsf{Entailment} & \mathsf{Reasoning\ logic\ is\ rational} \ \mathsf{Neutral} & \mathsf{Reasoning\ logic\ is\ uncertain} \ \mathsf{Contradiction} & \mathsf{Reasoning\ logic\ contradicts} \end{cases}$$

Dasso) wangitamyideangtiamyidealcobe-Air raa\_gpu\_v1.3 & python test\_py
Please enter your research question (or type 'exit' to quit): Question: In an experiment observing Ligand binding patterns on Gold Nano-Bipyramids (Au NBPs) with low Ligand coverage, what was the predominant observation regarding the Ligand binding behavior/Nn/Given options:\na. Ligands bind predominant observation regarding the Ligand binding behavior/Nn/Given options:\na. Ligands bind predominant observation regarding the Ligand binding behavior/Nn/Given options:\na. Ligands bind predominant observation behavior as a constant of the constant o

o-Bipyramids (AuNBPs) with low ligand coverage is that ligands bind predominantly to sharp tips due to high surface energy, leading to growth redirect

### **NLI** Model Judgment and Scoring

#### Scoring System

Each pair  $(T_i, T_{i+1})$  receives a score based on the NLI result:

$$S(T_i, T_{i+1}) = egin{cases} 1 & ext{if Entailment} \\ 0 & ext{if Neutral} \\ -1 & ext{if Contradiction} \end{cases}$$

#### Average Logic Score L

The overall logical consistency of the reasoning chain is given by:

$$L = \frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} S(T_i, T_{i+1})$$

where  $L \approx 1$  indicates high logical consistency, and  $L \approx -1$  suggests logical contradictions.

### Interpretation of the Logic Score

- $L \approx 1$ : The reasoning chain is coherent and logically consistent.
- $L \approx 0$ : Logic is uncertain across steps, with possible logical jumps.
- $L \approx -1$ : Significant logical contradictions are present in the reasoning chain.

**Note:** In the actual code, I set a threshold where  $L \ge 0.5$  is considered *reasonable*, and  $L \le -0.5$  is considered *contradiction*.

```
Logical Consistency Scores for Each Step Pair:
Step 1 to Step 2 - Score: 1
Step 2 to Step 3 - Score: -1
Step 3 to Step 4 - Score: 1
Step 4 to Step 5 - Score: 1
Final Average Logical Consistency Score: 0.50
```

# Summary Standardizer

- In initial testing, it was observed that GPT sometimes generates final summaries that do not strictly follow the prompt-imposed format.
- This inconsistency in format led to issues in post-processing, particularly in applying regex-based answer extraction.
- As a result, benchmark tests were affected since the system could not reliably match answers in improperly formatted summaries.

### Standardization Details

#### Standardization Criteria

The Standardizer focuses on specific criteria, including:

- **Consistency in terminology:** Ensuring uniform terminology across the summary.
- Structural clarity: Adjusting sentence order and paragraph breaks to improve readability.
- Formatted correctly:Especially Ans: such a clear answer to the part

### Outcome of Summary Format Correction

- After implementing the Standardizer mechanism, the consistency of summary format significantly improved.
- This allowed the regex patterns to correctly match and extract answers, leading to more reliable benchmark test results.
- Overall, the Standardizer step enhanced the robustness and accuracy of the system's performance in tests.

```
Change) wengstianyidewongitianyideMacBook_Air rag_gpu_vi_3 % python test_standardize_summery.py
Original Summary:

Literature Summary: Studies on the growth of Aubbrs (Gold Nono-Bipyramids) under varying conditions suggest that ligand binding behavior is influenced. Literature Summary:

Freet index all conditions, Observations across experiments lack direct evidence for specific structural changes under low ligand concentrations. None theless, the consensus supports a binding preference at the tips of the bipyramids.

Ans: The correct option seems to be closest to B, given the evidence presented, though it's based on general trends rather than specific confirmation. New Records and Standardized Summary:

Some studies referenced were inconclusive

Standardized Summary:

Literature Summary:

Litera
```

### Outline

- 1 Methodology
  - Logical Evaluation of Reasoning Paths
  - Summary Standardizer

- 2 Experiments
  - Benchmark Testing Automation
  - Logging and Progress Tracking

## Benchmark Testing Automation

- Developed an automated script to run benchmark tests.
- 2 Implemented rules to validate answer formats for consistency.
- 3 Recorded accuracy metrics in real-time.
- Challenge: Encountered issues with inconsistent output formats.
- **Solution**: Enhanced prompt design and used regex for answer extraction.

Progress: 95/775 (12.26%) Final Accuracy: 51.58% (49/95) [96/775] Question 96 - Incorrect Logical Consistency of Reasoning Chain: reasonable Progress: 96/775 (12.39%) Final Accuracy: 51.04% (49/96) [97/775] Question 97 - Incorrect Logical Consistency of Reasoning Chain: reasonable Progress: 97/775 (12.52%) Final Accuracy: 50.52% (49/97) [98/775] Question 98 — Correct Logical Consistency of Reasoning Chain: neutral Progress: 98/775 (12.65%) Final Accuracy: 51.02% (50/98) [99/775] Question 99 - Incorrect Logical Consistency of Reasoning Chain: neutral Progress: 99/775 (12.77%) Final Accuracy: 50.51% (50/99) [100/775] Question 100 — Incorrect Logical Consistency of Reasoning Chain: neutral Progress: 100/775 (12.90%) Final Accuracy: 50.00% (50/100)

### Logging and Progress Tracking

#### **Key Features**

- Added logging for each answer generation step.
- 2 Implemented progress tracking to avoid data loss.
- 3 Enhanced fault tolerance for long-running experiments.

