

STEER-ME: Assessing the Microeconomic Reasoning of Large Language Models

NARUN K. RAMAN, University of British Columbia, Canada

TAYLOR LUNDY, University of British Columbia, Canada

THIAGO AMIN, University of British Columbia, Canada

JESSE PERLA, University of British Columbia, Canada

KEVIN LEYTON-BROWN, University of British Columbia, Canada

How should one judge whether a given large language model (LLM) can reliably perform economic reasoning? Most existing LLM benchmarks focus on specific applications and fail to present the model with a rich variety of economic tasks. A notable exception is Raman et al. [2024], who offer an approach for comprehensively benchmarking strategic decision-making; however, this approach fails to address the non-strategic settings prevalent in microeconomics, such as supply-and-demand analysis. We address this gap by taxonomizing microeconomic reasoning into 58 distinct elements, focusing on the logic of supply and demand, each grounded in up to 10 distinct domains, 5 perspectives, and 3 types. The generation of benchmark data across this combinatorial space is powered by a novel LLM-assisted data generation protocol that we dub auto-STEER, which generates a set of questions by adapting handwritten templates to target new domains and perspectives. Because it offers an automated way of generating fresh questions, auto-STEER mitigates the risk that LLMs will be trained to over-fit evaluation benchmarks; we thus hope that it will serve as a useful tool both for evaluating and fine-tuning models for years to come. We demonstrate the usefulness of our benchmark via a case study on 27 LLMs, ranging from small open-source models to the current state of the art. We examined each model's ability to solve microeconomic problems across our whole taxonomy and present the results across a range of prompting strategies and scoring metrics.

1 Introduction

There is much recent interest in using language models (LLMs) to reason about economic topics. Some prominent examples include financial sentiment analysis, where LLMs are tasked with analyzing the sentiment information of financial texts [Araci, 2019, Maia et al., 2018, Malo et al., 2013, Yang et al., 2020]; question answering, where LLMs are tasked with answering an economic question based on the provided information [Chen et al., 2021, 2022, Maia et al., 2018, Raman et al., 2024, Shah et al., 2022, Xie et al., 2023b]; financial text summarization, which entails condensing long unstructured financial texts into short summaries that capture crucial information and maintain factual consistency with the original long texts [Mukherjee et al., 2022, Zhou et al., 2021]; and Named Entity Recognition, which asks the model to detect critical financial entities such as persons, organizations, and locations [Alvarado et al., 2015, Shah et al., 2022]. More open-ended applications are also starting to emerge. LLMs such as WallStreetBERT, TradingGPT, FinGPT, FinTral, and BloombergGPT are already giving advice to investors and financial advisors [Bhatia et al., 2024, Li et al., 2023, Wu et al., 2023a, Xie et al., 2023a, Yang et al., 2023]. LLMs can help to automate budgetary planning and allocation [Chen et al., 2023]. LLMs are also being deployed as agents in simulations to analyze the impact of policy changes on key indicators like inflation and GDP growth [Carriero et al., 2024, Li et al., 2024a].

Before LLMs should be trusted in such open-ended applications, they should demonstrate robustly strong performance on the fundamentals of economic reasoning (just as, e.g., financial advisors, budget planners, and economists are required to do). Many existing benchmarks have been proposed, many of which were introduced in papers cited above. However, most of these are quite narrowly focused on a single task and/or application, rather than assessing economic reasoning more broadly. A second—useful but insufficient—category of benchmarks tests foundational concepts in mathematics, ranging from basic arithmetic to complex problem-solving tasks [Amini et al., 2019, Huang et al., 2016, Lample and Charton, 2019, Ling et al., 2017, Zhao et al., 2020]. Notable benchmarks include GSM8K [Cobbe et al., 2021], a small but varied dataset that contains moderately difficult math problems and MATH [Hendrycks et al., 2021], a challenging benchmark for which no evaluated model has yet attained expert-level performance across any of the 57 tested scenarios.

What might it look like to assess an LLM’s economic reasoning more comprehensively? Economics encompasses a wide array of problems, such as determining optimal consumption bundles, forecasting profit in the face of uncertainty, or analyzing how a shift in supply impacts equilibrium prices and quantities. Each of these problems can occur in a wide range of contexts such as labor markets, consumer product markets, financial markets, or public policy. Beyond the breadth of inputs that must be considered, evaluating LLMs presents further challenges to benchmark designers. There is no guarantee that an LLM will perform equally well on problems that appear similar or are conceptually related [e.g., Hendrycks et al., 2020a]. For instance, an LLM that excels at maximizing profit may struggle with minimizing cost. Similarly, LLMs can be susceptible to perturbations in the text of a question, which can impact their performance on otherwise similar problems [Ribeiro et al., 2020]. For example, LLMs may excel in allocating budgets as a doctor, but struggle to allocate budgets as an educator. Finally, LLMs may reason correctly about their own incentives, but fail to apply this logic to other participants and hence have difficulty understanding market or aggregate level responses (e.g., total supply, demand, and prices). Therefore, in order to be comprehensive, a microeconomic benchmark must exhibit broad variation across problems, contexts, and textual perturbations. It is similarly nontrivial actually to conduct experiments that comprehensively assesses how well different LLMs perform at economic reasoning tasks. Different models may leverage distinct architectures, driving performance differences [Islam et al., 2023, Raman et al., 2024, Sanh et al., 2019]. Additionally, adaptation strategies—such as fine-tuning,

prompt engineering, and output distribution modification—can dramatically influence a model’s effectiveness [Brown et al., 2020, Kojima et al., 2022, Lester et al., 2021]. Under the right adaptations, models with as few as 7B parameters can achieve state-of-the-art performance [e.g., Bhatia et al., 2024]. Furthermore, robustness across multiple task formats (e.g., multiple-choice QA, free-text QA, etc.) is crucial for understanding the gaps in an LLM’s reasoning capabilities. A model that performs well on one task format may underperform on others, which suggests gaps in its reasoning processes. Finally, scoring performance using only a single metric can give a skewed understanding of an LLM’s abilities and limitations [Schaeffer et al., 2023], or obscure tradeoffs that are relevant to practitioners [Ethayarajh and Jurafsky, 2020]. Without a comprehensive evaluation, we risk misattributing performance to a LLM when it is instead driven by an adaptation strategy or is an artifact of the metric used.

A recent paper by Raman et al. [2024] developed a benchmark distribution for assessing economic reasoning in strategic settings that aims for comprehensiveness in the senses just described. This work serves as a starting point for our own paper, and so we describe it in detail. First, they developed a taxonomy that divided the space of game theory and foundational decision theory into 64 distinct “elements of economic rationality,” ensuring that the elements in the benchmark covered a wide range of strategic contexts and decision-making problems. Second, they formalized a hierarchy across elements so that an LLM’s performance could be better understood in the context of its dependent subtasks. They generated a huge set of questions from this taxonomy, dubbed STEER, which vary in their difficulty and domain (e.g., finance, medicine, public policy). Finally, they evaluated a spectrum of LLMs over two adaptation strategies and scored with a suite of metrics. They defined this evaluation framework as a STEER Report Card (SRC), a flexible scoring rubric that can be tuned by the user for their particular needs.

A key drawback of STEER is that, in its focus on game-theoretic reasoning, it neglects much of the subject matter of microeconomics: multiagent settings in which agents nevertheless act nonstrategically. Such reasoning is widespread in competitive markets, where each agent’s impact on the market is too small to affect prices unilaterally. For example, while a mobile phone manufacturer might make a strategic decision about the number of handsets to produce and the price to sell them at, a small farm’s decision to produce wheat instead of corn given market prices is non-strategic. We employ—and expand upon—the STEER blueprint to construct a benchmark for testing LLMs on economics in non-strategic environments. Following Raman et al. [2024], we built a taxonomy of non-strategic economics consisting of 58 elements. We then instantiated each element in the taxonomy across 8–10 domains. From here, we expanded on the blueprint in two ways. First, we increased the diversity of the questions in the dataset and instantiated each element in 5 different *perspectives* and up to 3 *types* (as defined in Section 3.1). Second, we expanded their evaluation framework to include newer LLMs (27 in total), some new adaptations (3 that we developed and 2 more from the literature), and many new scoring metrics (a family of 4 calibration metrics). We dub our benchmark STEER-ME, reflecting both its conceptual links to the original STEER and its novel focus on microeconomics.

Even given the best possible LLM benchmark, data contamination poses an increasingly important challenge [Deng et al., 2023, Ravaut et al., 2024, Sainz et al., 2023]. Data contamination occurs when the test data used to evaluate an LLM is similar or identical to data the LLM encountered during training, leading to inflated performance metrics that do not accurately reflect the LLM’s true capabilities. To tackle this issue, we introduce a new dynamic data generation process called auto-STEER which we used to generate all of the questions in STEER-ME. auto-STEER combines many of the features present in existing dynamic and modular frameworks [Gioacchini et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2024, White et al., 2024] that we detail in Appendix B.

In what follows, Section 2 gives an overview of our taxonomy; for space reasons we defer definitions and examples of each element—which are extensive—to Appendix A. Section 3 describes how we used this taxonomy to build the benchmark distribution. For 37 elements, we have written LLM prompts to synthetically generate 1,000–5,000 multiple-choice questions and manually validated 500 generations per element. Section 4 describes the setup of an experiment in which we generated full SRCs for 27 LLMs, ranging from Llama-2 7B to o1-preview, evaluated on a total of 21,000 test questions. We spent \$12,439.54 making requests to OpenAI and Anthropic’s API and 9.81 GPU years of compute to evaluate open-source models. Finally, we survey our experimental results in Section 5. Here, we offer a few highlights. We observed a significant variation in performance across both LLMs and elements. Even among large models, most underperform on at least a few tasks, indicating that a model’s size alone is not sufficient to predict its degree of success across our benchmark. The one exception is o1-preview, which consistently achieved top performance on every element we tested, standing out as the most robust and accurate model in our evaluations. Across domains and perspectives, LLMs generally exhibited stable performance, but key error patterns emerged throughout the benchmark. In some instances, LLMs would ignore the question asked and instead provide “near-miss” solutions—those that were economically relevant but addressed a simpler or different problem. In addition, they also frequently bypassed the intended reasoning process by relying on answer choices to reach the correct response rather than deriving solutions independently. Finally, our richest setting produced a particularly large number of errors: even models as large as GPT-4o and Claude 3.5 Sonnet consistently miscalculated a straightforward concept like deadweight loss by applying incorrect formulas and misinterpreting marginal cost.

We release all model outputs to support evaluation research and contributions via our website steer-benchmark.cs.ubc.ca, allowing users to deeply probe all of our experimental results and the underlying model prediction details. Finally, we will release an extensible codebase to support the community in taking STEER-ME further.

2 Elements of Economic Rationality

Our first step in generating a benchmark for non-strategic microeconomics is to taxonomize this space. Previous work by Raman et al. [2024] developed a taxonomy for economic rationality within strategic domains. Their approach involved identifying foundational principles that define how agents should make decisions in specific environments and then organizing these principles, or “elements,” into progressively more complex decision-making scenarios. We adopt a similar hierarchical approach for STEER-ME, focusing on organizing economic decision-making principles into structured categories. However, unlike STEER, which assesses decision-making in strategic environments, our focus is assessing how agents make decisions given prices and quantities that are determined by the forces of supply and demand. We call this sub-field non-strategic microeconomics.

Two of the settings from STEER remain directly relevant to non-strategic microeconomics: FOUNDATIONS and DECISIONS IN SINGLE-AGENT ENVIRONMENTS. As we describe our taxonomy, we begin with these foundational settings. The elements we incorporate from FOUNDATIONS—arithmetic, optimization, probability, and logic—are core mathematical skills essential for microeconomic reasoning and are already present in STEER. In STEER-ME, we expand this setting by adding elements that test basic calculus, such as single-variable derivatives and linear systems of equations. In STEER, DECISIONS IN SINGLE-AGENT ENVIRONMENTS focused on testing whether an agent can adhere to the von Neumann-Morgenstern utility axioms when making decisions over a set of alternative choices. We include those axiomatic elements and extend this setting to include testing the properties of commonly used parameterizations of utility functions in non-strategic microeconomic contexts, such as utility functions with satiation points, monotone preferences, and budget constraints.

Setting 1: Foundations

Module 1.1: Optimization	Number of elements: 6
Module 1.2: Systems of Equations	Number of questions: 127, 342
Module 1.3: Derivatives and Homotheticity	Average # of characters: 134.2 Number of types: 1

Setting 2: Consumption Decisions in Non-Strategic Environments

Module 2.1: Properties of Utility Functions	Number of elements: 22
Module 2.2: Deriving Demand	# of questions: 3, 295, 770
Module 2.3: Comparative Statics of Demand	Avg. # chars: 458.35
Module 2.4: Labor Supply	Number of types: 14
Module 2.5: Dynamic Consumption Decisions	

Setting 3: Production Decisions in Non-Strategic Environments

Module 3.1: Properties of Production Functions	Number of elements: 16
Module 3.2: Deriving Factor Demand	# of questions: 1, 333, 330
Module 3.3: Comparative Statics with Production	Avg. # chars: 434.48
Module 3.4: Dynamic Production Decisions	Number of types: 20

Setting 4: Non-Strategic Decisions in Multi-Agent Environments

Module 4.1: Consumer Goods Market Aggregation	Number of elements: 10
Module 4.2: Factor Market Aggregation	# of questions: 750, 060
Module 4.3: Prices in Static Market Equilibrium	Avg. # chars: 362.69
Module 4.4: Comparative Statics of Equilibrium Prices	Number of types: 6

Setting 5: Evaluating Equilibria and Externalities

Module 5.1: Welfare and Decentralization	Number of elements: 10
Module 5.2: Welfare Analysis of Market Equilibrium	# of questions: 698, 367
	Avg. # chars: 311.50
	Number of types: 5

Table 1. High-level diagram of the taxonomy of elements of rationality. At the top level, we divide the space of decision making into 5 settings; we further subdivide settings into modules (e.g., Comparative Statics of Demand) that capture conceptually similar behaviors. We also include a few summary statistics about the dataset. Each ⓘ icon is a hyperlink to the corresponding module in our appendix.

Building directly on these foundational settings, we introduce the next setting, DECISIONS ON CONSUMPTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS, which tests an agent’s ability to optimally exchange time and money for desired goods and services. Elements in this setting assume that the agent is a price taker, meaning that the agent accepts market prices as given rather than forecasting how a purchase might move the market. First, we test the agent’s ability to derive demand functions consistent with the axioms and functional forms from DECISIONS IN SINGLE-AGENT ENVIRONMENTS. These foundational elements are useful in assessing whether an agent can make consistent, rational choices in response to market prices. We then include elements testing the agent’s ability to determine optimal consumption bundles, decide when to leave the workforce, and conduct comparative statics with demand functions.

DECISIONS ON PRODUCTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS tests an agent’s ability to decide on the combination of inputs to efficiently produce goods and services to maximize profits. The setting starts by assessing the agent’s ability to identify and analyze basic properties of production functions, such as the relationship between input quantities and output levels. This includes concepts like returns to scale, diminishing marginal returns, and the technological constraints that shape production capabilities. We then test the agent’s ability to conduct expenditure minimization and its dual, profit maximization. This involves solving optimization problems where the agent must

use marginal analysis to determine the quantity of output that maximizes profit (i.e., minimizes cost).

DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS considers consumers and producers who each reason according to the principles just described to trade with each other. This more complex setting requires an agent to reason about how the aggregated behaviors of consumers and producers lead to market-clearing prices that balance supply and demand. This setting covers elements such as finding market-clearing prices, computing competitive equilibria, and analyzing the comparative statics of equilibrium in markets where individual actions do not directly impact others.

Our last setting, EVALUATING EQUILIBRIA AND EXTERNALITIES, tests agents on their ability to evaluate whether equilibria are efficient and to analyze the effects of interventions, such as taxes or price ceilings, on welfare. In this setting, agents must not only be able to analyze how supply and demand dynamics establish equilibrium prices but also consider how external interventions shift these dynamics and alter the behavior of both consumers and producers. The elements in this setting can be relatively simple (e.g., compute consumer/producer surplus) or involve detailed counterfactual analysis (e.g., predict how interventions impact prices, the allocation of resources, and welfare outcomes).

3 The STEER-ME Benchmark

We first give an overview of STEER-ME dataset and then explain the process we used to generate and validate these questions, which we call auto-STEER. Finally, we describe our evaluation framework.

3.1 Dataset

We adopted the widely used Multiple-Choice Question Answering (MCQA) format for our benchmark [see, e.g., Hendrycks et al., 2020b, Liang et al., 2022, Rajpurkar, 2016, Shah et al., 2022, Suzgun et al., 2022, Wang et al., 2019, 2018, Zellers et al., 2019]. In this format, each test question presents a decision-making scenario along with several candidate options, where only one is correct. As an evaluation paradigm, a key benefit of MCQA is that it provides a standardized way to evaluate an LLM’s ability to correctly respond to given prompts. MCQA tasks admit well-established metrics like exact-match accuracy or expected calibrated error that provide interpretable measures of how well an LLM answers questions [Li et al., 2024b, Liang et al., 2022]. Furthermore, many real-world applications of LLMs in economics involve answering questions: e.g., chatbots [Inserete et al., 2024] and virtual assistants [BloombergGPT Wu et al., 2023b].

Our own benchmark consists of a total of 30 instantiated elements, each containing 5,000–20,000 MCQA questions. Each question is characterized by a (type, domain, perspective) tuple. Different *types* represent distinct ways of testing an agent’s abilities within an element. For example, we could assess an agent’s ability to perform profit maximization by asking “What is the maximum profit?” or “How much labor is needed to maximize profit?” The *domain* of a question indicates which of 10 predefined topic areas it pertains to: consumer goods, medical, finance, education, technology, entertainment, environmental policy, politics, sports, or gambling. Finally, the *perspective* of a question represents which of the 5 predefined perspective the question was written in: first-person, second-person, third-person anonymous, third-person female and third-person male. We disallow over (type, domain, perspective) combinations that do not lead to coherent questions; for example, questions about welfare theorems do not make sense in gambling settings.

3.2 auto-STEER

Like Raman et al. [2024], we leveraged a state-of-the-art LLM to help generate our dataset. We substantially extended their methodology, however, by adding an additional style-transfer step

where we asked the LLM to rewrite questions in new domains or perspectives. This greatly increased the variety of questions we were able to add. This section describes how we used our new approach to design STEER-ME.

First, for each type we hand-wrote a set of gold-standard example templates that served as the seeds for the data generating process. As can be seen in Figure 17, these templates were tagged with a domain, a perspective, and a type, if appropriate. The majority of these questions had *labeled fields* for numbers (e.g., “...the cost of labor is {cost}...”) which were programmatically filled for test time. See Figure 2 for an example.

Next, we asked the LLM to style-transfer these templates into each of the domains. We primarily leveraged gpt-4o to generate our benchmark, but as we show in Appendix J.1, using claude-3-5-sonnet did not change LLM performance. Our prompt included explicit instructions to maintain the same set of labeled fields as the hand-written templates. Figure 18 depicts the style-transfer page in our web application along with the prompting instructions. LLMs can be inconsistent in maintaining the economic meaning of questions after domain style transfer, so we hand-checked each of the outputted templates and edited them when necessary. All of these operations are supported by a web application we built: see Figure 19 in Appendix L. We then further style-transferred each of these newly generated templates into each perspective, resulting in up to 40 unique domain-perspective pairs for each type. We ran an additional check on the style-transfer process by filling the labeled fields in the templates with values and asking the LLM to solve the questions as written, which we found could highlight mistakes in question wording or in programmatically filled values; see Figure 1. (We were careful only to use his procedure to correct mistakes in the templates, not to tune the difficulty of the questions in a way that would bias our benchmark.)

Summary Statistics

Total number of templates: 37

Number of correct templates: 37

Number of incorrect templates: 0

These templates were answered correctly:

You are buying movie tickets, and your demand for movie tickets at any given price is expressed by the following demand function: $-0.37Q + 7.45$. What is your consumer surplus if the price of movie tickets is 0.36?

A. 45.92
B. 68.0
C. 49.5
D. 59.85

Explanation: To determine the consumer surplus, we need to follow these steps:

- Find the quantity demanded (Q) at the given price ($P = 0.36$):
The demand function is given by $P = -0.37Q + 7.45$.
Set $P = 0.36$ and solve for Q :
 $0.36 = -0.37Q + 7.45$
- Rearrange to solve for Q :
 $-0.37Q = 0.36 - 7.45$
 $-0.37Q = -7.09$
 $Q = \frac{-7.09}{-0.37} \approx 19.16$
- Find the maximum price consumers are willing to pay (P_{\max}) when $Q = 0$:
Substitute $Q = 0$ into the demand function:
 $P = -0.37(0) + 7.45 = 7.45$
- Calculate the consumer surplus:
Consumer surplus is the area of the triangle formed by the demand curve above the price line up to the quantity demanded. The formula for consumer surplus is:
$$\text{Consumer Surplus} = \frac{1}{2} \times \text{Base} \times \text{Height}$$

Here, the base is the quantity demanded ($Q = 19.16$) and the height is the difference between the maximum price consumers are willing to pay ($P_{\max} = 7.45$) and the

Fig. 1. The web app user interface for template AI double-checking. This page instantiates and fills a set of question using a generated or example seed and then generates a response using an OpenAI model. The page also reports the number of questions answered correctly as well as the responses from the model.

We then took each of these templates and asked the LLM to replicate the template, keeping the domain, perspective and labeled fields fixed but modifying exact words or objects used in the question. We generated 100 new templates for each element, crossing every domain and perspective

Question:

Sophie is buying textbooks for *her* university classes, *her* demand for textbooks at any given price is expressed by the following demand function *{d_function}*. What is *Sophie's* consumer surplus if the price of textbooks is *{price}*?

Domain: Education, Perspective: Third Person Woman

Question:

John is purchasing hockey sticks, *his* demand for hockey sticks at any given price is expressed by the following demand function *{d_function}*. What is *John's* consumer surplus if the price of hockey sticks is *{price}*?

Domain: Sports, Perspective: Third Person Man

Fig. 2. This figure depicts two questions in the consumer surplus element with different domains and perspectives. The text colored in red are the labeled fields that will be filled for test time and the text in blue is the perspective. On top, a question is framed in the education domain from a third-person woman perspective, while on the bottom, the same question is written for the sports domain from a third person man perspective. These were both generated during the style-transfer step in the data generation process.

pair, resulting in 30,000 templates across the dataset. We then spot-checked 500 of the resulting templates for each element, and flagged 99.88% of the templates as valid.

Finally, we created 20 instantiated questions from each template by filling its labeled fields with randomly generated values. We restricted the random generator to output numbers that were appropriate given the context: e.g., demand functions had negative slopes, positive values for equilibrium prices, etc. We programmatically solved each question and filled in the appropriate options and answer. In the end, we produced 1,000 questions per (domain, perspective) pair and up to 40,000 per type.

3.3 Evaluation Framework

We now turn to describing our evaluation framework. Following other work in this space, we consider an LLM as a black box to which we provide inputs in the form of prompts (i.e., strings) and adjust the decoding parameters (e.g., temperature) to analyze the resulting output completions (i.e., strings) and log probabilities, when available. Within this black-box framework, we consider two classes of adaptations: performance adaptations, which modify inputs to affect performance on a task, and diagnostic adaptations, which aim to analyze specific behaviors or model characteristics. We then score LLMs across a suite of metrics.

We follow Raman et al. [2024] by allowing a user to tune the evaluation framework for their specific needs by choosing for their set of LLMs: the set of elements in the evaluation, the adaptation chosen for each LLM and a scoring metric. For instance, one may only want to evaluate specific economic modules in our taxonomy (e.g., utility maximization for individual decision-making in DECISIONS ON CONSUMPTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS or production optimization scenarios in DECISIONS ON PRODUCTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS), or conduct comparative assessments across adaptation strategies, or evaluate targeted use cases like medical or financial decision-making. We provide a number of predefined evaluation frameworks in our web application as well as allowing users to create new evaluation frameworks.

We classify any adaptation as a performance adaptation when the inputs are modified in a way that is intended to increase an LLM's performance on a task. Common performance adaptations are chain-of-thought reasoning [Huang et al., 2022, Kojima et al., 2022, Wei et al., 2022, Yoran

et al., 2023] and few-shot prompting [Brown et al., 2020, Perez et al., 2021]. We focus on zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning.

Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought (0-CoT). There has been work showing that performance can be improved by asking an LLM to explain its reasoning before outputting an answer [Huang et al., 2022, Kojima et al., 2022, Wei et al., 2022, Yoran et al., 2023]. We follow Kojima et al. [2022] in implementing 0-CoT by first asking the LLM to explain its reasoning and then subsequently asking it to select the correct answer. We take two approaches to adapting 0-CoT to MCQA, which we denote *hidden* and *shown*. In the hidden approach, we give the LLM the question text and ask it to explain its reasoning—we only provide the candidate options in the second step. In the shown approach, the LLM is given both the question text and candidate options when it is asked to explain its reasoning. See Figure 16 in Appendix K for an example.

3.3.1 Diagnostic Adaptations. *Diagnostic adaptations* alter the prompt or decoding parameters not to improve performance, but rather to gain a better understanding of an LLM’s behavior.

Calibrated Answer Replacement (CAR). In CAR, we modify the candidate options by replacing one of the options with the string “No other option is correct.” For a test containing questions with n options, we replace the correct answer with this placeholder in a $1/n$ fraction of questions. For the remaining questions, we replace one of the incorrect answers instead. This ensures that an LLM that always chooses “No other option is correct” achieves the same accuracy as random guessing.

Reshaped Probability Mapping (RPM). Sometimes, LLMs can assign nonzero probability to tokens that do not correspond to any of the options available. Such errors are trivial to fix in any downstream application. However, if not corrected for, such errors can distort performance metrics, e.g., leading models to appear to perform worse than random guessing. We call the adaptation that addresses this issue RPM and take two approaches to reshaping the outputs. The first approach is renormalizing the output distribution to distribute all probability mass to valid options. However, in cases where the model puts very little weight on *any* correct option this renormalization can make the model appear overconfident. Our second approach attempts to deal with this by mixing the output distribution with a uniform distribution over valid options. This means if very little probability mass is given to any correct option its output will look more uniform and hence less confident in its answer. We define these adaptations and offer further discussion in Appendix C. Importantly, neither implementation changes which of the valid option tokens receives the largest weight in the output distribution, and therefore assessments of the LLM’s accuracy.

Free-Text QA. In addition to the diagnostic adaptations discussed earlier, we conducted experiments involving free-text generation question answering to more closely align with real-world use cases. We ask an evaluator LLM to report the answer the chain of thought reasoning arrived at and None if there is no easily findable answer. We then scored a model’s answer as correct if it was within 98% of the correct answer value and is closer to the correct answer than any other option. We include the prompt we used in Appendix C.3.

3.3.2 Scoring. Given a complete set of model responses, it is far from straightforward to choose a way of computing a single, overall performance score. Consequently, benchmarks often employ a suite of metrics to provide a more comprehensive assessment of performance [Gehrman et al., 2021, Liang et al., 2022, Srivastava et al., 2022, Wang et al., 2019]. We evaluate LLMs using three categories of metrics: accuracy, calibration, and robustness. We leave the discussion and definitions of our scoring metrics in Appendix D and simply list the metrics below:

- Accuracy: Exact-Match accuracy and Normalized accuracy
- Calibration: Expected Calibration Error, Brier Score, and Expected Probability Assignment
- Robustness: Domain Robustness and Type Robustness.

In this paper we score LLMs on their restricted output distributions over valid option tokens, modified using the diagnostic adaptation RPM as described in Section 3.3.1. For each model, we also report the proportion of responses where the top token is not a valid option token.

A LLM’s score on an element is the average taken over all questions in an element. We consider an element a base concept in our benchmark and therefore define the accuracy and confidence metrics with respect to an element.

4 Experimental Setup

Table 8 in Appendix I lists the 27 LLMs we evaluated. We ran gpt-4o, gpt-4o-mini, and o1-preview using OpenAI’s API [OpenAI, 2020]; claude-3-5-sonnet and claude-3-haiku using Anthropic’s API [Anthropic, 2025]. We obtained 22 open-source LLMs from the HuggingFace Hub [Wolf et al., 2019] and ran them on between 1 and 4 A100, Tesla M60, and V100 GPUs (depending on model size) on one of several dedicated compute clusters to which we have access.

In multiple-choice classification, there are a few ways one might represent the input to an LLM. We follow prior work by Hendrycks et al. [2020c] who introduced the *joint* approach where all answer choices are combined with the question into a single prompt, and the LLM predicts the most likely option letter.¹ We then decoded valid multiple choice responses from all LLMs as described in Section 3.3.2. For those LLMs where we had no access to the output distribution (claude-3-5-sonnet, claude-3-haiku, o1-preview) we took the top token.² In the free-text QA adaptation, we used gpt-4o-mini as the evaluator LLM due to its low cost and high performance in text retrieval.

Due to time and budget constraints we evaluated the closed-source LLMs, claude-3-5-sonnet, claude-3-haiku, gpt-4o, and gpt-4o-mini, on all 35 of the instantiated elements, all open-source models on 20 of the instantiated elements, and o1-preview on 13 elements. We applied our benchmark across all combinations of adaptations and LLMs, except for in the case of o1-preview. We did not explicitly ask o1-preview to conduct 0-CoT reasoning since the model was already explicitly trained to perform reasoning; thus, we simply asked o1-preview for the top token. Additionally, since o1-preview always performs reasoning we do not run the hidden implementation as its impossible to keep it from doing an additional reasoning step once it sees the candidate answers. This led to a total of 4 experiments per element for o1-preview and 8 for all other LLMs.

5 Results

All LLMs struggled with at least some elements in each of the settings in our benchmark (i.e., from FOUNDATIONS to EVALUATING EQUILIBRIA AND EXTERNALITIES); however, on the 13 elements that we tested, o1-preview was the most accurate model. Even in elements where every other model was close to random guessing (e.g., Profit Maximization and Dynamic Profit Maximization) o1-preview obtained high accuracy. Besides o1-preview, no LLM consistently outperformed other LLMs across our benchmark.

For the remainder of this section, we organize our discussion by economic setting, identifying key trends, successes, and failures in model performance. For each non-FOUNDATIONS setting, we plot a heatmap of the performances of LLMs on the shown adaptation and without CAR. We selected these adaptations because we saw that LLMs performed best with that configuration. We plot the models in descending order of parameter size, breaking ties alphabetically, and aggregate element performance across all domains, types, perspective. We observed that for the LLMs that

¹There is another approach, called *separate* and employed by Brown et al. [2020] However, this approach is better suited to tasks where the answer choices are long-form generations.

²OpenAI models only return the top 20 tokens, however, we never saw a valid option token not present in those top 20 tokens.

we plot, our calibration metrics were correlated with normalized accuracy; thus, our exposition in what follows focuses on normalized accuracy.

5.1 FOUNDATIONS




Fig. 3. Scatter plot of calibrated performance on the Exponents element versus downstream performance gap across models. The x-axis shows the gap calculated as the quotient between a model’s accuracy on real-valued exponent-based (Cobb–Douglas) tasks and its accuracy on the linear version of those tasks for various downstream elements. The y-axis represents the model’s performance on Exponents normalized by dividing by its average accuracy on the benchmark. Each point corresponds to a specific (model, downstream element) pair, with colors distinguishing different models.

A persistent challenge for many economic reasoning tasks is the precision required in multi-step optimization problems. These tasks not only demand accurate sequential calculations but also require the proper economic interpretation of intermediate results. In such settings, even minor errors in foundational computations—like those involving exponent manipulation—can compound and significantly undermine the final outcome. Recognizing this challenge, we investigated whether models that excel at basic exponent operations performed better on downstream tasks that rely on these operations.

We first calibrated model performance on the Exponents element by normalizing it relative to the average accuracy across the benchmark. We then computed, for each downstream element, a performance gap defined as the difference between accuracy on tasks that involve exponentiation (those instantiated with Cobb–Douglas functions) and their linear counterparts that do not require exponent manipulation. Each (model, downstream element) pair is represented as a point in Figure 3, where the x-axis shows the performance gap and the y-axis displays the performance on the Exponents element.

The results reveal a clear trend: LLMs with higher performance on the Exponents element tended to exhibit a significantly reduced gap between their performance on exponent-based tasks and linear tasks. This relationship is statistically significant, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of $0.774 (p = 1.23 \times 10^{-7})$, indicating that foundational mathematical skills accounted for a significant portion of the variance in downstream task performance.

5.2 DECISIONS ON CONSUMPTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS




Fig. 4. Heatmap plotting normalized accuracy performance of LLMs on elements within the DECISIONS ON CONSUMPTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS setting. Performance is on the shown adaptation without CAR and we sort LLMs by parameter size (when available).

A key takeaway from Figure 4 is that the closed-source LLMs achieved relatively high average normalized accuracy on elements that assessed the properties of demand and labor supply functions, indicating that these models could generally interpret and compute straightforward statistics. However, their performance dropped considerably on more elements focusing on computational problems such as Intertemporal Consumption Smoothing and Derivation of Hicksian Demand from Expenditure Minimization.

Digging more deeply into these findings, this performance decline arose in part because the LLMs frequently ignored the specific problem posed and instead solved a simpler or otherwise different version of the problem. We examined model performance in the free-text QA adaptation and found that, in 36.2% of claudie-3-5-sonnet's incorrect Intertemporal Consumption Smoothing responses, a two-year stream of future income was “discounted” as if it was all received one period into the future. In reality, given that cash flows occur in different periods (e.g., year 1 and year 2) the optimal smoothing must discount each separately (e.g., using 0.99 for year 1 and 0.99² for year 2) rather than lumping them together with a single division. Many other incorrect solutions were caused by smoothing consumption with a simpler Euler formula. While we stipulated that the subject was risk averse with a CRRA utility function, the Euler equation that the LLMs used was more appropriate for smoothing consumption when the utility is linear but ignores the smoothing factor induced by the curvature of CRRA utility. This occurred for claudie-3-5-sonnet 11.0% of the time and gpt-4o 42.7% of the time. For more discussion on this see Appendix J.2.

A similar pattern emerged when the LLMs were tasked with deriving Hicksian demand functions. In many cases, the LLMs defaulted to the more familiar Marshallian approach—maximizing utility subject to a budget constraint—instead of minimizing expenditure subject to a utility constraint. This error did not occur uniformly across models. For example, gpt-4o erroneously applied a Marshallian derivation in roughly 51.2% of its incorrect responses, while gpt-4o-mini did so in about 23.4% of cases. Among the Anthropic models, claudie-3-5-sonnet made this mistake in approximately 48.9% of incorrect instances, compared to only 15.2% for claudie-3-haiku. These differences in error rates

likely reflect the LLMs' varying capacities to engage with the question. More sophisticated models tended to generate responses that were more economically relevant, even if they did not always arrive at the correct derivation. It is also important to note that we can only identify an LLM as using the Marshallian approach when it came to the right 'Marshallian' answer.

These findings underscore a broader concern: when faced with more complex tasks, sophisticated LLMs often give "near-miss" solutions that can appear correct at first glance but actually solve subtly different problems. This is especially worrisome in real-world use cases where a user may not easily be able to verify an answer.

5.3 DECISIONS ON PRODUCTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS




Fig. 5. Heatmap plotting normalized accuracy performance of LLMs on elements within the DECISIONS ON PRODUCTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS setting. Performance is on the shown adaptation without CAR and we sort LLMs by parameter size (when available).

Producer-side tasks in our benchmark often proved more challenging than their consumption-side counterparts. While LLMs generally performed well on simpler production-function properties (mirroring their success on basic consumer decision tasks), the more complex optimization elements exposed weaknesses. In particular, elements evaluating profit maximization were the most difficult elements in this setting with Dynamic Profit Maximization—a two-stage problem with interdependent calculations—being the most difficult in the entire benchmark.

In these complex elements, LLMs often failed to arrive at correct solutions through genuine optimization. Instead, we observed a "cheating" strategy in which the model, when appropriate, would plug in the candidate answer choices directly into the functions in the question and pick whichever yielded the best result, rather than solving via first principles (e.g., by taking derivatives). This was particularly evident in the Profit Maximization element, where models were asked to determine the labor input that maximizes profit. Rather than identifying the profit-maximizing choice analytically, they simply tested each option and selected the highest-profit outcome. Indeed, every spot-checked instance of a correct response from gpt-4o and claude-3-5-sonnet used this shortcut (see Figure 6 for an example).

While this approach is a common strategy for test-takers—humans and LLMs alike—it bypasses the economic reasoning that these elements were designed to assess. This is the issue our *hidden* adaptation was designed to highlight. When we evaluated LLMs using this adaptation, we observed

Question:

John manages a company that produces premium leather wallets. The production output depends on the capital (K) he invests, represented by the function $3.97K^{0.45}$. At the moment, the wallets are sold at a price of 3.64, and John has an initial capital of $K_1 = 3.3$. He needs to decide how much additional capital to invest for the next day's market. John is aware of the potential price distribution for his wallets for the next day, represented by price 2.7 with probability 0.24, price 2.14 with probability 0.42, price 3.52 with probability 0.34. There is also a cost associated with increasing his capital, given by $(K_1 - K_2)^2$, and he applies a discount factor of 0.37 to future revenues. To maximize his profits, how much additional capital should John invest?

- A. 0.44 [*Correct Answer.*]
- B. 0.14
- C. 1.1
- D. 0.09

GPT-4o:

[Steps 1–6 omitted for brevity.]

Step 7: Evaluate the Net Profit for Different Values of ΔK

We need to evaluate the net profit for the given options of additional capital investment:

Option A: $\Delta K = 0.44$

$$K_2 = 3.3 + 0.44 = 3.74$$

$$\text{Production Output} = 3.97 \times 3.74^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Revenue} = 2.7436 \times 3.97 \times 3.74^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Discounted Revenue} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue}$$

$$\text{Cost} = (0.44)^2 = 0.1936$$

$$\text{Net Profit} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue} - 0.1936$$

[Continues for the three remaining options.]

Step 8: Compare the Net Profits

We need to compare the net profits for each option to determine which one maximizes John's profit. After calculating the net profits for each option, we find that:

– Option A: $\Delta K = 0.44$ yields the highest net profit.

Therefore, the best option for John is to invest an additional capital of 0.44.

Answer: A. 0.44

Fig. 6. This figure depicts a question in the Profit Maximization element and corresponding snippet of GPT-4o's response. The response shows the model getting to the answer using the given options rather than deriving the answer from first principles. See the full response in Appendix F.3.

significant performance degradation: gpt-4o's exact-match accuracy declined from 33.2% (shown) to 27.1% (hidden), only 2% away from random guessing. This performance degradation was also visible on the CAR adaptation. When the correct answer was “No other option is correct,” claude-3-5-sonnet’s exact-match accuracy dropped by 20.5%, o1-preview’s by 15.1%, and gpt-4o’s by 11.2%. Going even further, when evaluated on free-text QA, no model exceeded 10% exact-match accuracy.³

³We did not evaluate o1-preview on free-text QA because its reasoning tokens were not available at the time.

5.4 DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT Non-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS




Fig. 7. Heatmap plotting normalized accuracy performance of LLMs on elements within the DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT Non-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS setting. Performance is on the shown adaptation without CAR and we sort LLMs by parameter size (when available).

LLMs faced a new twist in this section: economic outcomes depend on multiple consumers or producers acting in aggregate. Tasks included market-wide demand or supply aggregation, computing market-clearing prices, and identifying arbitrage opportunities. Overall accuracy here was higher than in earlier settings, largely because we presented the LLMs with already-derived demand and supply functions. Summation of given functions is inherently simpler than derivation from first principles and is thus less prone to the mathematical issues that often tripped up the LLMs in prior elements.

Despite this relative success, one consistent pattern emerged: LLMs appeared to use the multiple-choice options when reasoning about how to aggregate demand or supply functions. This was particularly prevalent in the Aggregation of Consumer Demand element, which requires summing individual demand functions for a large number of consumers; here the performance gap between the hidden and shown adaptations was among the highest across our benchmark. In the hidden version, models frequently failed to multiply the single-consumer demand by the number of consumers, yielding an incorrect quantity. By contrast, in the shown version, LLMs correctly multiplied by the number of consumers. Appendix F.1 illustrates how gpt-4o changed its response when only the adaptation was switched.

Figure 8 quantifies this phenomenon: As the number of digits in the correct answer increased from 5 to 6, claude-3-5-sonnet's exact-match accuracy rose from 38% to 72%. This suggests that large numeric answers can serve as a “nudge”




Fig. 8. This figure plots exact-match performance on Aggregation of Consumer Demand on the shown implementation of 0-CoT for the closed-source models against the number of digits of the correct answer.

for models to think more carefully about summation or aggregation steps. This underscores how sensitive even state-of-the-art LLMs remain to textual cues, even in tasks that are otherwise conceptually straightforward.

5.5 EVALUATING EQUILIBRIA AND EXTERNALITIES




Fig. 9. Heatmap plotting normalized accuracy performance of LLMs on elements within the EVALUATING EQUILIBRIA AND EXTERNALITIES setting. Performance is on the shown adaptation without CAR and we sort LLMs by parameter size (when available).

We observed larger gaps in performance between the base and distilled versions of closed-source models on the elements in this setting. While the base versions of the closed-source LLMs generally excelled on surplus-related elements, their distilled counterparts frequently failed to reach the correct answer. We found this gap surprising, given the relatively straightforward economic concepts and mathematics involved.

More surprising, perhaps, was that none of the closed-source LLMs, except for o1-preview, was able to consistently compute the Deadweight Loss of a Monopoly; an element whose primary mathematical requirement is computing the area of a triangle. We discovered that models like claude-3-5-sonnet and gpt-4o often used an incorrect formula for computing deadweight loss and made errors in interpreting the marginal cost, a crucial step in the problem-solving process. To investigate these errors, we scored LLMs on the free-text QA adaptation. Figure 10 shows the distribution of correct responses and specific errors for claude-3-5-sonnet and gpt-4o. While gpt-4o displayed performance better than random guessing, the majority of responses consisted of errors stemming from the use of an incorrect formula. claude-3-5-sonnet exhibited an even higher prevalence of incorrect formula errors, with nearly 44% of its responses relying on a particular incorrect formula for deadweight loss. Furthermore, gpt-4o was more susceptible to compounding issues, incorrectly computing marginal cost and using an incorrect deadweight loss formula, than claude-3-5-sonnet. We describe these errors in more detail in Appendix J.3.

5.6 Other Insights

5.6.1 Adaptations. We examined how providing multiple-choice options versus hiding them (free-text QA) impacted performance on four elements (Intertemporal Consumption Smoothing, Profit Maximization, Aggregation of Consumer Demand, and Producer Surplus) that exhibited the largest gap in accuracy between hidden and shown adaptations. Our analysis revealed that performance




Fig. 10. Error analyses of claude-3-5-sonnet and gpt-4o on the Deadweight Loss of a Monopoly element. In reds and oranges are failures due to incorrect computations of the deadweight loss area; in blue and further broken down are errors due to incorrectly interpreting the marginal cost. A more detailed description of what each error means can be found in Appendix J.3.

was almost always worse under the free-text QA adaptation compared to the hidden adaptation, see Figure 14. This performance gap appears to stem from the models’ tendency to select the closest option to the free-text answer. Figure 15 shows the percentage of times that models were correct under the hidden adaptation but incorrect under the free-text adaptation due to guessing the closest answer. In almost all cases the majority of the gap was due to this phenomenon. We offer more discussion in Appendix J.4.

We also examined the effect of CAR on model performance. Figure 12 shows that the fraction of times each model selects “No other option is correct” (NOTA) varies substantially across our benchmark, indicating different tendencies toward selecting NOTA vs. choosing among the listed options. On average, gpt-4o tended to select NOTA more frequently than the true rate, whereas claude-3-5-sonnet rarely did so; interestingly, the distilled models (gpt-4o-mini and claude-3-haiku) displayed these tendencies even more strongly.

To assess how well each model identified cases where NOTA truly was the right choice, we aggregated element-level results into overall precision, recall, and F1 scores (Table 2). Precision measures how often the LLM is right when it selects NOTA, whereas recall measures how often a model is right when NOTA is the correct answer. The F1 score is the harmonic mean of recall and precision, meaning it penalizes large differences between the two; both must be high for a strong F1.

Figure 12 (in the appendix) shows the distribution of NOTA selection rates across individual elements. Notably, gpt-4o exhibited comparable precision and recall, whereas o1-preview outperformed it on both, selecting NOTA only when it was highly confident. In contrast, gpt-4o-mini had low precision, indicating a tendency to overpredict NOTA. Lastly, the Anthropic models rarely selected NOTA—but when they did, they seldom selected it correctly.

5.6.2 Type Robustness. Here, we examine how LLM performance can fluctuate across several functional families commonly used in economic reasoning: Cobb-Douglas, Leontief, and linear.⁴ Each family poses its own difficulties—ranging from corner solutions in Leontief to exponent-based operations in Cobb-Douglas—that can trip up language models in non-trivial ways. In fact, while

⁴We offer technical descriptions and the economic interpretations to these functions in Appendix E.

Model	Recall	Precision	F1 Score
o1-preview	0.780	0.744	0.762
gpt-4o	0.704	0.698	0.701
claude-3-5-sonnet	0.438	0.607	0.509
gpt-4o-mini	0.747	0.451	0.562
claude-3-haiku	0.051	0.580	0.093

Table 2. Aggregated performance on the CAR adaptation across 20 elements. Overall, o1-preview attains the best balance between correctly catching true CAR questions (recall) and avoiding extraneous CAR predictions. In contrast, claude-3-haiku is extremely conservative about labeling CAR (low recall), which leads it to miss the vast majority of CAR questions. The random guessing baseline is 0.25 for all metrics.




Fig. 11. Exact-match accuracy of all closed-source models on three elements (Input Price Elasticity, Diminishing Marginal Products, and Returns to Scale) across three functional families (Cobb-Douglas, Leontief, and Linear). In general, while Cobb-Douglas often poses greater difficulty, performance does not consistently align with one family being the hardest for every element. For instance, while accuracy on Cobb-Douglas functions on Diminishing Marginal Products is considerably lower than for Linear functions, the opposite trend is seen for the Returns to Scale element. The red dashed line indicates the random-guessing baseline for comparison.

some models may excel at one concept (such as summing exponents to determine returns to scale in a Cobb-Douglas production function), they can stumble on another (for instance, capturing how inputs must remain in fixed proportions under Leontief). As illustrated in Figure 11, even among the three highlighted elements (e.g., Input Price Elasticity, Diminishing Marginal Products, and Returns to Scale), differences in performance underscore how the interplay between economic interpretation and mathematical representation can yield different outcomes across function families.

5.6.3 Domain Robustness. While overall the variation across domains was limited, we observed noticeable differences in specific elements. In particular, elements testing conceptual understanding

of foundational principles (e.g., first welfare theorem) showed that certain domains provided more effective contextual cues for the LLMs. For example, in the consumer goods domain—where items like apples, chairs, or mugs are familiar in economic word problems—LLMs were more likely to recognize the task as an economic problem and anchor their reasoning in classical economic principles.

In contrast, the technology domain, where the economic context could be interpreted as a real-world scenario, presented more challenges. The LLMs often failed to recognize what was being asked and equivocated when reasoning about the problem. The largest performance gaps appeared in the First Welfare Theorem and Second Welfare Theorem elements. To give some examples, the gap in accuracy between the consumer goods and technology domains for claude-3-5-sonnet, claude-3-haiku, and gpt-4o-mini was respectively 0.657, 0.48, and 0.278.

6 Discussion and Conclusions

Our work introduces a novel benchmark specifically designed to evaluate LLMs’ performance in non-strategic microeconomics, focusing on tasks that require a deep understanding of optimization, marginal analysis, and economic reasoning in individual decision-making contexts. This benchmark provides a comprehensive tool to assess the strengths and weaknesses of current models, revealing where they excel and where they struggle in applying foundational economic concepts. By identifying these areas, our benchmark can guide users in determining when LLMs can be trusted to perform well in economic analyses and when further development is needed.

In cases where models fall short, our benchmark serves as a practical resource for targeted improvements, e.g., via fine-tuning models, curating more specific datasets, or developing architectures better suited for microeconomic reasoning. These enhancements have the potential to impact a variety of economic applications, such as simulating consumer behavior, analyzing market dynamics, or conducting policy evaluations.

Looking ahead, we plan to expand our benchmark by incorporating additional elements from the microeconomics literature, deepening the evaluation of non-strategic decision-making. We encourage suggestions on new elements to include and make auto-STEER public for others to add more elements or expand on the elements we have currently. We also intend to explore further experimentation with additional LLMs, adaptation strategies, and prompt configurations, along with more detailed analyses of model performance.

7 Acknowledgements

This work was funded by an NSERC Discovery Grant, a DND/NSERC Discovery Grant Supplement, a CIFAR Canada AI Research Chair (Alberta Machine Intelligence Institute), awards from Facebook Research and Amazon Research, and DARPA award FA8750-19-2-0222, CFDA #12.910 (Air Force Research Laboratory). This paper draws on research supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

References

- Julio Cesar Salinas Alvarado, Karin Verspoor, and Timothy Baldwin. 2015. Domain Adaption of Named Entity Recognition to Support Credit Risk Assessment. In *Proceedings of the Australasian Language Technology Association Workshop, ALTA 2015, Parramatta, Australia, December 8 - 9, 2015*, Ben Hachey and Kellie Webster (Eds.). ACL, Parramatta, Australia, 84–90. <https://aclanthology.org/U15-1010/>
- Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. MathQA: Towards Interpretable Math Word Problem Solving with Operation-Based Formalisms. arXiv:1905.13319 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.13319>
- Anthropic. 2025. <https://docs.anthropic.com/en/api/getting-started>
- Dogu Araci. 2019. FinBERT: Financial Sentiment Analysis with Pre-trained Language Models. arXiv:1908.10063 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.10063>
- Gagan Bhatia, El Moatez Billah Nagoudi, Hasan Cavusoglu, and Muhammad Abdul-Mageed. 2024. FinTral: A Family of GPT-4 Level Multimodal Financial Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2402.10986> arXiv:2402.10986
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. arXiv:2005.14165 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165>
- David Budescu and Maya Bar-Hillel. 1993. To guess or not to guess: A decision-theoretic view of formula scoring. *Journal of Educational Measurement* 30, 4 (1993), 277–291.
- Andrea Carriero, Davide Pettenuzzo, and Shubhranshu Shekhar. 2024. Macroeconomic Forecasting with Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2407.00890> arXiv:2407.00890
- Yiting Chen, Tracy Xiao Liu, You Shan, and Songfa Zhong. 2023. The Emergence of Economic Rationality of GPT. arXiv:2305.12763 [econ.GN] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.12763>
- Zhiyu Chen, Wenhui Chen, Charese Smiley, Sameena Shah, Iana Borova, Dylan Langdon, Reema Moussa, Matt Beane, Ting-Hao Huang, Bryan Routledge, and William Yang Wang. 2021. FinQA: A Dataset of Numerical Reasoning over Financial Data. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 3697–3711. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.300>
- Zhiyu Chen, Shiyang Li, Charese Smiley, Zhiqiang Ma, Sameena Shah, and William Yang Wang. 2022. ConvFinQA: Exploring the Chain of Numerical Reasoning in Conversational Finance Question Answering. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2210.03849> arXiv:2210.03849
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. arXiv:2110.14168 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>
- Chunyuan Deng, Yilun Zhao, Xiangru Tang, Mark Gerstein, and Arman Cohan. 2023. Investigating Data Contamination in Modern Benchmarks for Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2311.09783> arXiv:2311.09783
- Kawin Ethayarajh and Dan Jurafsky. 2020. Utility is in the Eye of the User: A Critique of NLP Leaderboards. arXiv:2009.13888 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.13888>
- Sebastian Gehrmann, Tosin P. Adewumi, Karmanyaa Aggarwal, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Aremu Anuoluwapo, Antoine Bosselut, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Miruna-Adriana Clinciu, Dipanjan Das, Kaustubh D. Dhole, Wanyu Du, Esin Durmus, Ondrej Dusek, Chris Emezue, Varun Gangal, Cristina Garbacea, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Yufang Hou, Yacine Jernite, Harsh Jhamtani, Yangfeng Ji, Shailza Jolly, Dhruv Kumar, Faisal Ladhak, Aman Madaan, Mounica Maddela, Khyati Mahajan, Saad Mahmood, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Pedro Henrique Martins, Angelina McMillan-Major, Simon Mille, Emiel van Miltenburg, Moin Nadeem, Shashi Narayan, Vitaly Nikolaev, Rubungo Andre Niyongabo, Salomey Osei, Ankur P. Parikh, Laura Perez-Beltrachini, Niranjana Ramesh Rao, Vikas Raunak, Juan Diego Rodriguez, Sashank Santhanam, João Sedoc, Thibault Sellam, Samira Shaikh, Anastasia Shimorina, Marco Antonio Sobrevilla Cabezudo, Hendrik Strobelt, Nishant Subramani, Wei Xu, Diyi Yang, Akhila Yerukola, and Jiawei Zhou. 2021. The GEM Benchmark: Natural Language Generation, its Evaluation and Metrics. arXiv:2102.01672 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.01672>
- Luca Gioachini, Giuseppe Siracusano, Davide Sanvito, Kiril Gashteovski, David Friede, Roberto Bifulco, and Carolin Lawrence. 2024. AgentQuest: A Modular Benchmark Framework to Measure Progress and Improve LLM Agents. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2404.06411> arXiv:2404.06411
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. 2017. On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks. arXiv:1706.04599 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.04599>
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020a. Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding. arXiv:2009.03300 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03300>

- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020b. Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding. arXiv:2009.03300 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03300>
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020c. Measuring Massive Multitask Language Understanding. arXiv:2009.03300 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03300>
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset. arXiv:2103.03874 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.03874>
- Danqing Huang, Shuming Shi, Chin-Yew Lin, Jian Yin, and Wei-Ying Ma. 2016. How well do Computers Solve Math Word Problems? Large-Scale Dataset Construction and Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016, August 7-12, 2016, Berlin, Germany, Volume 1: Long Papers*. The Association for Computer Linguistics, Berlin, Germany. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/P16-1084>
- Jiaxin Huang, Shixiang Shane Gu, Le Hou, Yuexin Wu, Xuezhi Wang, Hongkun Yu, and Jiawei Han. 2022. Large Language Models Can Self-Improve. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2210.11610> arXiv:2210.11610
- Pau Rodriguez Inserte, Mariam Nakhle, Raheel Qader, Gaëtan Caillaud, and Jingshu Liu. 2024. Large Language Model Adaptation for Financial Sentiment Analysis. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2401.14777> arXiv:2401.14777
- Saidul Islam, Hanae Elmekki, Ahmed Elsebai, Jamal Bentahar, Nagat Drawel, Gaith Rjoub, and Witold Pedrycz. 2023. A Comprehensive Survey on Applications of Transformers for Deep Learning Tasks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2306.07303> arXiv:2306.07303
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2205.11916> arXiv:2205.11916
- Guillaume Lampe and François Charton. 2019. Deep Learning for Symbolic Mathematics. arXiv:1912.01412 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.01412>
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. The Power of Scale for Parameter-Efficient Prompt Tuning. arXiv:2104.08691 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.08691>
- Nian Li, Chen Gao, Mingyu Li, Yong Li, and Qingmin Liao. 2024a. EconAgent: Large Language Model-Empowered Agents for Simulating Macroeconomic Activities. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 15523–15536. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2024.ACL-LONG.829>
- Wangyue Li, Liangzhi Li, Tong Xiang, Xiao Liu, Wei Deng, and Noa Garcia. 2024b. Can Multiple-choice Questions Really Be Useful in Detecting the Abilities of LLMs?. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, Nicoletta Calzolari, Min-Yen Kan, Veronique Hoste, Alessandro Lenci, Sakriani Sakti, and Nianwen Xue (Eds.). ELRA and ICCL, Torino, Italia, 2819–2834. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.lrec-main.251>
- Yang Li, Yangyang Yu, Haohang Li, Zhi Chen, and Khaldoun Khashanah. 2023. TradingGPT: Multi-agent system with layered memory and distinct characters for enhanced financial trading performance.
- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Ré, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladha, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel J. Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yüksekgönül, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri S. Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. 2022. Holistic Evaluation of Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2211.09110> arXiv:2211.09110
- Wang Ling, Dani Yogatama, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. 2017. Program Induction by Rationale Generation: Learning to Solve and Explain Algebraic Word Problems. arXiv:1705.04146 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1705.04146>
- Macedo Maia, Siegfried Handschuh, André Freitas, Brian Davis, Ross McDermott, Manel Zarrouk, and Alexandra Balahur. 2018. WWW'18 Open Challenge: Financial Opinion Mining and Question Answering. In *Companion of the The Web Conference 2018 on The Web Conference 2018, WWW 2018, Lyon , France, April 23-27, 2018*, Pierre-Antoine Champin, Fabien Gandon, Mounia Lalmas, and Panagiotis G. Ipeirotis (Eds.). ACM, Lyon, France, 1941–1942. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3184558.3192301>
- Pekka Malo, Ankur Sinha, Pyry Takala, Pekka J. Korhonen, and Jyrki Wallenius. 2013. Good Debt or Bad Debt: Detecting Semantic Orientations in Economic Texts. arXiv:1307.5336 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.5336>
- Seyed-Iman Mirzadeh, Keivan Alizadeh, Hooman Shahrokhi, Oncel Tuzel, Samy Bengio, and Mehrdad Farajtabar. 2024. GSM-Symbolic: Understanding the Limitations of Mathematical Reasoning in Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2410.05229> arXiv:2410.05229
- Rajdeep Mukherjee, Abhinav Bohra, Akash Banerjee, Soumya Sharma, Manjunath Hegde, Afreen Shaikh, Shivani Srivastava, Koustuv Dasgupta, Niloy Ganguly, Saptarshi Ghosh, and Pawan Goyal. 2022. ECTSum: A New Benchmark

- Dataset For Bullet Point Summarization of Long Earnings Call Transcripts. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2210.12467>
arXiv:2210.12467
- Mahdi Pakdaman Naeini, Gregory F. Cooper, and Milos Hauskrecht. 2015. Obtaining Well Calibrated Probabilities Using Bayesian Binning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, January 25-30, 2015, Austin, Texas, USA*, Blai Bonet and Sven Koenig (Eds.). AAAI Press, Austin, Texas, 2901–2907. <https://doi.org/10.1609/AAI.V29I.19602>
- OpenAI. 2020. <https://openai.com/blog/openai-api>
- Ethan Perez, Douwe Kiela, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2021. True Few-Shot Learning with Language Models. arXiv:2105.11447 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.11447>
- P Rajpurkar. 2016. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text.
- Narun Krishnamurthi Raman, Taylor Lundy, Samuel Joseph Amouyal, Yoav Levine, Kevin Leyton-Brown, and Moshe Tennenholz. 2024. STEER: Assessing the Economic Rationality of Large Language Models. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net, Vienna, Austria. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nU1mtFDtMX>
- Mathieu Ravaut, Bosheng Ding, Fangkai Jiao, Hailin Chen, Xingxuan Li, Ruochen Zhao, Chengwei Qin, Caiming Xiong, and Shafiq Joty. 2024. How Much are LLMs Contaminated? A Comprehensive Survey and the LLMSanitize Library. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2404.00699> arXiv:2404.00699
- Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Tongshuang Wu, Carlos Guestrin, and Sameer Singh. 2020. Beyond Accuracy: Behavioral Testing of NLP Models with CheckList. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault (Eds.)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 4902–4912. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.442>
- Oscar Sainz, Jon Ander Campos, Iker García-Ferrero, Julen Etxaniz, Oier Lopez de Lacalle, and Eneko Agirre. 2023. NLP Evaluation in trouble: On the Need to Measure LLM Data Contamination for each Benchmark. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2310.18018> arXiv:2310.18018
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. arXiv:1910.01108 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.01108>
- Rylan Schaeffer, Brando Miranda, and Sanmi Koyejo. 2023. Are Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models a Mirage? <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.15004> arXiv:2304.15004
- Raj Sanjay Shah, Kunal Chawla, Dheeraj Eidnani, Agam Shah, Wendi Du, Sudheer Chava, Natraj Raman, Charese Smiley, Jiaao Chen, and Diyi Yang. 2022. When FLUE Meets FLANG: Benchmarks and Large Pretrained Language Model for Financial Domain. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2022, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 7-11, 2022*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2322–2335. <https://doi.org/10.18653/V1/2022.EMNLP-MAIN.148>
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R. Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, Agnieszka Kluska, Aitor Lewkowycz, Akshat Agarwal, Alethea Power, Alex Ray, Alex Warstadt, Alexander W. Kocurek, Ali Safaya, Ali Tazarv, Alice Xiang, Alicia Parrish, Allen Nie, Aman Hussain, Amanda Askell, Amanda Dsouza, Ambrose Sloane, Ameet Rahane, Anantharaman S. Iyer, Anders Andreassen, Andrea Madotto, Andrea Santilli, Andreas Stuhlmüller, Andrew M. Dai, Andrew La, Andrew K. Lampinen, Andy Zou, Angela Jiang, Angelica Chen, Anh Vuong, Animesh Gupta, Anna Gottardi, Antonio Norelli, Anu Venkatesh, Arash Gholamidavoodi, Arfa Tabassum, Arul Menezes, Arun Kirubarajan, Asher Mullokandov, Ashish Sabharwal, Austin Herrick, Avia Efrat, Aykut Erdem, Ayla Karakas, B. Ryan Roberts, Bao Sheng Loe, Barret Zoph, Bartłomiej Bojanowski, Batuhan Özurt, Behnam Hedayatnia, Behnam Neyshabur, Benjamin Inden, Benno Stein, Berk Ekmekci, Bill Yuchen Lin, Blake Howald, Bryan Orinon, Cameron Diao, Cameron Dour, Catherine Stinson, Cedrick Argueta, César Ferri Ramírez, Chandan Singh, Charles Rathkopf, Chenlin Meng, Chitta Baral, Chiyu Wu, Chris Callison-Burch, Chris Waites, Christian Voigt, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Potts, Cindy Ramirez, Clara E. Rivera, Clemencia Siro, Colin Raffel, Courtney Ashcraft, Cristina Garbacea, Damien Sileo, Dan Garrette, Dan Hendrycks, Dan Kilman, Dan Roth, Daniel Freeman, Daniel Khashabi, Daniel Levy, Daniel Moseguí González, Danielle Perszyk, Danny Hernandez, Danqi Chen, Daphne Ippolito, Dar Gilboa, David Dohan, David Drakard, David Jurgens, Debajyoti Datta, Deep Ganguli, Denis Emelin, Denis Kleyko, Deniz Yuret, Derek Chen, Derek Tam, Dieuwke Hupkes, Diganta Misra, Dilyar Buzan, Dimitri Coelho Mollo, Diyi Yang, Dong-Ho Lee, Dylan Schrader, Ekaterina Shutova, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Elad Segal, Eleanor Hagerman, Elizabeth Barnes, Elizabeth Donoway, Ellie Pavlick, Emanuele Rodolà, Emma Lam, Eric Chu, Eric Tang, Erkut Erdem, Ernie Chang, Ethan A. Chi, Ethan Dyer, Ethan J. Jerzak, Ethan Kim, Eunice Engefu Manyasi, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Fanyue Xia, Fatemeh Siar, Fernando Martínez-Plumed, Francesca Happé, François Chollet, Frieda Rong, Gaurav Mishra, Genta Indra Winata, Gerard de Melo, Germán Kruszewski, Giambattista Parascandolo, Giorgio Mariani, Gloria Wang, Gonzalo Jaimovich-López, Gregor Betz, Guy Gur-Ari, Hana Galijasevic, Hannah Kim, Hannah Rashkin, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Harsh Mehta, Hayden Bogar, Henry Shevlin, Hinrich Schütze, Hiromu Yakura, Hongming Zhang, Hugh Mee Wong, Ian Ng, Isaac Noble, Jaap

- Jumelet, Jack Geissinger, Jackson Kernion, Jacob Hilton, Jaehoon Lee, Jaime Fernández Fisac, James B. Simon, James Koppel, James Zheng, James Zou, Jan Kocon, Jana Thompson, Janelle Wingfield, Jared Kaplan, Jarema Radom, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Jason Phang, Jason Wei, Jason Yosinski, Jekaterina Novikova, Jelle Bosscher, Jennifer Marsh, Jeremy Kim, Jeroen Taal, Jesse H. Engel, Jesujoba Alabi, Jiacheng Xu, Jiaming Song, Jillian Tang, Joan Waweru, John Burden, John Miller, John U. Balis, Jonathan Batchelder, Jonathan Berant, Jörg Frohberg, Jos Rozen, José Hernández-Orallo, Joseph Boudeman, Joseph Guerr, Joseph Jones, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, Joshua S. Rule, Joyce Chua, Kamil Kanclerz, Karen Livescu, Karl Krauth, Karthik Gopalakrishnan, Katerina Ignat'yeva, Katja Markert, Kaustubh D. Dhole, Kevin Gimpel, Kevin Omondi, Kory W. Mathewson, Kristen Chiaffullo, Ksenia Shkaruta, Kumar Shridhar, Kyle McDonell, Kyle Richardson, Laria Reynolds, Leo Gao, Li Zhang, Liam Dugan, Lianhui Qin, Lidia Contreras Ochando, Louis-Philippe Morency, Luca Moschella, Lucas Lam, Lucy Noble, Ludwig Schmidt, Luheng He, Luis Oliveros Colón, Luke Metz, Lütfi Kerem Senel, Maarten Bosma, Maarten Sap, Maartje ter Hoeve, Maheen Farooqi, Manaal Faruqui, Mantas Mazeika, Marco Baturan, Marco Marelli, Marco Maru, María José Ramírez-Quintana, Marie Tolkiehn, Mario Giulianelli, Martha Lewis, Martin Potthast, Matthew L. Leavitt, Matthias Hagen, Mátyás Schubert, Medina Baitemirova, Melody Arnaud, Melvin McElrath, Michael A. Yee, Michael Cohen, Michael Gu, Michael I. Ivanitskiy, Michael Starritt, Michael Strube, Michal Swedrowski, Michele Bevilacqua, Michihiro Yasunaga, Mihir Kale, Mike Cain, Mimee Xu, Mirac Suzgun, Mitch Walker, Mo Tiwari, Mohit Bansal, Moin Aminnaseri, Mor Geva, Mozhdeh Gheini, Mukund Varma T., Nanyun Peng, Nathan A. Chi, Nayeon Lee, Neta Gur-Ari Krakover, Nicholas Cameron, Nicholas Roberts, Nick Doiron, Nicole Martinez, Nikita Nangia, Niklas Deckers, Niklas Muennighoff, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Niveditha Iyer, Noah Constant, Noah Fiedel, Nuan Wen, Oliver Zhang, Omar Agha, Omar Elbaghdadi, Omer Levy, Owain Evans, Pablo Antonio Moreno Casares, Parth Doshi, Pascale Fung, Paul Pu Liang, Paul Vicol, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Peiyuan Liao, Percy Liang, Peter Chang, Peter Eckersley, Phu Mon Htut, Pinyu Hwang, Piotr Milkowski, Piyush Patil, Pouya Pezeshkpour, Priti Oli, Qiaozhu Mei, Qing Lyu, Qinlang Chen, Rabin Banjade, Rachel Etta Rudolph, Raefer Gabriel, Rahel Habacker, Ramon Risco, Raphaël Millière, Rhythm Garg, Richard Barnes, Rif A. Saurous, Riku Arakawa, Robbe Raymaekers, Robert Frank, Rohan Sikand, Roman Novak, Roman Sitelew, Ronan LeBras, Rosanne Liu, Rowan Jacobs, Rui Zhang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Ryan Chi, Ryan Lee, Ryan Stovall, Ryan Teehan, Rylan Yang, Sahib Singh, Saif M. Mohammad, Sajant Anand, Sam Dillavou, Sam Shleifer, Sam Wiseman, Samuel Gruetter, Samuel R. Bowman, Samuel S. Schoenholz, Sanghyun Han, Sanjeev Kwatra, Sarah A. Rous, Sarik Ghazarian, Sayan Ghosh, Sean Casey, Sebastian Bischoff, Sebastian Gehrmann, Sebastian Schuster, Sepideh Sadeghi, Shadi Hamdan, Sharon Zhou, Shashank Srivastava, Sherry Shi, Shikhar Singh, Shima Asaadi, Shixiang Shane Gu, Shubh Pachchigar, Shubham Toshniwal, Shyam Upadhyay, Shyamolima (Shammie) Debnath, Siamak Shakeri, Simon Thormeyer, Simone Melzi, Siva Reddy, Sneha Priscilla Makini, Soo-Hwan Lee, Spencer Torene, Sriharsha Hatwar, Stanislav Dehaene, Stefan Divic, Stefano Ermon, Stella Biderman, Stephanie Lin, Stephen Prasad, Steven T. Piantadosi, Stuart M. Shieber, Summer Mishergi, Svetlana Kiritchenko, Swaroop Mishra, Tal Linzen, Tal Schuster, Tao Li, Tao Yu, Tariq Ali, Tatsu Hashimoto, Te-Lin Wu, Théo Desbordes, Theodore Rothschild, Thomas Phan, Tianle Wang, Tiberius Nkinyili, Timo Schick, Timofei Kornev, Titus Tunduny, Tobias Gerstenberg, Trenton Chang, Trishala Neeraj, Tushar Khot, Tyler Shultz, Uri Shaham, Vedant Misra, Vera Demberg, Victoria Nyamai, Vikas Raunak, Vinay V. Ramasesh, Vinay Uday Prabhu, Vishakh Padmakumar, Vivek Srikumar, William Fedus, William Saunders, William Zhang, Wout Vossen, Xiang Ren, Xiaoyu Tong, Xinran Zhao, Xinyi Wu, Xudong Shen, Yadollah Yaghoobzadeh, Yaïr Lakretz, Yangqiu Song, Yasaman Bahri, Yejin Choi, Yichi Yang, Yiding Hao, Yifu Chen, Yonatan Belinkov, Yu Hou, Yufang Hou, Yuntao Bai, Zachary Seid, Zhuoye Zhao, Zijian Wang, Zijie J. Wang, Zirui Wang, and Ziyyi Wu. 2022. Beyond the Imitation Game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2206.04615> arXiv:2206.04615
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksa Chowdhery, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Denny Zhou, and Jason Wei. 2022. Challenging BIG-Bench Tasks and Whether Chain-of-Thought Can Solve Them. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2210.09261> arXiv:2210.09261
- Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. SuperGLUE: A Stickier Benchmark for General-Purpose Language Understanding Systems. arXiv:1905.00537 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.00537>
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2018. GLUE: A Multi-Task Benchmark and Analysis Platform for Natural Language Understanding. *CoRR* abs/1804.07461 (2018). arXiv:1804.07461 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1804.07461>
- Haoyu Wang, Guozheng Ma, Cong Yu, Ning Gui, Linrui Zhang, Zhiqi Huang, Suwei Ma, Yongzhe Chang, Sen Zhang, Li Shen, Xueqian Wang, Peilin Zhao, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. Are Large Language Models Really Robust to Word-Level Perturbations? <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2309.11166> arXiv:2309.11166
- Siyuan Wang, Zhuohan Long, Zhihao Fan, Zhongyu Wei, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024. Benchmark Self-Evolving: A Multi-Agent Framework for Dynamic LLM Evaluation. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2402.11443> arXiv:2402.11443
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed H. Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain of Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. arXiv:2201.11903 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903>

- Colin White, Samuel Dooley, Manley Roberts, Arka Pal, Benjamin Feuer, Siddhartha Jain, Ravid Schwartz-Ziv, Neel Jain, Khalid Saifullah, Siddartha Naidu, Chinmay Hegde, Yann LeCun, Tom Goldstein, Willie Neiswanger, and Micah Goldblum. 2024. LiveBench: A Challenging, Contamination-Free LLM Benchmark. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2406.19314> arXiv:2406.19314
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierrick Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, and Jamie Brew. 2019. HuggingFace’s Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing. arXiv:1910.03771 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03771>
- Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabrowski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhanjan Kambadur, David S. Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. 2023a. BloombergGPT: A Large Language Model for Finance. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2303.17564> arXiv:2303.17564
- Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabrowski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhanjan Kambadur, David S. Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. 2023b. BloombergGPT: A Large Language Model for Finance. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2303.17564> arXiv:2303.17564
- Qianqian Xie, Weiguang Han, Yanzhao Lai, Min Peng, and Jimin Huang. 2023a. The Wall Street Neophyte: A Zero-Shot Analysis of ChatGPT Over MultiModal Stock Movement Prediction Challenges. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.05351> arXiv:2304.05351
- Qianqian Xie, Weiguang Han, Xiao Zhang, Yanzhao Lai, Min Peng, Alejandro Lopez-Lira, and Jimin Huang. 2023b. PIXIU: A Large Language Model, Instruction Data and Evaluation Benchmark for Finance. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2306.05443> arXiv:2306.05443
- Hongyang Yang, Xiao-Yang Liu, and Christina Dan Wang. 2023. FinGPT: Open-Source Financial Large Language Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2306.06031> arXiv:2306.06031
- Yi Yang, Mark Christopher Siy Uy, and Allen Huang. 2020. FinBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Financial Communications. arXiv:2006.08097 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.08097>
- Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Ben Bogin, Uri Katz, Daniel Deutch, and Jonathan Berant. 2023. Answering Questions by Meta-Reasoning over Multiple Chains of Thought. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.13007> arXiv:2304.13007
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. HellaSwag: Can a Machine Really Finish Your Sentence?. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Florence, Italy. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1472>
- Wei Zhao, Mingyue Shang, Yang Liu, Liang Wang, and Jingming Liu. 2020. Ape210K: A Large-Scale and Template-Rich Dataset of Math Word Problems. arXiv:2009.11506 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.11506>
- Zhihan Zhou, Liqian Ma, and Han Liu. 2021. Trade the Event: Corporate Events Detection for News-Based Event-Driven Trading. arXiv:2105.12825 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.12825>
- Kaijie Zhu, Jindong Wang, Jiaheng Zhou, Zichen Wang, Hao Chen, Yidong Wang, Linyi Yang, Wei Ye, Yue Zhang, Neil Gong, and Xing Xie. 2024. PromptRobust: Towards Evaluating the Robustness of Large Language Models on Adversarial Prompts. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Workshop on Large AI Systems and Models with Privacy and Safety Analysis, LAMPS 2024, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, October 14-18, 2024*, Bo Li, Wenyuan Xu, Jieshan Chen, Yang Zhang, Jason Xue, Shuo Wang, Guangdong Bai, and Xingliang Yuan (Eds.). ACM, Salt Lake City, Utah, 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3689217.3690621>

A Taxonomy of Non-Strategic Microeconomics

A.1 DECISIONS ON CONSUMPTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS

We begin by characterizing the space of elements that test an agent's ability to optimally allocate their limited resources to goods and services they desire. In economics and decision theory, the most primitive approach to describing the preferences of decision-makers is to use a function that maps a set of possible choices to the agent's optimal choice within that set. Under a set of intuitive assumptions, such as *transitivity* (i.e., if bundle X is preferred to bundle Y , and Y is preferred to bundle Z , then X must be preferred to Z), it becomes possible to "rationalize" preferences by instead describing a utility function. This function assigns a real number to each bundle, and the agent selects the bundle with the highest utility.

In this paper, we focus on these "rationalizable" preferences, where agent choice can be implemented as utility maximization constrained by prices and income. The solution to these consumer choice problems provides us with, among other things, individual demand functions, which describe the choice of each good or service as a function of prices and income. The individual demand functions for each good are essential when aggregating to the market demand in Consumer Goods Market Aggregation, which in turn is used to find the price in a non-strategic equilibrium. In addition, we test variations on the framework such as the agents ability to make tradeoffs between the quantity of goods they would need to be able to purchase for an increase in the amount of work they provide for a given wage (i.e., the elasticity of labor supply), as well as cases of choice under uncertainty where the agent is choosing between possible lotteries under rationalizability assumptions required for von Neuman expected utility.

A.1.1 Properties of Utility Functions. In this section, we test the ability of the agent to use utility functions as a means to compare preferences over different "bundles" of goods or services. A key feature of economic reasoning in this context is for agents to consider how substitution between different goods in a bundle might achieve the same utility (i.e., map out the "indifference curves"). Key tests include correctly distinguishing between substitutes and complements in consumption, and calculating the marginal rate of substitution at a point on an indifference curve. This logic is essential for both agents acting as a planner as we will see in Appendix A.4 and when fulfilling the role of choice under budget and income constraints, in Deriving Demand.

Element A.1 (Marginal Utility). *The ability to calculate marginal utility for different types of demand curves such as quasilinear, Cobb-Douglas, and Leontief.*

Element A.2 (Diminishing Marginal Utility). *The ability to recognize the role of diminishing marginal utility in consumption decisions and the role of achieving interior solutions.*

Element A.3 (Marginal Rate of Substitution). *The ability to calculate the marginal rate of substitution between two goods in a consumption decision.*

Element A.4 (Tangency and the Marginal Rate of Substitution). *The ability to calculate the marginal rate of substitution between two goods in a consumption decision at a given point in the budget constraint as tangent to the indifference curve.*

Element A.5 (Substitutes and Complements). *The ability to distinguish between substitutes and complements in consumption decisions.*

A.1.2 Deriving Demand. The module in this section tests an agent's ability to solve a constrained utility maximization problem to derive a demand function—relying on the results of Properties of Utility Functions. We test the canonical classes of demand functions, check the duality of Marshallian demand and Hicksian demand, and ask the agent to derive these demand functions from first principles.

Element A.6 (Derivation of Marshallian Demand). *The ability to calculate the demand curve for a good given a utility function and a budget constraint.*

Element A.7 (Derivation of Hicksian Demand from Expenditure Minimization). *The ability to calculate the demand curve for a good given a utility function and a budget constraint.*

Element A.8 (Duality of Hicksian Demand). *The ability to recognize that Hicksian demand (expenditure minimization) is dual to maximization in Marshallian Demand.*

A.1.3 *Comparative Statics of Demand.* This module considers how agents reason about changes in prices or income, and their effects on the quantity of each good they would purchase. We test the classic law of demand, different types of goods (e.g., normal, inferior, and Giffen), and derive Engel curves from first principles. The key tests are to ensure the agent rationally responds to changes in relative prices, and investigate their substitution between goods in a bundle. In practice, these tests involve comparative statics of the argmax from the utility maximization of the previous section on Deriving Demand—i.e., using an Envelope theorem and perturbing prices or income.

Element A.9 (Law of Demand). *The ability to calculate the change in demand with the change in price for normal goods.*

Element A.10 (Price Elasticity of Demand). *The ability to calculate the price elasticity of demand for a good given a utility function and a budget constraint.*

Element A.11 (Consumption Changes). *The ability to change the relative expenditures on goods given changes in relative prices with ordinary or Giffen goods.*

Element A.12 (Engel Curves). *The ability to calculate the Engel curve for a good given a utility function and a budget constraint.*

Element A.13 (Income Elasticity of Demand). *The ability to calculate the income elasticity of demand for a good given a utility function and a budget constraint.*

A.1.4 *Labor Supply.* While the proceeding elements tested tradeoffs in choices of bundles with different goods, services (in Deriving Demand and over lotteries in Dynamic Consumption Decisions), often agents need to make a choice trading off between leisure and consumption. The elements in this module test an agent’s ability to optimally make that tradeoff by balancing the consumption goods required to compensate for decreased leisure—which leads to the labor supply elasticity central to many branches of economics. Since goods must be purchased, agents will consider the relative wage from additional work compared to the price of goods. This leads us to be able to test an agent’s ability to distinguish real from nominal prices.

Element A.14 (Deriving Labor Supply). *The ability to calculate the labor supply curve given specific preference parameterizations such as separable preferences or homothetic preferences.*

Element A.15 (Labor Supply Elasticity). *The ability to calculate the elasticity of labor supply.*

Element A.16 (Marginal Rate of Substitution in Labor Supply). *The ability to calculate the marginal rate of substitution between consumption and leisure in a labor supply decision.*

A.1.5 *Dynamic Consumption Decisions.* Individuals often face decisions about how to trade off more consumption today at the cost of additional debt and less consumption in the future, and how best to plan for consumption with various contingencies with the future is uncertain. Among other applications, this provides a formal model of how to best choose a mixture of financial assets—i.e., portfolios. Consequently, this subsection tests intertemporal consumption choices, optimal portfolio choice—which involves selecting a mix of assets that maximizes expected utility given the risks and returns associated with each asset. Understanding portfolio choice helps explain how consumers

manage risk and make investment decisions, which is vital for financial planning and economic stability.

Element A.17 (Price of Risk with Mean-Variance Utility). *The ability to calculate the price of risk for a mean-variance utility function.*

Element A.18 (State-Contingent Consumption). *The ability to calculate the optimal consumption given a utility function and a set of state-contingent consumption bundles.*

Element A.19 (Arbitrage). *The ability to recognize and execute arbitrage opportunities given two goods and prices you can resell.*

Element A.20 (Optimal Portfolio Choice with Bid-Ask Spreads). *The ability to calculate the optimal portfolio given bid-ask spreads.*

Element A.21 (Exponential Discounting). *The ability to exponentially discount future rewards or costs.*

Element A.22 (Intertemporal Consumption Smoothing). *The ability to calculate a smoothed consumption path and determine whether it is preferred to a non-smoothed path.*

A.2 DECISIONS ON PRODUCTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS

In the previous section, we derived how an agent facing a set of prices would choose the quantity demanded of each good or service to maximize their utility function. We also tested the amount of time that an agent might choose to work (i.e., the quantity of labor supplied) given market wages—where the agent trades off the additional goods they might purchase against the lost leisure time they must forgo. Here, we look at the other side of the market and test an agent’s ability to operate a production technology to maximize profits. Facing market prices for all production factors (e.g., wages and the capital) and the market price of the good or service they produce, the agent chooses the quantity of each factor of production and the total output. Parallel to DECISIONS ON CONSUMPTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS, in Properties of Production Functions we first test general properties of production functions to ensure the agent can reason about substitution between factors, economies of scale in production, etc. Then in Deriving Factor Demand we solve the firms optimal profit maximization problem to determine the optimal choice of factors of production and output given a set of market prices. Finally, in Comparative Statics with Production we test the agents ability to reason about comparative statics on prices and their impact on factor demand and firm output.

A.2.1 Properties of Production Functions. Production functions in these environments take continuous inputs of each factor, which lets us test an agent’s ability to conduct marginal thinking when choosing the composition of inputs. For example, by knowing the hourly wage of hiring an additional worker, the additional output the worker might produce using the particular production process, and the price they can sell the firm’s output, they can decide whether hiring the additional worker is profitable. In the absence of prices, this section tests basic decision making of the agent for understanding substitution between factor of production, marginal products for each input, and the understanding of the returns to scale of a production process.

Element A.23 (Marginal Products). *The ability to calculate separate marginal products for a production function with multiple inputs (e.g., labor and capital).*

Element A.24 (Input Price Elasticity). *The ability to calculate the responsiveness of output to a proportional change in a specific input’s cost, holding all other inputs constant.*

Element A.25 (Output Elasticity). *The ability to calculate the output elasticity of an input in a production function.*

Element A.26 (Elasticity of Substitution). *The ability to calculate the marginal elasticity of substitution between inputs in a production function.*

Element A.27 (Diminishing Marginal Products). *The ability to calculate the diminishing marginal products for a production function with multiple inputs.*

Element A.28 (Average and Marginal Costs). *The ability to calculate average and marginal costs given a production function and input prices, and use them to determine scale.*

Element A.29 (Returns to Scale). *The ability to determine the proportional change in output resulting from a proportional change in all inputs in a production function.*

A.2.2 *Deriving Factor Demand.* This module tests the agent's ability to act in the role of a profit maximizer in non-strategic situations where they take as given the price which they could sell goods they produce, and must pay for inputs to their production process at market rates (e.g., a competitive wage). Whereas in Deriving Demand, the agent was solving a utility maximization problem subject to a budget constraint, here they solve a profit maximization problem constrained by a production function. We test decisions on the quantity and composition of inputs, and the quantity of output for canonical production functions such as Cobb-Douglas and Leontief production functions given the agent's understanding of production functions from Properties of Production Functions. The agent is asked to derive the factor demand functions from first principles from profit maximization and test their ability to reason with the dual cost-minimization formulation—analogous to the Hicksian vs. Marshallian demand of Deriving Demand.

Element A.30 (Profit Maximization). *The ability to calculate the optimal input bundle for a firm given a production function and input prices. Examples of given production functions: Cobb-Douglas, Leontief, Perfect Substitutes, CES production, CRS production, fixed costs.*

Element A.31 (Expenditure Minimization). *The ability to calculate the optimal input bundle for a firm given a production function and input prices.*

Element A.32 (Duality of Profit Maximization and Expenditure Minimization). *The ability to recognize that profit maximization is dual to expenditure minimization in production decisions and achieve consistent solutions.*

A.2.3 *Comparative Statics with Production.* This module considers how agents reason about changes in the prices at which they can sell their goods, as well as changes in the costs of producing those goods. In particular, we can test how this affects their optimal choice of inputs to their production process (e.g., how many people to hire or robots to lease). We test comparative statics on the prices of inputs to the production function, changes to the underlying production technology, and substitution between goods for classic production functions such as Cobb-Douglas and Leontief. Analogous to the relationship between Deriving Demand and Comparative Statics of Demand, these tests involve comparative statics of the argmax from the profit maximization of Deriving Factor Demand—i.e., using an Envelope theorem and perturbing factor prices.

Element A.33 (Price Elasticity of Supply). *The ability to calculate the price elasticity of supply for a good given a production function and input prices.*

Element A.34 (Shephard's Lemma). *The ability to calculate factor demands given a cost function using the derivatives with respect to prices.*

Element A.35 (Input Price Elasticity). *The ability to calculate how the optimal input bundle changes with changes in input prices for a given production function.*

Element A.36 (Total Factor Productivity). *The ability to calculate total factor productivity given a production function and input prices*

A.2.4 Dynamic Production Decisions. While Deriving Factor Demand tested the ability of agents to make static (i.e., within-period) decisions on the mix of input factors to maximize profits, many producer problems are inherently dynamic. For example, we can test if an agent can optimally choose the amount of capital to purchase given forecasts of future consumer demand and prices or choose how much to adjust the labor force in cases when labor is difficult to relocate due to frictions such as hiring and firing costs. Finally, agents are tested on their ability to make optimal entry and exit decisions based on their forecasted profits in an evolving market.

Element A.37 (Dynamic Profit Maximization). *The ability to calculate the optimal investment decision given a production function and input prices.*

Element A.38 (Entry and Exit Decisions). *The ability to calculate the optimal entry and exit decisions given a production function and fixed costs.*

A.3 DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS

This setting tests the core logic of the relationship between supply-and-demand and prices, building on the tests of optimal behavior in appendix A.2 and appendix A.1. Economists refer to “general equilibrium” as the process where equilibrium prices and quantities emerge with a large number of non-strategic, price-taking market participants interact. Unlike the strategic models found in STEER, the assumption is that the market interactions that lead to this equilibrium occur through an unspecified process that clears markets (i.e., a “Walrasian auctioneer” or “invisible hand”).

In particular, for non-strategic settings, all market participants take prices as given and choose the quantity demanded or supplied in each market. For example, consumers jointly decide on the quantity demanded of goods and services given relative prices, and the quantity of labor supplied given a wage. Simultaneously, producers choose the quantity supplied of the good and the demand of each factor of production. With a large number of non-strategic market participants we can test the agents ability aggregate all of their supply and demand functions to calculate a market-level supply and demand. Finally, given the aggregated supply and demand functions for each market, we can test whether an agent can find the market clearing price where supply is equal to demand in equilibrium—given their internal model of all the market participants.

In this section, we organize by markets rather than by the role of a decision maker, as in the previous sections. For example, in the goods market we first ensure agents understand how individual demand functions from Deriving Demand aggregate to a market demand function for the good given a price, then that the agent understands how to aggregate the output from each producer at a given price from Comparative Statics with Production, and finally that the agent is able to calculate the price which would equate demand and supply and clear the market in a non-strategic setting. Factor markets are treated similarly.

Finally, given a system of equations that defines an equilibrium price we can perturb primitives (e.g., technological factors, distortions on decisions such as tax rates, or exogenous prices not determined in equilibrium) to see how the market clearing price would respond. That is an essential tool for agents to be able to reason about the impact of interventions and distortions in Appendix A.4.

A.3.1 Consumer Goods Market Aggregation. The market clearing prices in general equilibrium arise from the separate market-level demand and supply curves, which sums the demand or supply across all market participants at a given price. Here we test the aggregation of demand functions derived from individual preferences, as in Deriving Demand and Comparative Statics of Demand, to a market demand function that summarizes the total quantity demanded across all agents at a given price. Central to the tests is to verify that the agent can aggregate the demands of market participants with heterogeneous preferences. On the other side of the market, we test if the agent

can aggregate the “supply functions” resulting from the optimal choice of factors in Deriving Factor Demand and Comparative Statics with Production.

Element A.39 (Aggregation of Consumer Demand). *The ability to calculate the aggregate demand for a good given primitives of demand into expenditure shares.*

Element A.40 (Aggregation of Offer Curve for the Good). *The ability to calculate the aggregate supply of a good given primitives of supply into production functions.*

A.3.2 *Factor Market Aggregation.* As with the case of the goods market in Consumer Goods Market Aggregation the market demand and supply for factors of production are essential to find the market clearing price. For example, we test whether the agent can aggregate the individual labor supply curve decisions from market participants who work at a particular wage, following Labor Supply, into a market labor supply curve. On the other side of the market, we test whether the agent can aggregate the labor demand in Deriving Factor Demand from producers into a market labor demand curve. The same tests are essential for all factors of production, including capital.

Element A.41 (Aggregation of Labor Demand). *The ability to calculate the aggregate demand for labor given primitives of demand into expenditure shares.*

Element A.42 (Aggregation of Capital Demand). *The ability to calculate the aggregate demand for capital given primitives of demand into expenditure shares.*

Element A.43 (Aggregation of Labor Supply). *The ability to calculate the aggregate supply of labor given primitives of supply into production functions.*

Element A.44 (Aggregation of Fixed Factor Supply). *The ability to calculate the aggregate supply of capital given primitives of supply into production functions.*

A.3.3 *Prices in Static Market Equilibrium.* In this setting we test the agent’s ability to reason about how prices emerge in non-strategic setting as a process of equating supply and demand, which in turn relies on their ability to aggregate those market demand functions from consumer and producer behavior.

More specifically, the core logic of general equilibrium is to find the equilibrium price by taking the aggregated demand and supply functions for each market and find the prices which would equate demand and supply. For example, the supply and demand functions for the good, as a function of the price, in Consumer Goods Market Aggregation; or the supply and demand functions for factors of production, as a function of factor prices in Factor Market Aggregation. This is done market by market, taking all other prices as given—which requires the agent reason through comparative statics of the solution to a system of equations while keeping everything else fixed.

Element A.45 (Find Equilibrium Price). *The ability to calculate the equilibrium prices given a production function and a demand function.*

Element A.46 (Factor Shares in Equilibrium). *The ability to calculate the factor shares in a competitive equilibrium given a production function and input prices.*

A.3.4 *Comparative Statics of Equilibrium Prices.* Here, we test whether agents can reason about how prices and allocations (e.g., labor, capital, and goods) would respond to changes in the environment. The canonical tests are to see how changes in model primitives (e.g., productivity of the production process) or exogenous forces from outside the model (e.g., impact of weather), change the equilibrium price and allocations of labor, capital, etc. that would clear the market and equate demand and supply.

Element A.47 (Comparative Statics with Total Factor Production Shocks). *The ability to calculate how equilibrium prices change with changes in input prices for a Cobb-Douglas production function.*

Element A.48 (Comparative Statics with Inelastic or Perfectly Elastic Supply). *The ability to calculate how equilibrium prices change with changes in input prices for a production function with inelastic or perfectly elastic supply.*

A.4 EVALUATING EQUILIBRIA AND EXTERNALITIES

In DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS, we tested an agent's ability to reason about equilibrium prices and quantities arising from supply and demand decisions in a non-strategic setting. Although preferences were reflected in the underlying supply and demand functions themselves (i.e., utility maximization in the consumption decisions of DECISIONS ON CONSUMPTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS and profit maximization in the production decisions of DECISIONS ON PRODUCTION IN NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS), the equilibria in DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS do not necessarily reflect broader social preferences.

However, we can still ask whether the resulting “allocations” (i.e., the physical goods produced and how they are distributed to individuals, the amount of hours worked, and the physical capital installed) from the “invisible hand” in DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS compare to alternative ways of allocating resources which may directly take social preferences into account. A central result of economics in non-strategic settings is that absent market imperfections and market power (i.e., when self-interested agents cannot directly manipulate prices because they are too small) the competitive equilibria of DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS typically yields the same allocations a benevolent planner might choose.

In this section, we consider how a social planner would evaluate the underlying welfare, efficiency, and inequality that comes about in non-strategic equilibria with prices derived from equating supply and demand. This leads to testing the ability of the agent to evaluate Pareto efficiency, consider the welfare theorems, evaluate Pigouvian externalities, and weigh the welfare impact of various market interventions which change the equilibria derived in DECISIONS IN MULTI-AGENT NON-STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS.

A.4.1 Welfare and Decentralization. In this section, we test whether the agent can determine cases where the competitive equilibrium they calculate would yield the same distribution of resources and consumer welfare as that of a benevolent social planner directly making the consumption and production decisions of all agents directly (also known as the “Welfare Theorems”). In cases where the supply-and-demand relationships lead to the same results as those of a planner, the competitive equilibrium and its prices are said to “decentralize” the problem of a social planner. We then test that the agent recognizes cases where the welfare theorems fail, and can calculate the degree of welfare loss due to the distortions.

Element A.49 (First Welfare Theorem). *The ability to recognize that a competitive equilibrium is Pareto efficient.*

Element A.50 (Second Welfare Theorem). *The ability to recognize that any Pareto efficient allocation can be achieved as a competitive equilibrium with prices.*

Element A.51 (Consumer Surplus). *The ability to calculate consumer surplus given a demand curve and a price.*

Element A.52 (Producer Surplus). *The ability to calculate producer surplus given a supply curve and a price.*

Element A.53 (Efficient Surplus). *The ability to calculate the total surplus in a competitive equilibrium and recognize that it is maximized in the competitive equilibrium.*

Element A.54 (Deadweight Loss of a Monopoly). *The ability to calculate the deadweight loss of a monopoly given a demand curve and a supply curve.*

A.4.2 Welfare Analysis of Market Equilibrium. In this section, we focus on the agent’s ability to evaluate welfare implications of various forms of market equilibrium, particularly how different policies and distortions impact overall efficiency and resource allocation. The agent is tested on their understanding of how different interventions—such as taxes, subsidies, and price controls—affect welfare outcomes, and their ability to distinguish between distortionary and non-distortionary policies.

Element A.55 (Identify Non-Distortionary Taxes). *The ability to identify taxes which do not distort the allocation of resources.*

Element A.56 (Irrelevance of Tax Incidence). *The ability to recognize that the incidence of a tax does not depend on who is legally responsible for paying the tax.*

Element A.57 (Labor Supply Distortions). *The ability to determine the extent that labor taxes will distort labor supply and change aggregates and prices.*

Element A.58 (Capital Market Distortions). *The ability to identify that taxing a fixed factor is non-distortionary, but distorts with dynamic accumulation.*

B Mitigating Data Contamination with auto-STEER

Data contamination, where training data inadvertently includes information from test sets, poses significant challenges in machine learning, leading to overestimated model performance and compromised generalization capabilities. To address this, we implemented a structured dataset generation methodology incorporating human oversight, controlled data generation, and style transfer techniques. This appendix details our approach and its alignment with best practices in the literature.

The auto-STEER methodology provides a systematic approach to generating datasets that mitigates the risk of data contamination, ensuring the integrity of benchmarks and the validity of results. Below, we outline the key aspects of auto-STEER that address this issue:

B.1 Challenging Models with Rephrasings:

Rephrasings are known to cause significant variance in model performance, as demonstrated in the GSM-Symbolic dataset [Mirzadeh et al., 2024] and other studies [e.g., Wang et al., 2023, Zhu et al., 2024] highlighting how syntactic or stylistic changes can challenge generalization. In Appendix H, we also show that much of the observed variance in LLM performance arises from these rephrasings, underscoring their role in robust evaluations. auto-STEER leverages this phenomenon to craft diverse rephrased questions that test beyond rote learning.

B.2 Dynamic Question Generation:

auto-STEER generates new questions through a structured process that balances diversity and consistency. Questions are systematically rephrased or style-transferred to ensure they are different enough from the original templates to prevent memorization while retaining the same core meaning. This approach reduces the risk of overlap with pre-trained data while preserving the focus of the assessment.

The rapid advancement of large language models necessitates benchmarks that can evolve just as quickly. To address this, auto-STEER incorporates a user interface that allows users to regenerate

entire datasets with minimal effort. By modifying domains, seeds, or even resampling numerical values, users can quickly produce an entirely new dataset with minimal effort. This adaptability ensures that benchmarks remain fresh and resistant to contamination as models advance.

C Technical Descriptions of Adaptations

C.1 RPM (Conditioning):

Given the LLM’s output distribution over all possible tokens, filter to include only those that correspond to valid options. For example, if a question has four options then get the probabilities corresponding to ‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’, and ‘D’. Then, compute softmax over the valid options to normalize the filtered probabilities into a distribution.

C.2 RPM (Mixing):

Alternatively, we restrict the output distribution to only valid option tokens O as follows: $\alpha \cdot p(o) + (1 - \alpha)^{1/|O|}$, where $o \in O$, $p(o)$ is the probability the LLM assigns to each token it outputs, and $\alpha = \sum_{o \in O} p(o)$. We then compute the softmax to normalize the resulting probabilities into a distribution.

In the mixing approach, if an LLM is confident in a valid option token the resulting distribution will place high probability on that token, but if an LLM places negligible probability on the valid option tokens then the resulting distribution will more closely resemble a uniform distribution.

C.3 Prompt for Getting Answers from Free-Text QA

User Message:

Report the answer that the following reasoning ended up with. Do not solve the question just look at the explanation text and report the answer if it exists or None if not. Just report the number or None.

Q: {question_text}

Explanation: {model_response}

D Technical Descriptions of Metrics

D.1 Accuracy.

Accuracy is the most broadly used metric for evaluating LLMs. We define accuracy metrics as metrics that only look at the top token that the LLM outputs.

D.1.1 Exact-Match accuracy. This is the fraction of questions answered correctly.

D.1.2 Normalized accuracy. Elements can differ in their number of multiple choice options, leading to differences in the exact-match accuracy of random guessing. We can compensate for this by reporting the gap between the LLM’s exact-match accuracy and random guessing [Budescu and Bar-Hillel, 1993]. We compute normalized accuracy for an element as follows: $\sum_{i=1}^N a_i(t_i) - \frac{1-a_i(t_i)}{|O_i|-1}$, where t_i is the top token the LLM outputs for question i , a_i is the indicator describing whether the top token is correct or not, N the number of questions in the element, and $|O_i|$ the number of options in the question. In other words, normalized accuracy rewards an LLM with 1 point for every correct answer and penalizes an LLM by 1 over the number of options minus 1 for each incorrect answer.

D.2 Calibration

It can also be useful to understand how confident an LLM is in its responses and the extent to which these confidence levels align with accuracy.

D.2.1 Expected Calibration Error. We follow Liang et al. [2022] and Raman et al. [2024] in measuring the confidence of an LLM’s response and computing the expected calibration error [ECE; Guo et al., 2017, Naeini et al., 2015]. ECE measures how closely the probability an LLM assigns to its top answer matches the actual probability of the correct answer, which in our case is 1. ECE first splits the data into M equally spaced bins, where each bin contains the probabilities the model assigned to their top token in that range: e.g., let p^{\max} be the set of most probable tokens for each question then if $M = 2$, then the first bin $B_1 = \{p \mid p \in p^{\max} \text{ and } p \in [0, 0.5]\}$. It is then defined as $\sum_{i \in [M]} |B_i|/N \cdot |\text{acc}(B_i) - \text{conf}(B_i)|$, where $\text{conf}(B_i)$ is the average probability the LLM assigned to its top token in bin B_i , and $\text{acc}(B_i)$ denotes the exact-match accuracy in bin B_i . We allow users to choose the number of bins, however, we set $M = 10$ uniformly spaced over the interval $[0, 1]$ as standard.

D.2.2 Brier Score. The Brier Score of an element is defined as

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{|O_i|} \sum_{o \in O_i} (p_i(o) - a_i(o))^2,$$

where $p_i(o)$ is the probability the LLM assigns to option o in question i . Thus, if an LLM is overly confident in an incorrect answer (e.g., assigns a probability of 0.9 to a wrong option), the Brier Score will penalize it more heavily.

D.2.3 Expected Probability Assignment. EPA measures how much probability mass an LLM assigns to the correct answer option out of all possible options. It is defined as: $1/N \sum_{i \in [N]} p_i^*$, where p_i^* is the predicted probability that the LLM assigns to the correct option for question i .

D.3 Robustness

Elements are not the lowest level of granularity in our benchmark and aggregating on an element-by-element basis may hide where LLM performance varies. We introduce three robustness metrics that aggregate on the component fields of an element: domains, types, and perspectives. We compute the domain (type, perspective) robustness on each element by taking the minimum normalized accuracy over all domains (types, perspectives).

E Technical Descriptions of Functional Families

In this section, we describe the functional forms that we use in testing economic concepts. Each can be applied to *consumer* problems (as utility functions) or *producer* problems (as production functions). We highlight the canonical mathematical form and note any technical differences in interpretation when modeling consumers versus producers.

E.1 Cobb-Douglas

The *Cobb-Douglas* functional form is one of the most frequently used due to its tractable properties and partial elasticities interpretation. Suppose there are n goods (or inputs). For a producer with input vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, a typical Cobb-Douglas production function can be written as:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = A x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n},$$

where $A > 0$ is a scale parameter and each $\alpha_i \geq 0$. For a consumer's utility function, the same functional family looks like:

$$u(\mathbf{q}) = q_1^{\beta_1} q_2^{\beta_2} \cdots q_n^{\beta_n},$$

where $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)$ are quantities of goods consumed, and $\beta_i \geq 0$. Economically, α_i (or β_i) often reflect the relative importance (or expenditure share) of each input (or good).

E.2 Leontief

A *Leontief* functional form encodes strict complementarity. A producer's Leontief production function is described as:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \min\left\{\frac{x_1}{a_1}, \frac{x_2}{a_2}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{a_n}\right\},$$

where each $a_i > 0$ captures a fixed proportion in which inputs must be combined. For a consumer, their Leontief utility function is of the form:

$$u(\mathbf{q}) = \min\left\{\frac{q_1}{\gamma_1}, \frac{q_2}{\gamma_2}, \dots, \frac{q_n}{\gamma_n}\right\}.$$

This implies goods are perfect complements: the consumer gains utility only when goods are consumed in the specific ratio $\gamma_1 : \gamma_2 : \dots : \gamma_n$. In production, perfect complementarity imposes that a shortage of any one input strictly limits total output.

E.3 Linear

The *linear* family is the simplest and assumes perfect substitutability. For a producer, the linear production function with inputs \mathbf{x} takes the form:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + \cdots + b_n x_n,$$

where $b_i \geq 0$. This means each input contributes additively (and independently) to output. A consumer's linear utility function with goods \mathbf{q} is:

$$u(\mathbf{q}) = \theta_1 q_1 + \theta_2 q_2 + \cdots + \theta_n q_n,$$

where $\theta_i > 0$ captures the marginal utility for good i . In both contexts, linear forms imply a constant rate of technical (or preferential) substitution, reflecting strong substitutability among inputs (or goods).

E.4 Non-Linear

Beyond the classic forms, we use low-degree polynomial specifications for both production and utility functions. Such functions can capture nonlinearities without resorting to strictly Cobb-Douglas or other functional families. For a producer with inputs \mathbf{x} , a second-degree polynomial looks like:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ij} x_i x_j,$$

where $\alpha_0, \alpha_i, \alpha_{ij}$ are specified parameters. Similarly, for a consumer's utility function, we write:

$$u(\mathbf{q}) = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i q_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} q_i q_j.$$

These forms allow more flexible curvature than linear or Cobb-Douglas, but remain computationally tractable for low degrees. The main difference in interpretation is that producers typically focus on *return-to-scale* questions or *marginal products*, while consumers focus on *marginal utilities* and *marginal rates of substitution*.

F Examples

F.1 GPT-4o Aggregation of Consumer Demand (Shown)

User Message:

Q: As the owner of a premium bedding brand, I cater to a diverse group of customers. I've discovered that there are 1204 potential buyers for my luxury bedding products. Out of these, 820 shoppers in urban markets each follow the demand function $18.1 - 1.51P$, while 384 shoppers in suburban markets each adhere to the demand function $75.44 - 8.68P$. How can I calculate the total demand for my bedding at a price point of 8.4?

- A. 2779.36
- B. 1832.01
- C. 5411.87 (*Correct Answer*)
- D. 5050.03

Let's think step by step. Explain your reasoning.

GPT-4o Message:

To calculate the total demand for your luxury bedding products at a price point of 8.4, we need to evaluate the demand functions for both urban and suburban markets separately and then sum the results.

Step 1: Calculate the demand in the urban market

The demand function for the urban market is given by:

$$Q_u = 18.1 - 1.51P$$

Substitute $P = 8.4$ into the urban demand function:

$$Q_u = 18.1 - 1.51 \times 8.4$$

$$Q_u = 18.1 - 12.684$$

$$Q_u = 5.416$$

Since there are 820 shoppers in the urban market, the total demand in the urban market is:

$$\text{Total Urban Demand} = 820 \times 5.416$$

$$\text{Total Urban Demand} = 4441.12$$

Step 2: Calculate the demand in the suburban market

The demand function for the suburban market is given by:

$$Q_s = 75.44 - 8.68P$$

Substitute $P = 8.4$ into the suburban demand function:

$$Q_s = 75.44 - 8.68 \times 8.4$$

$$Q_s = 75.44 - 72.912$$

$$Q_s = 2.528$$

Since there are 384 shoppers in the suburban market, the total demand in the suburban market is:

$$\text{Total Suburban Demand} = 384 \times 2.528$$

$$\text{Total Suburban Demand} = 970.88$$

Step 3: Calculate the total demand

Now, sum the total demand from both markets:

$$\text{Total Demand} = \text{Total Urban Demand} + \text{Total Suburban Demand}$$

$$\text{Total Demand} = 4441.12 + 970.88$$

$$\text{Total Demand} = 5411.87$$

Therefore, the total demand for your bedding at a price point of 8.4 is approximately 5411.87.

The correct answer is:

C. 5411.87

F.2 GPT-4o Aggregation of Consumer Demand (Hidden)**User Message:**

Q: As the owner of a premium bedding brand, I cater to a diverse group of customers. I've discovered that there are 1204 potential buyers for my luxury bedding products. Out of these, 820 shoppers in urban markets each follow the demand function $18.1 - 1.51P$, while 384 shoppers in suburban markets each adhere to the demand function $75.44 - 8.68P$. How can I calculate the total demand for my bedding at a price point of 8.4?

Let's think step by step. Explain your reasoning.

GPT-4o Message:

To calculate the total demand for your luxury bedding at a price point of 8.4, we need to evaluate the demand functions for both urban and suburban markets separately and then sum the results. Here's a step-by-step breakdown:

1. Identify the demand functions:

- Urban market demand function: $Q_u = 18.1 - 1.51P$
- Suburban market demand function: $Q_s = 75.44 - 8.68P$

2. Substitute the price point ($P = 8.4$) into each demand function:

- For the urban market:

$$Q_u = 18.1 - 1.51 \times 8.4$$

Calculate the value:

$$Q_u = 18.1 - 1.51 \times 8.4 = 18.1 - 12.684 = 5.416$$

- For the suburban market:

$$Q_s = 75.44 - 8.68 \times 8.4$$

Calculate the value:

$$Q_s = 75.44 - 8.68 \times 8.4 = 75.44 - 72.912 = 2.528$$

3. Sum the demands from both markets to get the total demand:

$$Q_{total} = Q_u + Q_s = 5.416 + 2.528 = 7.944$$

Therefore, at a price point of 8.4, the total demand for your luxury bedding products from both urban and suburban markets is approximately 7.944 units.

User Message:

- A. 2779.36
- B. 1832.01
- C. 5411.87 (*Correct Answer*)
- D. 5050.03

Answer by writing the option letter corresponding to the correct option. WRITE ONLY A SINGLE LETTER.

A:

GPT-4o Message:

B

F.3 GPT-4o Profit Maximization

User Message:

Q: John manages a company that produces premium leather wallets. The production output depends on the capital (K) he invests, represented by the function $3.97K^{0.45}$. At the moment, the wallets are sold at a price of 3.64, and John has an initial capital of $K_1 = 3.3$. He needs to decide how much additional capital to invest for the next day's market. John is aware of the potential price distribution for his wallets for the next day, represented by price 2.7 with probability 0.24, price 2.14 with probability 0.42, price 3.52 with probability 0.34. There is also a cost associated with increasing his capital, given by $(K_1 - K_2)^2$, and he applies a discount factor of 0.37 to future revenues. To maximize his profits, how much additional capital should John invest?

- A. 0.44
- B. 0.14
- C. 1.1
- D. 0.09

Let's think step by step. Explain your reasoning.

GPT-4o Message:

To determine how much additional capital John should invest to maximize his profits, we need to consider the expected revenue from the different potential prices, the cost of increasing capital, and the discount factor applied to future revenues. Let's break this down step by step.

Step 1: Calculate the Expected Revenue

First, we need to calculate the expected price of the wallets for the next day using the given probabilities.

$$\text{Expected Price} = (2.7 \times 0.24) + (2.14 \times 0.42) + (3.52 \times 0.34)$$

$$\text{Expected Price} = 0.648 + 0.8988 + 1.1968 = 2.7436$$

Step 2: Determine the Production Function

The production function is given by $3.97K^{0.45}$. We need to calculate the production output for different levels of capital K .

Step 3: Calculate the Revenue for Different Capital Levels

Let's denote the initial capital as $K_1 = 3.3$. We need to consider the additional capital ΔK that John might invest. The new capital K_2 will be $K_1 + \Delta K$.

The revenue function for a given capital K is:

$$\text{Revenue} = \text{Expected Price} \times \text{Production Output}$$

$$\text{Revenue} = 2.7436 \times 3.97K^{0.45}$$

Step 4: Calculate the Cost of Increasing Capital

The cost of increasing capital is given by $(K_1 - K_2)^2$. Since $K_2 = K_1 + \Delta K$, the cost becomes:

$$\text{Cost} = (\Delta K)^2$$

Step 5: Calculate the Discounted Future Revenue

John applies a discount factor of 0.37 to future revenues. Therefore, the discounted future revenue is:

$$\text{Discounted Revenue} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue}$$

Step 6: Calculate the Net Profit

The net profit is the discounted revenue minus the cost of increasing capital:

$$\text{Net Profit} = 0.37 \times (2.7436 \times 3.97K_2^{0.45}) - (\Delta K)^2$$

GPT-4o Message (Continued):**Step 7: Evaluate the Net Profit for Different Values of ΔK**

We need to evaluate the net profit for the given options of additional capital investment:

Option A: $\Delta K = 0.44$

$$K_2 = 3.3 + 0.44 = 3.74$$

$$\text{Production Output} = 3.97 \times 3.74^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Revenue} = 2.7436 \times 3.97 \times 3.74^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Discounted Revenue} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue}$$

$$\text{Cost} = (0.44)^2 = 0.1936$$

$$\text{Net Profit} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue} - 0.1936$$

Option B: $\Delta K = 0.14$

$$K_2 = 3.3 + 0.14 = 3.44$$

$$\text{Production Output} = 3.97 \times 3.44^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Revenue} = 2.7436 \times 3.97 \times 3.44^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Discounted Revenue} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue}$$

$$\text{Cost} = (0.14)^2 = 0.0196$$

$$\text{Net Profit} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue} - 0.0196$$

Option C: $\Delta K = 1.1$

$$K_2 = 3.3 + 1.1 = 4.4$$

$$\text{Production Output} = 3.97 \times 4.4^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Revenue} = 2.7436 \times 3.97 \times 4.4^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Discounted Revenue} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue}$$

$$\text{Cost} = (1.1)^2 = 1.21$$

$$\text{Net Profit} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue} - 1.21$$

Option D: $\Delta K = 0.09$

$$K_2 = 3.3 + 0.09 = 3.39$$

$$\text{Production Output} = 3.97 \times 3.39^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Revenue} = 2.7436 \times 3.97 \times 3.39^{0.45}$$

$$\text{Discounted Revenue} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue}$$

$$\text{Cost} = (0.09)^2 = 0.0081$$

$$\text{Net Profit} = 0.37 \times \text{Revenue} - 0.0081$$

Step 8: Compare the Net Profits

We need to compare the net profits for each option to determine which one maximizes John's profit.

After calculating the net profits for each option, we find that:

- Option A: $\Delta K = 0.44$ yields the highest net profit.

Therefore, the best option for John is to invest an additional capital of 0.44.

Answer: A. 0.44

User Message:

Answer by writing the option letter corresponding to the correct option. WRITE ONLY A SINGLE LETTER.

A:

GPT-4o Message:

A

G Figures




Fig. 12. This figure plots the distribution of selection rates of “No other option is correct” (NOTA) element-by-element. The dotted black line represents the correct frequency of selecting NOTA. We see that Anthropic models rarely select NOTA, whereas the non-reasoning OpenAI models over-select NOTA.

H Analysis of Rephrasing Variance

To understand the role of question rephrasings in our dataset, we conducted an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on all other controllable features. These features include type, domain, and perspective. The goal of this analysis was to quantify the variance in LLM performance attributable to these features and, by exclusion, infer the contribution of rephrasings to the remaining unexplained variance.

The results for the top-performing models, summarized in Table 3 through Table 7, indicate that the explained variance attributable to the controlled features is consistently low across all evaluated models. This leaves approximately 56% (for claude-3-5-sonnet) and up to 91% (for o1-preview) of the variance unexplained by the features included in the analysis. Given that question rephrasings are a systematic element of our dataset design and were not included as a feature in this analysis, we infer that the majority of this residual variance is due to differences in how models respond to semantically equivalent but syntactically varied prompts.

Factor	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F-Statistic	p-value
domain	7.5572	11.0000	3.0199	0.0823
perspective	3.4351	5.0000	3.0199	0.0823
CAR	21.1235	1.0000	92.8524	0.0000
element:type	178.6251	260.0000	3.0199	0.0823
Residual	2218.5356	9752.0000		
<i>R-squared</i>				0.0941
<i>Adjusted R-squared</i>				0.0907

Table 3. ANOVA Results for o1-preview-2024-09-12

Factor	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F-Statistic	p-value
domain	0.2619	11.0000	0.0928	0.7607
perspective	0.1190	5.0000	0.0928	0.7607
0-CoT	229.7295	1.0000	895.0635	0.0000
CAR	141.3015	1.0000	550.5338	0.0000
element:type	47.4945	1995.0000	0.0928	0.7607
Residual	16015.5015	62399.0000		
<i>R-squared</i>				0.3368
<i>Adjusted R-squared</i>				0.3358

Table 4. ANOVA Results for gpt-4o-2024-05-13

Factor	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F-Statistic	p-value
domain	0.4573	11.0000	0.1293	0.7191
perspective	0.2079	5.0000	0.1293	0.7191
0-Cot	34.0324	1.0000	105.8911	0.0000
CAR	159.1899	1.0000	495.3161	0.0000
element:type	82.9338	1995.0000	0.1293	0.7191
Residual	18642.5829	58006.0000		
<i>R-squared</i>				0.2964
<i>Adjusted R-squared</i>				0.2953

Table 5. ANOVA Results for gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18

Factor	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F-Statistic	p-value
domain	1.2389	11.0000	0.5004	0.6063
perspective	0.5032	5.0000	0.4472	0.5037
0-CoT	30.9486	1.0000	137.5118	0.0000
CAR	156.8135	1.0000	696.7577	0.0000
element:type	224.0990	1995.0000	0.4991	0.6071
Residual	18025.1941	80090.0000		
<i>R-squared</i>				0.4436
<i>Adjusted R-squared</i>				0.4430

Table 6. ANOVA Results for claude-3-5-sonnet-20240620

Factor	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F-Statistic	p-value
domain	1.4703	11.0000	0.3814	0.5369
perspective	0.6683	5.0000	0.3814	0.5369
0-Cot	0.2629	1.0000	0.7502	0.3864
CAR	0.4909	1.0000	1.4007	0.2366
element:type	266.6568	1995.0000	0.3814	0.5369
Residual	38842.9909	110826.0000		
<i>R-squared</i>				0.2336
<i>Adjusted R-squared</i>				0.2330

Table 7. ANOVA Results for claude-3-haiku-20240307

I Models

Model Name	Model Card	Chat/ Instruction Tuned
Closed-Source		<i>Continued on next page</i>

Model Name	Model Card	Chat/Instruction Tuned
<i>OpenAI</i>		
gpt-4o		✓
gpt-4o mini		✓
<i>Anthropic</i>		
claude-3-5-sonnet		✓
claude-3-haiku		✓
<i>Huggy Llama</i>		
llama-7b	huggyllama/llama-7b	✗
llama-13b	huggyllama/llama-13b	✗
llama-30b	huggyllama/llama-30b	✗
llama-65b	huggyllama/llama-65b	✗
<i>Meta Llama</i>		
Llama-2-7b-hf	meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-hf	✗
Llama-2-13b-hf	meta-llama/Llama-2-13b-hf	✗
Llama-2-7b-chat-hf	meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-chat-hf	✓
Llama-2-13b-chat-hf	meta-llama/Llama-2-13b-chat-hf	✓
Llama-3-8B	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B	✗
Llama-3-8B-Instruct	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct	✓
Llama-3.1-8B	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3.1-8B	✗
Llama-3.1-70B	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3.1-70B	✗
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	✓
<i>Mistral</i>		
Mistral-7B-v0.1	mistralai/Mistral-7B-v0.1	✗
Mathstral-7B-v0.1	mistralai/Mathstral-7B-v0.1	✗
Mistral-7B-v0.3	mistralai/Mistral-7B-v0.3	✗
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	✓
Mistral-Nemo-Base-2407 (12.2B)	mistralai/Mistral-Nemo-Base-2407	✗
Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 (12.2B)	mistralai/Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407	✓
<i>TIIuae</i>		
falcon-7B	tiiuae/falcon-7b	✗
falcon-11B	tiiuae/falcon-11B	✗
<i>AI21</i>		
Jamba-v0.1	ai21labs/Jamba-v0.1	✗
AI21-Jamba-1.5-Mini	ai21labs/AI21-Jamba-1.5-Mini	✗

Table 8. Overview of the open- and closed-source LLMs we evaluated. The table includes their names, their model card links, and whether they have been chat or instruction tuned. Models are grouped by family and sorted by parameter size, with non-chat-tuned models listed first within each group.

J Extra Results

J.1 Performance on Elements Generated by Claude 3.5 Sonnet

To assess whether the performance on our dataset was influenced by the choice of the generation LLM, we re-generated three elements from scratch using claude-3-5-sonnet. We selected Find Equilibrium Price because it exhibited the largest performance gap between gpt-4o and claude-3-5-sonnet, Diminishing Marginal Products was chosen as a random element with slight performance variation across the models, and Price Elasticity of Demand served as a control where no significant differences were expected.

Figure 13 shows the exact-match performance of both models on these three elements. We found no significant differences in performance between any of the models.




Fig. 13. Exact-match performance comparison between closed-source models on three that were generated by gpt-4o and claude-3-5-sonnet. The elements were selected based on the observed performance differences across models, with Price Elasticity of Demand serving as a control. The figure shows no significant differences in performance between the models on these elements. Note that the red dotted line signifies random guessing performance.

J.2 Intertemporal Consumption Smoothing

When optimizing intertemporal consumption, the consumer maximizes the discounted utility

$$\sum_{t=0}^T \beta^t u(c_t)$$

subject to the intertemporal budget constraint. The first-order condition for an optimum leads to the Euler equation:

$$u'(c_t) = \beta(1+r) u'(c_{t+1}).$$

For our purposes, we tested models using a constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) utility function. We used the following form:

$$u(c) = \frac{c^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} \quad (\gamma \neq 1),$$

where γ is the coefficient of relative risk aversion. This function exhibits diminishing marginal utility, meaning that each additional unit of consumption adds less to utility when overall consumption is high compared to when it is low. Due to diminishing returns, an agent is motivated to smooth consumption over time, even with a discount factor of 1; spending too much in one period reduces the marginal utility in that period, while having too little in another period results in a steep loss of satisfaction.

For CRRA utility, the Euler equation is given by:

$$u'(c_t) = \beta(1+r) u'(c_{t+1}),$$

where

$$u'(c) = c^{-\gamma}.$$

Rearranging yields:

$$c_{t+1} = [\beta(1+r)]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} c_t.$$

However, we found that LLMs would often use linear utility functions in their analysis. For a linear utility function, the Euler equation—which equates the marginal benefit of consuming today with that of consuming tomorrow—simplifies significantly. If $u'(c)$ is constant (say, equal to 1), then aside from the effects of discounting and interest, there is no curvature-driven motive to adjust consumption levels across periods. The optimal allocation would then depend solely on the intertemporal budget constraint and the returns on savings.

J.3 Deadweight Loss

To conduct our error analysis, we ran all closed-source models on the free-text QA adaptation of the deadweight loss task. We began by inspecting a range of model outputs to identify distinct classes of errors that were common across responses. Once these error categories were established, we computed the answers corresponding to these errors and rescored the models based on whether their outputs were within 98% of either the correct answer or any of the answers derived from specific error assumptions. We also ensured that when there was any overlap in incorrect responses that we chose the closest one to the model’s response. This approach allowed us to capture not only the frequency of correct outputs but also the systematic nature of the models’ reasoning flaws. Below, we provide a detailed breakdown of the primary error types:

- Incorrect Base for Deadweight Loss Type 1: This error incorrectly substitutes $P_e - P_m$ (the difference between the competitive equilibrium price and the monopolist’s price) in place of the correct term $P_m - MC(Q_m)$ (the difference between the monopolist’s price and the marginal cost at the monopolist’s quantity).

- Incorrect Base for Deadweight Loss Type 2: This error calculates the deadweight loss using the difference between the monopoly price and the competitive equilibrium price as the base of the triangle.
- Incorrect Base and Height Type 1: This error replaces the base of the DWL triangle ($Q_e - Q_m$) with a miscalculated value for the equilibrium quantity and replaces the base with the Type 1 variant.
- Incorrect Base and Height Type 2: This error assumes that $P_e = MC(Q_m)$, leading to an incorrect height calculation where the DWL triangle's height becomes $P_m - P_e$.
- Treating Marginal Cost as Constant: Instead of recognizing marginal cost as a function derived from the supply curve ($MC(Q) = a_{\text{supply}} \times Q + b_{\text{supply}}$), several models treated marginal cost as a constant, often equal to the slope of the supply curve. This assumption led to errors in determining the monopolist's quantity and price, further propagating inaccuracies in the deadweight loss calculation.
- Combined Errors: A subset of models combined the two errors above, simultaneously using an incorrect formula for deadweight loss and assuming a constant marginal cost. This compounded error significantly reduced the likelihood of producing a correct answer and highlighted the systematic nature of the misunderstanding.

J.4 Performance Gaps Between Free Text QA and Hidden MCQA

While most cases show a negative gap between hidden and free-text QA performance, there are notable exceptions. Figure 14 shows that in the Producer Surplus element, gpt-4o performed better in the free-text QA adaptation compared to the hidden adaptation. One might expect that the explanation for this positive gap is that the multiple-choice answers in the hidden adaptation were very similar, which may have caused confusion for the LLM. However, our analysis shows that when the free-text QA was scored correctly, gpt-4o selected an incorrect answer in the hidden adaptation with at least a 10% difference from the correct answer 78% of the time. This suggests that while the LLM could reason effectively about the problem, it struggled to correctly match its reasoning to the multiple-choice options provided.




Fig. 14. Comparison of exact-match accuracy for four elements (Intertemporal Consumption Smoothing, Profit Maximization, Aggregation of Consumer Demand, and Producer Surplus) across all closed-source models. The plot illustrates the difference in performance under the hidden and free-text adaptations, highlighting the impact of multiple-choice options on reasoning accuracy. Plotted in blue is the accuracy random guessing would have in the hidden adaptation, note that this line is not relevant for the free-text QA adaptation.




Fig. 15. This figure depicts the percentage of time models were incorrect in the free-text adaptation but correct on the hidden adaptation due to choosing the closest answer. The plot compares the performance of four elements—Intertemporal Consumption Smoothing, Profit Maximization, Aggregation of Consumer Demand, and Producer Surplus—across all closed-source models.

The plot also suggests that the performance gap in the Profit Maximization element is primarily due to the benefit random guessing has on accuracy in the hidden adaptation compared to free-text QA. Furthermore, in the Aggregation of Consumer Demand element, the inclusion of options after the reasoning step offered limited benefit, highlighting that the true advantage lies in including these options during the reasoning process.

These observations highlight an important nuance: although multiple-choice formats generally offer helpful structure for models, they may also hinder performance in certain scenarios.

K Section 3 Images

<p> User Prompt</p> <p>Q: A baseball team is buying new equipment and needs baseballs, their demand for baseballs at any given price is expressed by the following demand function $-1.89Q + 2.6$. What is the team's consumer surplus if the price of baseballs is 1.24? Let's think step by step. Explain your reasoning.</p>	<p> User Prompt</p> <p>Q: A baseball team is buying new equipment and needs baseballs, their demand for baseballs at any given price is expressed by the following demand function $-1.89Q + 2.6$. What is the team's consumer surplus if the price of baseballs is 1.24?</p> <p>A. 0.49 B. 0.33 C. 0.21 D. 1.34</p> <p>Let's think step by step. Explain your reasoning.</p>
<p> Output Model used: gpt-4</p> 	<p> Output Model used: gpt-4</p> 
<p> User Prompt</p> <p>A. 0.49 B. 0.33 C. 0.21 D. 1.34</p> <p>Answer by writing the option letter corresponding to the correct option. WRITE ONLY A SINGLE LETTER. A:</p>	<p> User Prompt</p> <p>Answer by writing the option letter corresponding to the correct option. WRITE ONLY A SINGLE LETTER. A:</p>
<p> Output Model used: gpt-4</p> <p>D</p>	<p> Output Model used: gpt-4</p> <p>B</p>

Fig. 16. (Left) The hidden approach to 0-CoT: the model is given only the question and asked to explain its reasoning before being provided with options. (Right) The shown approach to 0-CoT: the model is presented with both the question and options before explaining its reasoning.

L Web Application

The screenshot shows the 'Template Writing' page. On the left, there's a sidebar with navigation steps: Step 1: Write Templates, Step 2: Generate Templates, Step 3: Generate Dataset, Step 4: Validate Dataset, and Template Playground. Below this is a 'Templates' section with dropdown menus for Consumer Goods Template 1 and Consumer Goods Template 2. The main area has a title 'Template Writing' and a sub-section 'Enter the directory name for the element: Profit Maximization'. It includes fields for 'Include Options', 'Select the difficulty level' (set to 0), 'Enter the question type' (set to 'Optimize Labor'), 'Pick a domain' (set to 'consumer_goods'), 'Enter the tags' (set to 'first_person'), and a 'Generate Instructions' button. A text area for instructions is present, followed by a 'Verify Template' button. To the right, there's a panel for 'Question 0-0' with a detailed description of a profit maximization problem, a list of four multiple-choice options, and a 'Correct Answer' field. At the bottom right are 'Save Template' and 'Deploy' buttons.

Fig. 17. The web app user interface for template writing. This page includes fields for type, domain, grade level and tags (including perspectives). The right shows an example of template verification which uses a LLM to generate another template using the example seed.

The screenshot shows the 'Template Generation' page. The sidebar includes the same navigation steps as Fig. 17. The main area has a 'Enter Domains to Generate:' field containing 'consumer_goods', 'medical', 'finance', 'education', 'technology', 'entertainment', 'environmental...', 'politics', 'sports', and 'gambling'. Below it is a 'Generate 20 Templates' button. The next section is 'Template 1/20' with a code editor showing JSON template code. The code includes fields like 'question_1', 'options_1', 'instructions', and 'metadata'. Buttons for 'Save', 'Valid', 'Invalid', and 'Template status not set' are at the bottom. Below this is 'Template 2/20'.

Fig. 18. The web app user interface for template generation. This page allows for a selection of domains, and types for which templates will be generated using the available example seeds. Templates can then be verified and saved by the user.

Step 1: Write Templates
Step 2: Generate Templates
Step 3: Generate Dataset
Step 4: Validate Dataset
Template Playground

Template File
profit_maximization

Validation Stats
Completed: 0
↳ Valid: 0
↳ Invalid: 0
Pending: 15501

Instructions
Please give an MCQ example testing the ability compute the amount of labor that maximizes profit. The question should be concerning consumer goods. The question should be written in the second person. Do not include numbers in the example but leave them as variables as in the example below. Use the following variables in the curly braces: {price}, {p_func}, {capital}, {cost}. The MCQ should have only one option. See the following example as a guide but give a different example and write a narrative:

```
Metadata:
{
  "domain": "consumer_goods",
  "type": "compute_labor",
  "difficulty_level": 0,
  "tags": "second_person"
}
```

Template to validate:

Question 57295-0:
You operate a company that produces furniture. The furniture pieces are sold at {price} dollars each. Your production function in terms of capital (K) and labor (L) is {p_func}. The amount of capital you possess is fixed at {capital}. The cost per unit of labor is {cost}. How much labor should you employ to maximize your profit?
A. 0
B. No options found
C. False

Closest Example Template:
Question 0-0:
I run a company that produces smartphones. Smartphones currently sell for {price} dollars each. My production function, which depends on capital (K) and labor (L), is {p_func}. The amount of capital is fixed at {capital}. The cost per unit of labor is {cost}. How much labor should I utilize to maximize my profit?
A. 0
B. No options found
C. False

< 1 / 15501 > Save Progress

Invalid Valid

Fig. 19. The web app user interface for template validation. This page displays all generated seeds returned by the model for manual validation.