Benchmarking Biopharmaceuticals Retrieval-Augmented Generation Evaluation

Hanmeng Zhong

PatSnap Co., LTD. zhonghanmeng@patsnap.com

Linqing Chen* PatSnap Co., LTD. chenlinqing@patsnap.com

Abstract

Recently, the application of the retrievalaugmented Large Language Models (LLMs) in specific domains has gained significant attention, especially in biopharmaceuticals. However, in this context, there is no benchmark specifically designed for biopharmaceuticals to evaluate LLMs. In this paper, we introduce the Biopharmaceuticals **Retrieval-Augmented Generation Evalua**tion (BRAGE), the first benchmark tailored for evaluating LLMs' Query and Reference Understanding Capability (ORUC) in the biopharmaceutical domain, available in English, French, German and Chinese.¹ In addition, Traditional Question-Answering (QA) metrics like accuracy and exact match fall short in the open-ended retrieval-augmented QA scenarios. To address this, we propose a citation-based classification method to evaluate the QRUC of LLMs to understand the relationship between queries and references. We apply this method to evaluate the mainstream LLMs on BRAGE. Experimental results show that there is a significant gap in the biopharmaceutical QRUC of mainstream LLMs, and their QRUC need to be improved.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have become powerful tools in general and specific domains (OpenAI et al., 2024; Dubey et al., 2024; Anthropic, 2023; Team et al., 2024; Chen, 2025), due to their generative capabilities (Bang et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2023). Despite their excellent performance (Singhal et al., 2022; Anil et al., 2023; OpenAI et al., 2024; Dubey et al., 2024; Nori et al., 2023), LLMs still suffer from factual hallucinations (Cao et al., 2020; Raunak et al., 2021; Ji et al., 2023), caused by outdated knowledge (He et al., 2022) and limited domain-specific expertise (Li et al., 2023c). Weilei Wang PatSnap Co., LTD. wangweilei@patsnap.com

Wentao Wu

PatSnap Co., LTD. wuwentao@patsnap.com



Figure 1: Improper understanding of the query by LLM leads to the generation of incorrect content in their response. Here green and check marks indicate relevant, while red and cross marks indicate irrelevant in the retrieval results. Red text in the response represents content generated based on noisy references.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) addresses these shortcomings by retrieving relevant and upto-date information from trusted sources to supplement the knowledge of LLMs. This approach has been shown to effectively mitigate hallucinations and knowledge gaps in various domains (Guu et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2020a; Borgeaud et al., 2022; Izacard et al., 2023). In the biopharmaceutical domain, the incorporation of external knowledge not only enhances the existing capabilities of LLMs, but also provides the up-to-date information that they lack to accurately answer the biopharmaceutical queries (Lála et al., 2023; Zakka et al., 2024).

While RAG improves performance, it also introduces challenges (Menick et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023a). If invalid content (irrelevant or noisy content) is retrieved, LLMs may generate invalid content in responses. For example, in Figure 1, given the query "What is the application of ionic compounds in pharmaceuticals?" and two references (one relevant, one irrelevant), the LLM generates

^{*}Corresponding author.

¹We will release data and code after the paper is accepted.

invalid content about "ionic compounds in energy materials" (highlighted in red). Despite advances in retrieval systems, invalid content remains a challenge. It generally falls into three categories: (1). noisy but semantically similar, (2). completely irrelevant, and (3). factually incorrect (Fang et al., 2024). Properly classifying the retrieved content is the basis of utilizing them and requires accurate understanding capability. In biopharmaceuticals, domain-specific knowledge is essentially required, such as the relationships between drugs, targets, and indications. And due to the high requirements for accuracy in biopharmaceuticals, external knowledge is needed in most cases. Current benchmarks for evaluating retrieval-augmented LLMs (Chen et al., 2024; Fang et al., 2024; Jin et al., 2019; Xiong et al., 2024), which focus on closed-ended queries, cannot adequately assess LLMs' Query and Reference Understanding Capability (QRUC). Therefore, there is a need for benchmarks that evaluate the biopharmaceutical **QRUC**.

In this paper, we introduce the Biopharmaceuticals Retrieval-Augmented Generation Evaluation (BRAGE), a multilingual benchmark in English, French, German and Chinese. In detail, BRAGE is composed of open-ended queries, aiming to address two key issues of evaluation based on closedended queries: (1). predefined answers, which fails to evaluate the QRUC of LLMs; (2). quickly outdated, as the fast data evolution, some queries can be correctly answered only by the internal knowledge of LLMs. Specifically, the gold answers of open-ended queries are dependent on the augmented references: (a). the quality of the answer depends on the quality of the relevant content in the reference; (b). different LLMs may interpret the same reference differently. Therefore, LLMs are required to comprehensively comprehend the relationship between queries and augmented references, providing a more robust evaluation of QRUC in BRAGE. For augmented references, we apply LlamaIndex² as the retrieval method and utilize PubMed and search results from Google as data sources to fetch them.

Based on BRAGE, we evaluate the mainstream LLMs and explore potential improvements based on LLaMA 3 (Dubey et al., 2024). In order to better and explicitly evaluate the **QRUC** of retrieval-augmented LLMs, we prompt the LLMs to respond with citations and propose a citation-based evalu-

ation method. Given the characteristics of openended queries, where different LLMs generate various responses, traditional QA metrics like Acc and EM are invalid. We instead frame the evaluation as a binary classification, using Precision, Recall, and F1-score to measure whether the references cited in the response is relevant. This method directly quantifies the **QRUC** of LLMs. In addition, we evaluate the latest reasoning LLMs and analyze the impact of explicit COT (Chain-of-Thought) on the **QRUC** of LLMs. Moreover, we conduct human evaluations to validate the rationale of this evaluation method. Specifically, we check whether content before citation numbers in the responses matches the corresponding references.

Generally, our contributions are three-fold:

- We introduce BRAGE, the first biopharmaceutical benchmark designed for the evaluation on retrieval-augmented LLMs, aiming to evaluate the capability of LLMs to correctly utilize references relevant to queries.
- We formulate the evaluation of LLMs into a binary classification, quantitatively assessing the **QRUC** of LLMs. Additionally, we perform human evaluations to substantiate the reliability of this classification-based method.
- We conduct experiments on BRAGE, including evaluations of mainstream LLMs and validation experiments based on Llama 3. Experimental results quantify the **QRUC** of LLMs in biopharmaceuticals and the potential for further improvements, highlighting the utility of BRAGE for future research.

2 Related Work

Large Language Models (LLMs) excel in text generation but struggle with outdated knowledge, domain-specific gaps, and hallucinations (Huang et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Tonmoy et al., 2024). Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) (Lewis et al., 2020b) mitigates these issues by retrieving external knowledge to improve responses (Yu et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2024; Huang and Huang, 2024). RAG has shown strong performance in open-domain QA (Izacard and Grave, 2021; Trivedi et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023b), dialogue (Cai et al., 2019; Peng et al., 2023), and code generation (Zhou et al., 2023). However, retrieved external knowledge is difficult to utilize in biopharmaceuticals. Therefore, we introduce

²https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index

the Biopharmaceuticals Retrieval-Augmented Generation Evaluation Benchmark, using open-ended queries to better reflect real-world scenarios.

Benchmarks Evaluation of retrieval-augmented LLMs involves assessing performance when generating responses based on augmented references. It focuses on evaluating whether LLMs can correctly answer queries by utilizing the augmented references. Most current RAG benchmarks introduce noise into augmented references and evaluate the responses through predefined answers (Fang et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024; Thakur et al., 2024; Friel et al., 2024; Xiong et al., 2024). For instance, RGB (Chen et al., 2024) utilizes accuracy to assesses four abilities: Noise Robustness, Negative Rejection, Information Integration, and Counterfactual Robustness. NoMIRACL (Thakur et al., 2024) constructs relevant and non-relevant subsets, and evaluates the hallucination and error rates based on the subset labels. RAAT (Fang et al., 2024) constructs the RAG-bench that contains multiple types of noise, and divides a portion of the data as the training set. In the medical domain, MIRAGE (Xiong et al., 2024) adapts existing medical datasets into a RAG framework. However, current benchmarks focus on close-ended queries, which unable to evaluate QRUC. To address this, we introduce BRAGE to better reflect real-world challenges.

Metrics Most metrics for evaluating retrievalaugmented LLMs focus on response accuracy by determining whether the response contains the predefined answers (Chen et al., 2024; Xiong et al., 2024). Fine-tuning methods also use metrics like exact match and text utilization to verify improvements brought by training (Fang et al., 2024; Friel et al., 2024). Moreover, (Gao et al., 2023) proposes a citation-based metric using an NLI model to evaluate fluency, correctness, and citation quality of short QA tasks. RAGChecker (Ru et al., 2024) breaks down responses into correct and incorrect claims, assessing context utilization, noise sensitivity, hallucination, and faithfulness. RAGAS (Es et al., 2024) and ARES (Saad-Falcon et al., 2024) adopt the RAG Triad framework (Ferrara et al., 2024), evaluating context relevance, groundedness, and answer relevance. However, these metrics are evaluated based on predefined answers or the "LLM-as-judge" approach. Specifically, previous metrics are either not applicable to the open-ended QA scenarios or have overly strict requirements for the output format, failing to meet the evaluation needs of QRUC. To address this, we propose a classification-based metric, directly quantifying the **QRUC** of LLMs.

3 BRAGE

In this section, we first introduce the **QRUC** of retrieval-augmented LLMs in ($\S3.1$), which is the core capability we evaluate. Next, we outline our benchmark construction procedure in (\$3.2) and peresent the proposed evaluation metric in (\$3.3).

3.1 QRUC

Query and Reference Understanding Capability (QRUC) of retrieval-augmented LLMs refers to the capability to understand the query and the augmented references, and utilize the relevant items and ignore irrelevant items to answer the query. In detail, **QRUC** can be divided into two aspects: (1). the capability to identify the relevant references and utilize them in the answer; (2). the capability to identify the irrelevant references and not be influenced by them in the answer. Capability 1 refers to the extent to which LLMs achieve the purpose of augmenting references, that is, the degree of positive influence. In contrast, Capability 2 refers to the defensive property of LLMs against the augmented noisy references, that is, the degree of negative influence. Taking the above two capabilities into account, QRUC comprehensively measures the capability to utilize augmented references, which is highly consistent with the requirements of the biopharmaceutical domain. Therefore, QRUC should be the primary capability to be evaluated when assessing retrieved-augmented LLMs in biopharmaceuticals.

3.2 Data Construction

Framework of BRAGE The overview of our data construction is shown in Figure 2. Differently from the previous benchmarks (Chen et al., 2024; Xiong et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2023; Fang et al., 2024), we adopt a QA format but do not annotate gold answers, introducing noise that cannot answer the query into the augmented references to evaluate the **QRUC** of retrieval-augmented LLMs. In detail, since the evaluation objective of our benchmark is to assess **QRUC**, and the quantity of relevant and irrlevant references can be dynamically adjusted in the different experimental settings, annotating gold answers is unrealitic and meaningless. In a sense, the gold labels in BRAGE are whether relevant references should be cited, rather than predefined

phrases. It is closer to the major premise that in the scenario of augmented references QA, **QRUC** ensures the correctness of the answer content.



Figure 2: Overview of the data construction procedure involved in BRAGE.

Query collection Instead of prompting LLMs to generate queries and answers based on web data (Chen et al., 2024), we collect open-ended biopharmaceutical queries from experts ³. In detail, we classify collected queries into **five categories** to reflect the performance in different aspects: Basic Biology, Drug Development and Design, Clinical Translation and Application, Ethics and Regulation, Public Health and Infectious Disease. Their quantity distribution is shown in the Figure 3.



Figure 3: Distribution of query types in BRAGE

Reference collection After obtaining the biopharmaceuticals queries, we apply LlamaIndex as the retireval method to get relevant references from PubMed and search results from Google. Then annotators (biopharmaceuticals experts) are asked to categorize the retrieved results into two sets: 1) content that can answer the query, i.e., relevant; 2) content that cannot answer the query, i.e., irrelevant. For queries with a small number of irrelevant content, we perform **query rephrasing** (e.g., rewriting "the action mechanism of drug A" into "the adverse reactions of drug A"), and then use the new query to get references. The references of the rephrased queries are used as **noisy references**, and annotators are asked to conduct a second round of classification since the references of the rephrased queries might still be able to answer the original query. The reason of taking this approach is that in real-world applications, as retrieval systems continue to improve, the likelihood of completely irrelevant content appearing in the retrieved results is minimal and noise robustness should primarily target highly confusing noise content such as different attributes of the same entity. Since we focus on the biopharmaceuticals, we standardize the format of drug, patent, paper, and clinical references, like the example shown in Figure 1. This is completely different from the document snippets extraction approaches used in previous work (Chen et al., 2024; Fang et al., 2024; Xiong et al., 2024) and is more suitable for the professionalism need of the biopharmaceuticals domain. Additionally, we also perform content-based deduplication on the augmented references to avoid the evaluation being too easy. At this point, we obtain both relevant and irrelevant sets of augmented references for each query.

	query	# pos.	# neg.
English	100	620	457
French	100	620	457
German	100	620	457
Chinese	100	610	485

Table 1: The basic statistics of BRAGE. Here **# pos.** and **# neg.** stand for relevant references and irrelevant references, respectively.

In terms of quantity, we collect a total of **400** biopharmaceuticals queries and **2,470** relevant references and **1,856** irrelevant references as shown in the Table 1. In detail, We retain several queries without relevant references to simulate scenarios where relevant content might not be retrievable in real-world situations. For the other queries, we ensure each one has at least two relevant references and three irrelevant references to facilitate dynamic adjustments in the evaluation settings.

3.3 Evaluation Method

The core purpose of BRAGE is to evaluate **QRUC** whether LLMs can correctly understand the relationship between queries and augmented references, utilize the relevant and remain unaffected by the irrelevant in their responses. We convert the original query-level response evaluation into a evaluation of **query-reference pairs classification**.

³PhD graduates in biopharmaceutical major, and are paid \$1 for every five pieces of data.

Ø	Instruction prompt
(1)	Q: What are the drugs for treating lymphoma in China?
ļ	[1] ("drug name": "Zuberitamab", "target": "CD20",, "status": "Approved", "drug type": "Monoclonal antibody", "first approved country": "China") [2] ("drug name": "Linperlisib", "target": "PI3K6",, "status": "Approved", "drug
Đ	type": "Small molecule drug", "first approved country?: "China"] [3] {"drug name": "Teclistamab", "target": "CD3,BCMA",, "status": "Approved", "drug type": "Bispecific T-cell Engager (BTE), "first approved country?: "European Union, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway") (LI Cidun pame): "Biorgetape): "broad" ("DOQ0", "tratus": "Approved")
	[4] Long Intile : independent in the independent independent in the inde
<u> </u>	The dama area of factors in the sector is Objective industry is the
	Linperlish, and Ripertamab. Zuberitamab, a monoclonal antibody targeting CD20, is approved for treating CD20 positive Diffuse Large B- Cell Lymphoma [1]. Linperlish, a small molecule drug targeting PI3K5, is approved for treating Recurrent Folicular Lymphoma [2]. Ripertamab, another monoclonal antibody targeting CD20, is approved for treating Diffuse Large B-Cell Lymphoma [4].
I_N_	Gold labels: [1 1 0 1 0]
0000	Predictions: [1, 1, 0, 1, 0]

Figure 4: Overview of our proposed evaluation method. Here green and check marks indicate relevant, while red and cross marks indicate irrelevant in the retrieval results. Reference numbers cited in the response are classified as relevant.

Specifically, inspired by previous work on citation quality evaluation (Gao et al., 2023), we prompt LLMs to generate responses with citation numbers of the corresponding references. We then consider the references cited in the response classified as relevant and the references not cited classified as irrelevant. For example, in Figure 4, the 1st, 2nd, and 4th references are relevant, while the 3rd and 5th are irrelevant references. Therefore, in this case, the ground-truth labels would be [1, 1, 0, 1, 0]. And the LLM's response cited the 1st, 2nd, and 4th references, so the predicted labels would be [1, 1, 0, 1, 0]. In this way, the evaluation of QRUC for LLMs focuses on the classification results of the query and reference, rather than on the response content which is more difficult to evaluate in open-ended QA. Moreover, since this is a pair classification task, the method significantly reduces the number of queries needed in evaluation, thus decreasing the cost of human annotation and evaluation. Specifically, the 400 evaluations based on response content are transformed into more than 4,000 evaluations based on results of query-reference pairs classification.

Here, we use an instruction prompt to guide the LLMs to cite the reference numbers when generating responses based on the augmented references. In addition, it must be mentioned that our proposed evaluation method is focused on **QRUC**, thus **assuming** that LLMs will provide correspond-

ing reasonable answers when citing the correct references (**information integration**) and refuse to answer when identifying no relevant content provided (**negative rejection**). The reason for prompting LLMs to respond with citations is that traceability is very important in the biopharmaceutical QA scenario. The responses generated by retrieval-augmented LLMs are essentially refined summaries of the augmented references relevant to the query, with citations provided for users to obtain the source information and gain the comprehensive answers of the queries.

To verify the effectiveness of our evaluation method, we conduct the **human evaluation** of the results from Gemini-1.5-pro in English section. For each citation number appearing in the response, the evaluators are required to check whether the content preceding it is generated based on the corresponding reference. If the citation number is correctly utilized, the corresponding reference would be labeled as 1; otherwise, it would be labeled as 0.

4 Experiments

We evaluate the mainstream LLMs on **BRAGE** and discuss the results, analyzing the errors made by the evaluated LLMs. Moreover, we conduct an experiment on Llama3 to validate the potential of improvements.

4.1 Experimental Settings

Task formats. Given the high cost of large-scale evaluation, for each query, we randomly select **2 relevant** references and **3 irrelevant** references from the annotated sets of references. We fix the random seed at 42 to sample augmented references and **shuffle** the order of the references before evaluation (Liu et al., 2024).

Models. We evaluate the current representative LLMs on BRAGE and conduct the validation experiment based on Llama3-70B (Dubey et al., 2024).

4.2 Experimental Results

We validate the improvement of **QRUC** based on Llama3-70B and evaluate the mainstream LLMs with the classification evaluation metrics introduced in (§3.3) and the overall performance can be seen in Table 7 (The full version of performance can be seen in the Appendix B.). As is described in (§3.3), if the LLMs cite the reference numbers in their responses, it is considered that the LLMs classify the corresponding references as relevant;



Figure 5: Performance comparison of LLMs across different query categories in English.

otherwise, it is considered irrelevant. We report the classification performance for relevant reference (**positive**), irrelevant reference (**negative**), and the **macro average** of the two categories respectively. The positive performance reflects the capability to identify relevant information from the given references, while the negative performance reflects the capability to ignore irrelevant information from the given references. The macro avg is a comprehensive reflection of **QRUC**.

In detail, we conduct Continual Pre-Training (CPT) of Llama3-70B with biopharmaceuticals knowledge and perform Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) on a small amount of constructed data containing noisy references. Considering the high cost of CPT, we conduct validation experiments only in Chinese section of our benchmark and both CPT data and SFT data are from open-source biopharmaceutical data. The F1-scores of validation experiments are shown in Table 2.

Models	pos.	neg.	macro avg
Llama3	64.93	74.04	69.48
+ CPT&SFT	71.01	79.24	75.13

Table 2: Results of F1 scores in validation experiments. Here Llama3 refers to the Meta native instruct model.

As can be seen in Table 2, after obtaining biopharmaceuticals knowledge, the LLM improves capabilities in both categories, which visually validate the potential for improvement.

Evaluation results of mainstream LLMs are shown in Table 7. As can be seen, Gemini-1.5pro achieves the highest macro-avg F1 scores in the English section, scoring 71.24 points, GPT-40 achieves the highest macro F1 scores in the French and Chinese sections, and Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct achieves the highest macro F1 scores in the French section. From the perspective of language comparison, it can be observed from the Table 7 that the latest closed-source LLMs perform more consistently compared to open-source LLMs, primarily due to their larger parameter sizes and more extensive multilingual pretraining knowledge. Notably, each LLM exhibits biases towards either positive or negative categories. For example, while Doubaopro-32k achieves the highest F1 score on positive examples, its performance on negative examples ranks last among the closed-source models. The evaluation results reflect each LLM's capability to leverage useful information and exclude irrelevant information. In this way, the evaluation quantifies the specific capabilities of the LLMs in these two aspects, enabling more targeted optimization.

We also evaluate the recently popular reasoning LLMs, as shown in the last four lines of each linguistic section in Table 7. From the results, it can be seen that the DeepSeek series of reasoning LLMs have not improved in terms of QRUC compared to their original base models. Instead, there has been a decline. We attribute this to overly long thinking, which causes the LLMs to overthink the irrelevant references and classify them as relevant ones. We will elaborate on this in §4.4. On the contrary, the QRUC performance of Geminithinking and o3-mini is basically on par with that of their corresponding base models, and there are improvements in the German and French sections.

To provide a more comprehensive comparison, we conduct evaluations of the seven representative large-scale LLMs across each query category in the English section, as macro avg F1 scores shown in

	Positive			Negative			Macro avg		
Models	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)
			English						
GPT-4-turbo	58.11	79.38	67.10	82.53	63.00	71.46	70.32	71.19	69.28
GPT-40	60.58	75.26	67.13	81.03	68.33	74.14	70.80	71.80	70.63
Claude-3.7-sonnet	50.14	89.18	64.19	85.91	42.67	57.02	68.03	65.92	60.60
Gemini-1.5-pro	70.51	56.70	62.86	75.15	84.67	79.62	72.83	70.68	71.24
DeepSeek-V3	54.40	70.10	61.26	76.23	66.05	64.82	65.31	66.05	64.82
Doubao-pro	75.43	72.67	74.02	60.00	63.40	61.65	67.72	68.03	67.84
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	55.06	89.69	68.24	88.76	52.67	66.11	71.91	71.18	67.17
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	59.29	77.32	67.11	81.74	65.67	72.83	70.52	71.49	69.97
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B	52.61	67.53	59.14	74.29	60.67	66.79	63.45	64.10	62.97
DeepSeek-R1	47.25	88.66	61.65	83.08	36.00	50.23	65.16	62.33	55.94
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp	59.52	77.32	67.26	81.82	66.00	73.06	70.67	71.66	70.16
o3-mini	60.38	80.93	69.16	84.19	65.67	73.78	72.29	73.30	71.47
			French						
GPT-4-turbo	68.75	51.03	58.58	72.86	85.00	78.46	70.80	68.02	68.52
GPT-40	63.59	67.53	65.50	78.12	75.00	76.53	70.86	71.26	71.02
Claude-3.7-sonnet	55.02	81.96	65.84	82.93	56.67	67.33	68.97	69.31	66.58
Gemini-1.5-pro	71.63	52.06	60.30	73.65	86.67	79.63	72.64	69.36	69.97
DeepSeek-V3	63.35	62.37	62.86	75.91	76.67	76.29	69.63	69.52	69.57
Doubao-pro	70.20	54.64	61.45	74.34	85.00	79.32	72.27	69.82	70.38
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	55.63	81.44	66.11	82.86	58.00	68.24	69.25	69.72	67.17
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	62.94	63.92	63.43	76.43	75.67	76.05	69.69	69.79	69.74
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B	54.61	82.47	65.71	83.08	55.67	66.67	68.85	69.07	66.19
DeepSeek-R1	54.07	85.57	66.27	85.03	53.00	65.30	69.55	69.28	65.78
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp	63.52	76.29	69.32	82.38	71.67	76.65	72.95	73.98	72.98
o3-mini	64.55	73.20	68.60	81.02	74.00	77.35	72.78	73.60	72.98
			German						
GPT-4-turbo	67.14	48.45	56.29	71.75	84.67	77.68	69.45	66.56	66.98
GPT-4o	64.06	63.40	63.73	76.49	77.00	76.74	70.28	70.20	70.24
Claude-3.7-sonnet	58.08	87.11	69.69	87.68	59.33	70.78	72.88	73.22	70.23
Gemini-1.5-pro	66.67	49.48	56.80	72.00	84.00	77.54	69.33	66.74	67.17
DeepSeek-V3	62.63	61.34	61.98	75.33	76.33	75.83	68.98	68.84	68.90
Doubao-pro	70.34	52.58	60.18	73.64	85.67	79.20	71.99	69.12	69.69
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	58.58	72.16	64.67	78.82	67.00	72.43	68.70	69.58	68.55
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	65.35	68.04	66.67	78.77	76.67	77.70	72.06	72.35	72.18
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B	52.82	67.53	59.28	74.39	61.00	67.03	63.61	64.26	63.15
DeepSeek-R1	56.84	83.51	67.64	84.69	59.00	69.55	70.77	71.25	68.59
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp	62.71	76.29	68.84	82.17	70.67	75.99	72.44	73.48	72.41
o3-mini	64.78	76.80	70.28	82.95	73.00	77.66	73.87	74.90	73.97
		(=) =	Chinese	7 0.01	04.00	00.01		75.04	76.00
GPT-4-turbo	73.74	67.35	70.40	79.81	84.33	82.01	76.78	75.84	76.20
GPT-40	77.66	74.49	76.04	83.77	86.00	84.87	80.71	80.24	80.46
Claude-3.7-sonnet	59.73	89.29	71.57	89.66	60.67	72.37	74.69	74.98	71.97
Gemini-1.5-pro	69.14	57.14	62.57	74.85	83.33	78.86	71.99	70.24	70.72
DeepSeek-V3	/4.44	68.37	71.28	80.38	84.67	82.47	77.41	76.52	76.87
Doubao-pro	77.68	87.00	82.08	75.62	61.73	67.98	76.65	74.37	75.03
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	64.29	82.65	72.32	86.07	70.00	77.21	75.18	76.33	74.76
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	69.72	77.55	73.43	84.17	78.00	80.97	76.95	77.78	77.20
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B	58.69	77.55	66.81	81.43	64.33	71.88	70.06	70.94	69.35
DeepSeek-R1	57.24	86.73	68.97	86.93	57.67	69.34	72.09	72.20	69.15
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp	66.81	80.10	72.85	85.06	74.00	79.14	75.93	77.05	76.00
o3-mini	68.44	78.57	73.16	84.50	76.33	80.21	76.47	77.45	76.68

Table 3: The overall performance of representative LLMs

query	# neg.	response
What drugs are avail- able for CD47 and PDL1 bispecific anti- bodies?	<pre>[4] {"drug name": "JY-207b", "target": "CD47,PDL1",, "status": "Preclini- cal", "drug type": "Antibody drug conjugate"}</pre>	Drugs that are dual antibodies against CD47 and PDL1 include IMM-2520, JY-207b , and BAT-7104 [1][4][5].
Who is more likely to get an Salmonella in- fection and severe ill- ness?	[4] Get the Facts about Salmonella FDA People can also become infected with Salmonella by handling contami- nated food	Individuals handling contaminated food are more likely to get a Salmonella infection as the bacteria can be spread from their hands to their mouths [4]

Table 4: Error cases where # neg. stand for irrelevant references.

the Figure 5. As can be seen, the best-performing LLM varies across different categories, highlighting the differences between **QRUC** in the biopharmaceutical domain and those in general domains. This also underscores the importance of evaluating performance in each category.

4.3 Human Evaluation

We conduct a human evaluation of the results from the highest-scoring model in the English section, detail can be seen in Appendix A.

4.4 Error Analysis

To better comprehend the **QRUC** of retrievedaugmented LLMs in biopharmaceuticals, we analyze the incorrect citations in the English section and classify these errors into **three** categories:

(1) Lack of expertise. In some cases, LLMs lack sensitivity to biopharmaceuticals knowledge, leading to the oversight or confusion of some important concepts in biopharmaceuticals. For example, in the first case in Table 4, LLM fails to differentiate between the bispecific antibodies and antibody-drug conjugates. Therefore, it incorrectly identifies the drug "JY-207b" as a dual-specificity antibody drug targeting both CD47 and PDL1 and cite the irrelevant "reference [4]".

(2) Specialized entity overlap. For the irrelevant references that contain the key entities of the query, the LLMs may confuse them and explain them in responses. Take the second case in Table 4 as an instance, the query expresses which groups of people are more susceptible to Salmonella infection, while the reference explains that humans can contract it through contact with contaminated food. Both contain the key entity "Salmonella", and LLM forcibly uses the transmission mode to answer the query about susceptible populations.

(3) Accept all. LLMs somtimes generate responses to queries based solely on all references without considering their relevance. This situation mostly occurs in queries that tend to list information, such as "clinical studies of a certain drug", where LLMs proceed to describe the provided references one by one.



Figure 6: Statistics on the number of citation error types.

Based on the analysis above, we manually conduct a count of these three types of errors for some LLMs in the English section, as shown in the Figure 6. To enhance the comprehension of LLMs, these three aspects are suitable starting points.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we create the **Biopharmaceuticals Retrieval-Augmented Generation Evaluation** (**BRAGE**) and evaluate the **Q**uery and **R**eference Understanding Capability (**QRUC**) of the retrievalaugmented LLMs in biopharmaceuticals. To conduct the evaluation, we propose a citation-based evaluation method to quantify the **QRUC**. In addition, we verify the potential of improvements on **QRUC**. Experimental results demonstrates the obvious gaps in **QRUC** among different retrievalaugmented LLMs in biopharmaceuticals. In the future, we will explore the improvements of the retrieved-augmented LLMs in biopharmaceuticals.

6 Limitations

Our evaluation method is based on the application of references in the responses. However, we are currently unable to quantify the three types of errors mentioned in the article. At present, we can only generally measure the understanding ability of LLMs in the biopharmaceutical domain.

References

- Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, and etc. 2023. Palm 2 technical report.
- Anthropic. 2023. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku.
- Yejin Bang, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Nayeon Lee, Wenliang Dai, Dan Su, and et al. 2023. A multitask, multilingual, multimodal evaluation of ChatGPT on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity. In Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 675–718.
- Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, and etc. 2022. Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2206–2240.
- Deng Cai, Yan Wang, Wei Bi, Zhaopeng Tu, Xiaojiang Liu, Wai Lam, and Shuming Shi. 2019. Skeletonto-response: Dialogue generation guided by retrieval memory. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pages 1219–1228.
- Meng Cao, Yue Dong, Jiapeng Wu, and Jackie Chi Kit Cheung. 2020. Factual error correction for abstractive summarization models. In *Proceedings of the* 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), pages 6251–6258.
- Jiawei Chen, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, and Le Sun. 2024. Benchmarking large language models in retrieval-augmented generation. *Proceedings of* the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 38(16):17754–17762.
- Linqing Chen. 2025. Streamlining biomedical research with specialized llms. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 9–19.

- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, and etc. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models.
- Shahul Es, Jithin James, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Steven Schockaert. 2024. RAGAs: Automated evaluation of retrieval augmented generation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 150–158.
- Feiteng Fang, Yuelin Bai, Shiwen Ni, Min Yang, Xiaojun Chen, and etc. 2024. Enhancing noise robustness of retrieval-augmented language models with adaptive adversarial training.
- J. Ferrara, Ethan-Tonic, and O. M. Ozturk. 2024. The rag triad.
- Robert Friel, Masha Belyi, and Atindriyo Sanyal. 2024. Ragbench: Explainable benchmark for retrievalaugmented generation systems.
- Tianyu Gao, Howard Yen, Jiatong Yu, and Danqi Chen. 2023. Enabling large language models to generate text with citations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6465–6488.
- Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, and etc. 2024. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey.
- Biyang Guo, Xin Zhang, Ziyuan Wang, Minqi Jiang, Jinran Nie, and etc. 2023. How close is chatgpt to human experts? comparison corpus, evaluation, and detection.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2020. Realm: Retrievalaugmented language model pre-training.
- Hangfeng He, Hongming Zhang, and Dan Roth. 2022. Rethinking with retrieval: Faithful large language model inference.
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, and etc. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions.
- Yizheng Huang and Jimmy Huang. 2024. A survey on retrieval-augmented text generation for large language models.
- Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. 2021. Leveraging passage retrieval with generative models for open domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 874–880, Online.
- Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, and etc. 2023. Atlas: Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(251):1–43.

- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, and etc. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(12).
- Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. 2019. Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pages 2567–2577.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, and etc. 2020a. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledgeintensive nlp tasks. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 33, pages 9459– 9474.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, and etc. 2020b. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledgeintensive nlp tasks. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 33, pages 9459– 9474.
- Daliang Li, Ankit Singh Rawat, Manzil Zaheer, Xin Wang, Michal Lukasik, and etc. 2023a. Large language models with controllable working memory. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1774–1793.
- Daliang Li, Ankit Singh Rawat, Manzil Zaheer, Xin Wang, Michal Lukasik, Andreas Veit, and etc. 2023b. Large language models with controllable working memory. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1774–1793.
- Xianzhi Li, Samuel Chan, Xiaodan Zhu, Yulong Pei, Zhiqiang Ma, and etc. 2023c. Are chatgpt and gpt-4 general-purpose solvers for financial text analytics? a study on several typical tasks.
- Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, and etc. 2024. Lost in the Middle: How Language Models Use Long Contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173.
- Jakub Lála, Odhran O'Donoghue, Aleksandar Shtedritski, Sam Cox, Samuel G. Rodriques, and etc. 2023. Paperqa: Retrieval-augmented generative agent for scientific research.
- Jacob Menick, Maja Trebacz, Vladimir Mikulik, John Aslanides, Francis Song, and etc. 2022. Teaching language models to support answers with verified quotes.
- Harsha Nori, Nicholas King, Scott Mayer McKinney, Dean Carignan, and Eric Horvitz. 2023. Capabilities of gpt-4 on medical challenge problems.
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, and etc. 2024. Gpt-4 technical report.

- Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Pengcheng He, Hao Cheng, Yujia Xie, Yu Hu, and etc. 2023. Check your facts and try again: Improving large language models with external knowledge and automated feedback.
- Vikas Raunak, Arul Menezes, and Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt. 2021. The curious case of hallucinations in neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the* 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 1172–1183.
- Dongyu Ru, Lin Qiu, Xiangkun Hu, Tianhang Zhang, Peng Shi, Shuaichen Chang, and etc. 2024. Ragchecker: A fine-grained framework for diagnosing retrieval-augmented generation.
- Jon Saad-Falcon, Omar Khattab, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2024. ARES: An automated evaluation framework for retrieval-augmented generation systems. In Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 338–354.
- Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, and etc. 2022. Large language models encode clinical knowledge.
- Gemini Team, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, and etc. 2024. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context.
- Nandan Thakur, Luiz Bonifacio, Xinyu Zhang, Odunayo Ogundepo, Ehsan Kamalloo, David Alfonso-Hermelo, and etc. 2024. Nomiracl: Knowing when you don't know for robust multilingual retrieval-augmented generation.
- S. M Towhidul Islam Tonmoy, S M Mehedi Zaman, Vinija Jain, Anku Rani, Vipula Rawte, and etc. 2024. A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models.
- Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. Interleaving retrieval with chain-of-thought reasoning for knowledgeintensive multi-step questions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10014–10037.
- Cunxiang Wang, Xiaoze Liu, Yuanhao Yue, Xiangru Tang, Tianhang Zhang, Cheng Jiayang, and etc. 2023. Survey on factuality in large language models: Knowledge, retrieval and domain-specificity.
- Guangzhi Xiong, Qiao Jin, Zhiyong Lu, and Aidong Zhang. 2024. Benchmarking retrieval-augmented generation for medicine.
- Hao Yu, Aoran Gan, Kai Zhang, Shiwei Tong, Qi Liu, and Zhaofeng Liu. 2024. Evaluation of retrievalaugmented generation: A survey.

- Cyril Zakka, Rohan Shad, Akash Chaurasia, Alex R. Dalal, Jennifer L. Kim, and etc. 2024. Almanac
 retrieval-augmented language models for clinical medicine. *NEJM AI*, 1(2):AIoa2300068.
- Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Frank F. Xu, Zhengbao Jiang, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Docprompting: Generating code by retrieving the docs. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

A Human Evaluation

We conduct a human evaluation of the results from Gemini-1.5-pro, the highest-scoring model in English section to validate the rationale of this evaluation method, independent of the issue of citation hallucination. In detail, the purpose of human evaluation is mainly **twofold**: 1). To eliminate instances where LLMs reference a citation number but do not provide an answer based on the corresponding content; 2). To eliminate instances where LLMs state that the reference is irrelevant to the query.

Settings	macro avg							
	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)					
cls.	72.83	70.68	71.24					
humans.	72.71	71.67	72.04					

Table 5: Comparison between classification metrics andhuman evaluation metrics

The performance comparison between human evaluation and classification-based automated evaluation is shown in Table 5. As can be seen, the differences in Precision, Recall, and F1-score between the two methods are all within 1 point, which are within a reasonable error margin. This validates that the classification-based evaluation method can independently serve as a reliable assessment perspective.

B Full Version of Performance

	Positive			Negative			Macro avg		
wodels	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)
			English						
GPT-3.5-turbo	51.60	74.23	59.50	77.00	54.67	63.94	64.30	64.70	62.50
GPT-4-turbo	58.11	79.38	67.10	82.53	63.00	71.46	70.32	71.19	69.28
GPT-40	60.58	75.26	67.13	81.03	68.33	74.14	70.80	71.80	70.63
GPT-4o-mini	58.80	80.93	68.11	83.70	63.33	72.11	71.25	72.13	70.11
Claude-3.5-sonnet	49.58	91.24	64.25	87.59	40.00	54.92	68.59	65.62	59.58
Claude-3.7-sonnet	50.14	89.18	64.19	85.91	42.67	57.02	68.03	65.92	60.60
Gemini-1.5-pro	70.51	56.70	62.86	75.15	84.67	79.62	72.83	70.68	71.24
DeepSeek-V3	54.40	70.10	61.26	76.23	66.05	64.82	65.31	66.05	64.82
Doubao-pro	75.43	72.67	74.02	60.00	63.40	61.65	67.72	68.03	67.84
GLM-4-9B-chat	55.00	51.03	52.94	69.75	73.00	71.34	62.37	62.02	62.14
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	56.43	70.10	62.53	77.08	65.00	70.52	66.75	67.55	66.53
Llama-3.1-Tulu-3-8B	73.56	21.33	33.07	42.01	88.14	56.91	57.79	54.74	44.99
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	56.41	79.38	65.95	81.90	60.33	69.48	69.16	69.86	67.72
Llama-3.1-Nemotron-70B	47.50	88.14	61.73	82.84	37.00	51.15	65.17	62.57	56.44
Llama-3.1-Tulu-3-70B	47.12	92.78	62.50	87.50	32.67	47.57	67.31	62.73	55.04
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	55.06	89.69	68.24	88.76	52.67	66.11	71.91	71.18	67.17
Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct	61.19	69.07	64.89	78.18	71.67	74.78	68.69	70.37	69.84
Qwen-2.5-14B-Instruct	59.73	68.04	63.61	77.29	70.33	73.65	68.51	69.19	68.63
Qwen-2.5-32B-Instruct	58.17	78.87	66.96	82.25	63.33	71.56	70.21	71.10	69.26
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	59.29	77.32	67.11	81.74	65.67	72.83	70.52	71.49	69.97
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B	52.61	67.53	59.14	74.29	60.67	66.79	63.45	64.10	62.97
DeepSeek-R1	47.25	88.66	61.65	83.08	36.00	50.23	65.16	62.33	55.94
QwQ-32B	49.70	86.08	63.02	82.91	43.67	57.21	66.31	64.87	60.11
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp	59.52	77.32	67.26	81.82	66.00	73.06	70.67	71.66	70.16
o3-mini	60.38	80.93	69.16	84.19	65.67	73.78	72.29	73.30	71.47
			French						
GPT-3.5-turbo	58.29	59.79	59.03	73.56	72.33	72.94	65.93	66.06	65.99
GPT-4-turbo	68.75	51.03	58.58	72.86	85.00	78.46	70.80	68.02	68.52
GPT-4o	63.59	67.53	65.50	78.12	75.00	76.53	70.86	71.26	71.02
GPT-4o-mini	62.79	69.59	66.01	78.85	73.33	75.99	70.82	71.46	71.00
Claude-3.5-sonnet	55.12	80.41	65.41	81.99	57.67	67.71	68.56	69.04	66.56
Claude-3.7-sonnet	55.02	81.96	65.84	82.93	56.67	67.33	68.97	69.31	66.58
Gemini-1.5-pro	71.63	52.06	60.30	73.65	86.67	79.63	72.64	69.36	69.97
DeepSeek-V3	63.35	62.37	62.86	75.91	76.67	76.29	69.63	69.52	69.57
Doubao-pro	70.20	54.64	61.45	74.34	85.00	79.32	72.27	69.82	70.38
GLM-4-9B-chat	53.96	38.66	45.05	66.48	78.67	72.06	60.22	58.66	58.55
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	69.40	47.94	56.71	71.94	86.33	78.48	70.67	67.14	67.60
Llama-3.1-Tulu-3-8B	50.96	68.56	58.46	73.82	57.33	64.54	62.39	62.95	61.50
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	64.06	63.40	63.73	76.49	77.00	76.74	70.28	70.20	70.24
Llama-3.1-Nemotron-70B	51.04	88.14	64.65	85.53	45.53	59.26	68.29	66.74	61.95
Llama-3.1-Tulu-3-70B	49.69	83.51	62.31	80.95	45.33	58.12	65.32	64.42	60.21
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	55.63	81.44	66.11	82.86	58.00	68.24	69.25	69.72	67.17
Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct	60.99	57.22	59.04	73.40	76.33	74.84	67.19	66.77	66.94
Qwen-2.5-14B-Instruct	64.40	63.40	63.90	76.57	77.33	76.95	70.48	70.37	70.42
Qwen-2.5-32B-Instruct	64.44	59.79	62.03	75.16	78.67	76.87	69.80	69.23	69.45
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	62.94	63.92	63.43	76.43	75.67	76.05	69.69	69.79	69.74
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B	54.61	82.47	65.71	83.08	55.67	66.67	68.85	69.07	66.19
DeepSeek-R1	54.07	85.57	66.27	85.03	53.00	65.30	69.55	69.28	65.78
QwQ-32B	59.77	78.87	68.00	82.77	65.67	73.23	71.27	72.27	70.62
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp	63.52	76.29	69.32	82.38	71.67	76.65	72.95	73.98	72.98
o3-mini	64.55	73.20	68.60	81.02	74.00	77.35	72.78	73.60	72.98

Table 6: The overall performance of representative LLMs in the English and French section

	Positive			Negative			Macro avg		
Widels	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)	P (%)	R (%)	F1 (%)
German									
GPT-3.5-turbo	60.26	48.45	53.71	70.41	79.33	74.61	65.34	63.89	64.16
GPT-4-turbo	67.14	48.45	56.29	71.75	84.67	77.68	69.45	66.56	66.98
GPT-40	64.06	63.40	63.73	76.49	77.00	76.74	70.28	70.20	70.24
GPT-4o-mini	60.00	71.13	65.09	78.79	69.33	73.76	69.39	70.23	69.43
Claude-3.5-sonnet	57.25	77.32	65.79	81.03	62.67	70.68	69.14	69.99	68.23
Claude-3.7-sonnet	58.08	87.11	69.69	87.68	59.33	70.78	72.88	73.22	70.23
Gemini-1.5-pro	66.67	49.48	56.80	72.00	84.00	77.54	69.33	66.74	67.17
DeepSeek-V3	62.63	61.34	61.98	75.33	76.33	75.83	68.98	68.84	68.90
Doubao-pro	70.34	52.58	60.18	73.64	85.67	79.20	71.99	69.12	69.69
GLM-4-9B-chat	53.96	56.19	55.05	70.89	69.00	69.93	62.43	62.59	62.49
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	59.46	45.36	51.46	69.36	80.00	74.30	64.41	62.68	62.88
Llama-3.1-Tulu-3-8B	50.34	75.77	60.49	76.73	51.67	61.75	63.54	63.72	61.12
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	59.02	62.37	60.65	74.74	72.00	73.34	66.88	67.19	67.00
Llama-3.1-Nemotron-70B	51.37	87.11	64.63	84.85	46.67	60.22	68.11	66.89	62.42
Llama-3.1-Tulu-3-70B	50.16	82.99	62.52	80.92	46.67	59.20	65.54	64.83	60.86
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	58.58	72.16	64.67	78.82	67.00	72.43	68.70	69.58	68.55
Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct	56.60	68.5	62.00	76.45	66.00	70.84	66.52	67.28	66.42
Qwen-2.5-14B-Instruct	61.24	65.98	63.52	76.84	73.00	74.87	69.04	69.49	69.20
Qwen-2.5-32B-Instruct	64.15	70.10	67.00	79.43	74.67	76.98	71.79	72.38	71.99
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	65.35	68.04	66.67	78.77	76.67	77.70	72.06	72.35	72.18
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B	52.82	67.53	59.28	74.39	61.00	67.03	63.61	64.26	63.15
DeepSeek-R1	56.84	83.51	67.64	84.69	59.00	69.55	70.77	71.25	68.59
QwQ-32B	55.40	79.38	65.25	81.48	58.67	68.22	68.44	69.02	66.74
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp	62.71	76.29	68.84	82.17	70.67	75.99	72.44	73.48	72.41
o3-mini	64.78	76.80	70.28	82.95	73.00	77.66	73.87	74.90	73.97
	1		Chinese						
GPT-3.5-turbo	58.52	68.37	63.06	76.78	68.33	72.31	67.65	68.35	68.65
GPT-4-turbo	73.74	67.35	70.40	79.81	84.33	82.01	76.78	75.84	76.20
GPT-40	77.66	74.49	76.04	83.77	86.00	84.87	80.71	80.24	80.46
GPT-4o-mini	68.12	71.94	69.98	80.97	78.00	79.46	74.54	74.97	74.72
Claude-3.5-sonnet	60.14	90.82	72.36	91.00	60.67	72.80	75.57	75.74	72.58
Claude-3.7-sonnet	59.73	89.29	71.57	89.66	60.67	72.37	74.69	74.98	71.97
Gemini-1.5-pro	69.14	57.14	62.57	74.85	83.33	78.86	71.99	70.24	70.72
DeepSeek-V3	74.44	68.37	71.28	80.38	84.67	82.47	77.41	76.52	76.87
Doubao-pro	77.68	87.00	82.08	75.62	61.73	67.98	76.65	74.37	75.03
GLM-4-9B	64.71	33.67	44.30	67.01	88.00	76.08	65.86	60.84	60.19
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	64.32	65.31	64.81	77.10	76.33	76.72	70.71	70.82	70.76
Llama-3.1-Tulu-3-8B	84.44	38.00	52.41	48.48	89.29	62.84	66.46	63.64	57.63
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	65.02	73.98	69.21	81.32	74.00	77.49	73.17	73.99	73.35
Llama-3.1-Nemotron-70B	49.18	92.35	64.18	88.28	37.67	52.80	68.73	65.01	58.49
Llama-3.1-Tulu-3-70B	54.02	85.71	66.27	84.86	52.33	64.74	69.44	69.02	65.51
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	64.29	82.65	72.32	86.07	70.00	77.21	75.18	76.33	74.76
Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct	72.73	65.31	68.82	78.75	84.00	81.29	75.74	74.65	75.05
Qwen-2.5-14B-Instruct	70.44	72.96	71.68	81.91	80.00	80.94	76.18	76.48	76.31
Qwen-2.5-32B-Instruct	69.95	76.02	72.86	83.39	78.67	80.96	76.67	77.34	76.91
Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct	69.72	77.55	73.43	84.17	78.00	80.97	76.95	77.78	77.20
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B	58.69	77.55	66.81	81.43	64.33	71.88	70.06	70.94	69.35
DeepSeek-R1	57.24	86.73	68.97	86.93	57.67	69.34	72.09	72.20	69.15
QwQ-32B	52.34	85.71	64.99	84.00	49.00	61.89	68.17	67.36	63.44
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp	66.81	80.10	72.85	85.06	74.00	79.14	75.93	77.05	76.00
o3-mini	68.44	78.57	73.16	84.50	76.33	80.21	76.47	77.45	76.68

Table 7: The overall performance of representative LLMs in the Germany and Chinese section