
Understanding Causality with Large Language Models: Feasibility and Opportunities

Cheng Zhang, Stefan Bauer, Paul Bennett, Jiangfeng Gao, Wenbo Gong, Agrin Hilmkil, Joel Jennings, Chao Ma, Tom Minka, Nick Pawlowski, James Vaughan

Abstract

We assess the ability of large language models (LLMs) to answer causal questions by analyzing their strengths and weaknesses against three types of causal question. We believe that current LLMs can answer causal questions with existing causal knowledge as combined domain experts. However, they are not yet able to provide satisfactory answers for discovering new knowledge or for high-stakes decision-making tasks with high precision. We discuss possible future directions and opportunities, such as enabling explicit and implicit causal modules as well as deep causal-aware LLMs. These will not only enable LLMs to answer many different types of causal questions for greater impact but also enable LLMs to be more trustworthy and efficient in general.

1 Introduction

The development of large language models Brown et al. (2020); OpenAI (2022; 2023); Ouyang et al. (2022); Radford et al. (2018; 2019); Thoppilan et al. (2022); Vaswani et al. (2017) has been extremely rapid. Recently, ChatGPT OpenAI (2022; 2023); Ouyang et al. (2022) has disrupted many domains, such as search, AI-aided content generation and editing, and is making great strides towards artificial general intelligence (AGI) Bubeck et al. (2023). On the other hand, LLMs have been shown to have some limitations in formal reasoning Bubeck et al. (2023); Mahowald et al. (2023); Wolfram (2023).

One of the most commonly asked question types are causal questions (several examples of such questions are given in Section 2). As humans actively interact with the environment, causal questions are fundamental to our nature. Besides its ultimate importance, understanding causal questions will likely be important for AGI and beyond. Answering such questions requires a combination of symbolic reasoning and high precision prediction; efficient interaction with humans to understand and verify assumptions; discovery of unknown knowledge; and interfacing of real-world physical interactions with safety awareness. Thus, in this article, we discuss LLMs in terms of their causal reasoning capabilities and the opportunities going forward.

In particular, we want to discuss and examine to what extent LLMs can be used to answer questions of causal nature. We will initially focus on current LLMs, a type of auto-regressive generative model Brown et al. (2020); Radford et al. (2019), characterized by the next token generation-based training. ChatGPT OpenAI (2022; 2023); Ouyang et al. (2022) introduces a new training paradigm where human feedback is utilized to enhance the alignment to the human objective regarding usefulness. The current usage of such human interventions is in its infancy, and we will discuss its potential in Section 3. Using causal reasoning as an example, our discussion perhaps generalizes beyond causal questions towards reasoning skills.

Correspond to: cheng.zhang@microsoft.com; the rest of the authors are ordered by family name initials.

Claim: This commentary are based only on publicly available information such as public APIs and technical articles by March 2023.

LLMs have obtained impressive language skills, providing a generic and natural way for human to interact with AI Mahowald et al. (2023). It has also obtained a large volume of knowledge about the world which in many cases appear as a "conservative team of experts" Guo et al. (2023).

Most impressively, it demonstrated strong understanding beyond memorization in a large range of scenarios including correct tool use, basic mathematical reasoning and understanding the mental state of human and agents Bubeck et al. (2023). LLMs can answer causal questions that are rooted in common knowledge or using known tools (as **Type 1**). However, when deep and high precision reasoning required (as **Type 2** and **Type 3**), for instance, when optimizing decisions about future actions or expanding the existing knowledge boundary, the current capability of LLMs is insufficient, especially considering the limitations of existing causal methods.

This is aligned with the current observation of its limitations in advanced mathematical reasoning ability as shown in Bubeck et al. (2023). This opens great opportunities to enable LLMs to answer deeper causal questions, while requiring the introduction of new paradigms in the machine learning model itself (Section 3). Research enabling all type of causal questions to be answered by LLMs will be a great step to further scale the impact, augmenting human skill and empowering a broader audience to utilize AI for real-world actions.

2 Can current LLMs answer causal questions?

2.1 Causal questions

Any questions regarding the understanding of the effect of (imagined) interventions are causal questions. Causal methods are designed not only to understand causality like humans but also to augment human ability to optimize decisions with high precision at large scale. For example, decision-making scenarios requiring quantitative understanding of the effect of actions leading to the desired outcome, especially when the decision space is large. In science, causality is used to expand human knowledge to discover new causal relationships from data, such as bio-chemical or physical processes Meinshausen et al. (2016); Mooij et al. (2020); Runge et al. (2019); Sanchez-Romero et al. (2018). The questions below are typical causal questions, and answering them correctly requires an AI to have some degree of understanding of causality.

Type 1 Identifying causal relationships using domain knowledge (See App. A.1)

Example 1: Patient: Will my minor spine injury cause numbness in my shoulder?

Example 2: Person: I am balancing a glass of water on my head. Suppose I take a quick step to the right. What will happen to the glass?

Type 2 Discovering new knowledge from data (See App. A.2)

Example 1: Scientist: In a new scientific experiment. I observe two variables A and B which were from climate data. The observations are as follows: A:[...], B:[...]. Please let me know if A cause B or B causes A.

Example 2: Marketing specialist: I plan to launch a new membership program different from our competitors X and Y. There are two ways to design the benefit as members. The first is "buy four and get a fifth one for free," and the other is "get 20 dollar cash return for every 100 dollar spend". Which one should I choose?

Type 3 Quantitative estimating of the consequences of actions (See App. A.3)

Example 1: Sales manager: I have 1000 dealers with the following information about them [...]. I can only give membership to 100 of them next year. I want the membership program provides the highest revenue growth. Which 100 dealers should I choose?

Example 2: Medical doctor: This is the third time that this patient has returned with lumbago. The epidural steroid injections helped him before, but not for long. I injected 12mn betamethasone the last two times. What is the dose that I should use this time?

Feasibility Current LLMs OpenAI (2022; 2023) can answer **Type 1** well thanks to their large collection of knowledge. Thus, even though the answers are not 100% reliable today, we believe that such causal questions will be solved by LLMs.

However, the current token generation approaches limit the ability of LLMs to answer **Type 2** and **Type 3** questions. To answer these questions, the model needs to understand the fundamental causal mechanisms to discover new knowledge from data beyond the current human knowledge (**Type 2**), and provide intervention recommendations with an understanding of the quantitative effect on a large population (**Type 3** Example 1) or for personalized high-stake decisions (**Type 3** Example 2). Currently, LLMs fail to answer these questions directly without extra prompting as shown in App. A.2 A.3. With prompting, LLMs can generate and execute algorithms (Section 3 in Bubeck et al. (2023)), but often fail to choose the most suitable ones. Although the ability to choose the correct method will be improved in future LLMs, the limitations of existing causal methods that the model has at its disposal to answer these questions remains.

2.2 Challenges

Discovering new insight beyond human knowledge One of the key goals for using machine learning to answer causal questions, especially causal discovery Glymour et al. (2019); Spirtes et al. (2000), is to discover *unknown* causal relationships from data. Thus, it is targeted towards expanding existing human knowledge. In general, new scientific knowledge is discovered by collecting data, forming hypotheses and testing hypotheses with more data. Nowadays, causal machine learning methods can be used to discover new relationships from observational data to suggest possible new insights into a given process.

As shown in Section 4 in Bubeck et al. (2023), LLMs in their current form are limited in advanced symbolic and mathematical reasoning . We also observe that they often make mistakes understanding mathematical assumptions which are required to find the suitable existing causal solutions or build new ones.

Earning trust Assumptions are needed to build any machine learning model. In causality, they play a pivotal role in method design and creating trust in the results from the users. A model with explicit assumptions for the different steps, that is able to provide step-by-step explanations regarding how the conclusion is reached from the assumptions is more trustworthy.

Currently, LLMs tend to make mistakes (hallucinations) in intermediate steps or skip steps in advanced math reasoning Bubeck et al. (2023); Fu et al. (2022) with seeming confidence.

Answers in their current form are difficult to trust as the reasoning is not always clearly broken down or is flawed. It could be dangerous in high stakes decision-making tasks to rely on the LLM’s answers. Some method of earning the trust when answering high-stake causal questions is needed.

Precision and in-context requirements When it comes to interventional decision-making, high precision for numerical optimization in a highly contextual setting may be required, such as in **Type 3**. This is a hard or impossible task for humans to perform. To answer **Type 3** example 1, one needs to know the effect of the membership program on every customer and recommend the top ones. To answer **Type 3** example 2, although it is an individual patient, we require high precision and the exact treatment and dose with an accurate understanding of the effect.

Both applications require large-scale estimation of individual treatment effects with high-numerical precision in addition to the assumptions discussed before. The limitation shown in Section 4 in Bubeck et al. (2023) of LLMs demonstrates GPT4’s inability to answer such a question directly. Utilizing external APIs makes LLMs inherits the limitation of existing causal methods to answer these questions. Moreover, such applications require highly contextual reasoning. The symptoms of a particular patient can indicate different things compared to the same symptoms in another. The requirement for complete information induces further questions regarding privacy and continual learning that are shared by other machine learning models as well Zanella-Beguelin et al. (2021); Zhang et al. (2022); Bubeck et al. (2023).

3 Opportunities for enlarged impact

Natural language is the most intuitive way for humans to communicate. The ability to bring causality to LLMs is a huge opportunity for greater impact.

For LLMs, the impact can be twofold. Firstly, having the ability to answer questions of causal nature will significantly enlarge its impact on new domains (Impact 1). Secondly, new paradigms (RLHF) to train LLMs require human interventions, which is naturally a causal paradigm. Advancing LLM research with rigorous consideration of the underlying causal mechanism has great potential to even further improve its language question-answering ability, considering generalization, fairness, interpretability computation efficiency, and sample efficiency Jin et al. (2022); Ortega et al. (2021); Zhou et al. (2023) (Impact 2).

Although causality has had an impact in specific domains with expert involvement such as in economics, the long-standing research in the field has yet to realize its full potential at scale Heinze-Deml et al. (2018); Geffner et al. (2022). Further advances are needed in causal machine learning methods with respect to real-world considerations such as scalability, flexibility, and generality. Current causal methods also suffer from difficulties of obtaining domain knowledge, communicating assumptions, and communicating results. LLMs certainly can help with obvious advantages in communication with humans (Impact 3). Although more challenging, LLMs have the potential to advance the causal method as well (Impact 4).

With these great potentials, we believe that we can either introduce modularity (causal modules that can interact with LLMs) or further enlarge the reasoning capacity with new training paradigms while keeping the model foundational. These two research directions are not limited to causality. This is aligned with symbolic reasoning Wolfram (2023) and other functional competences Mahowald et al. (2023).

Causal Modules Should we train LLMs to do floating point multiplication or just allow them to call Python? The same question applies to causal reasoning and other functional competencies as well. Rather than training LLMs to understand causality intrinsically, an efficient way to enlarge the impact is to create causal modules that can be used by the LLM.

There are two clear ways to create causal modules. Use existing methods such as create different causal APIs or utilize LLMs ability to generate such modules themselves (LLMs has shown impressive ability to code Bubeck et al. (2023); OpenAI (2023)).

This is non-trivial and requires both research and engineering effort, even with the assumption that all causal methods have an available API that can be easily interfaced with. First, causal modelling requires communicating with users to identify appropriate assumptions needed as well as further identification of the most suitable causal models meeting these assumptions to choose the correct API. (See Fig. 5) Secondly, to develop trust, summarizing the causal module’s intermediate and final outputs with step-wise assumptions to provide a final answer in a trustworthy way is required.

With either direct access to API or generating the module themselves, LLMs with causal modules are limited to existing causal machine learning methods. Causal machine learning is still at its early stage. Thus, advances in the efficiency of causal machine learning is key to the user experience so that waiting times for answers are short. The scalability of such techniques to allow them to be applied to dataset sizes seen in the real world. The generality of such techniques, allowing them to realistic assumptions for different applications.

LLMs with new model paradigm to understand causality To go beyond current limitations, exploring a new training paradigm that enables a single foundational model to understand causality and perform causal reasoning directly or through generating novel methods is an exciting direction. The new RL-based paradigm OpenAI (2022); Ouyang et al. (2022) already introduces human interventions, by incorporating causality into this design may allow LLMs to be trained more efficient and have the possibility to answer many different types of causal questions. However, only advancing LLMs through RL would not be sufficient as naive RL methods only thrive when cheap interventions such as in simulators are. In the real world, most interventions and experiments are costly or even infeasible, which is one of the key motivations of causal machine learning research. Possible next steps include explicitly modeling the interventions and

consequences using LLMs; distilling causal models in LLMs to allow LLMs to gain the ability to internally build new methods; introducing assumption understanding and model verification to produce trustworthy causal answers.

4 Conclusion

To conclude, we would like to quote Scott and Shaw (2021), “ The ability to use AI to remove constraints and create abundance in pursuit of solutions to our most important problems, and the opportunity to do this in ways where we pair the strength of AI with the strength of humans, is the real answer to "Why AI?". ”

Large language models represent a remarkable advancement in AI research, bringing us closer than ever to achieving human-level language capabilities. We envision a future where AI is empowered by the ability to solve causal questions beyond human’s current ability and provide insights to augment human’s ability, enabling new discoveries and optimizing decision making in the (physical) real world. This paradigm shift has the potential to revolutionize and unlock the full potential of AI, and pave the way for more unprecedented progress in the field.

References

- T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- S. Bubeck, V. Chandrasekaran, R. Eldan, J. Gehrke, E. Horvitz, E. Kamar, P. Lee, Y. T. Lee, Y. Li, S. Lundberg, H. Nori, H. Palangi, M. T. Ribeiro, and Y. Zhang. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4, 2023.
- Y. Fu, H. Peng, A. Sabharwal, P. Clark, and T. Khot. Complexity-based prompting for multi-step reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00720*, 2022.
- T. Geffner, J. Antoran, A. Foster, W. Gong, C. Ma, E. Kiciman, A. Sharma, A. Lamb, M. Kukla, N. Pawlowski, et al. Deep end-to-end causal inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.02195*, 2022.
- C. Glymour, K. Zhang, and P. Spirtes. Review of causal discovery methods based on graphical models. *Frontiers in genetics*, 10:524, 2019.
- B. Guo, X. Zhang, Z. Wang, M. Jiang, J. Nie, Y. Ding, J. Yue, and Y. Wu. How close is chatgpt to human experts? comparison corpus, evaluation, and detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.07597*, 2023.
- C. Heinze-Deml, M. H. Maathuis, and N. Meinshausen. Causal structure learning. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 5:371–391, 2018.
- Z. Jin, A. Feder, and K. Zhang. Causalnlp tutorial: An introduction to causality for natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Tutorial Abstracts*, pages 17–22, 2022.
- K. Mahowald, A. A. Ivanova, I. A. Blank, N. Kanwisher, J. B. Tenenbaum, and E. Fedorenko. Dissociating language and thought in large language models: a cognitive perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.06627*, 2023.
- N. Meinshausen, A. Hauser, J. M. Mooij, J. Peters, P. Versteeg, and P. Bühlmann. Methods for causal inference from gene perturbation experiments and validation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27):7361–7368, 2016.
- J. M. Mooij, S. Magliacane, and T. Claassen. Joint causal inference from multiple contexts. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):3919–4026, 2020.

-
- OpenAI. Chatgpt. <https://chat.openai.com/chat/>, 2022.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- P. A. Ortega, M. Kunesch, G. Delétang, T. Genewein, J. Grau-Moya, J. Veness, J. Buchli, J. Degraeve, B. Piot, J. Perolat, et al. Shaking the foundations: delusions in sequence models for interaction and control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.10819*, 2021.
- L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. L. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.02155*, 2022.
- A. Radford, K. Narasimhan, T. Salimans, I. Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- J. Runge, S. Bathiany, E. Boltt, G. Camps-Valls, D. Coumou, E. Deyle, C. Glymour, M. Kretschmer, M. D. Mahecha, J. Muñoz-Marí, et al. Inferring causation from time series in earth system sciences. *Nature communications*, 10(1):2553, 2019.
- R. Sanchez-Romero, J. D. Ramsey, K. Zhang, M. K. Glymour, B. Huang, and C. Glymour. Causal discovery of feedback networks with functional magnetic resonance imaging. *bioRxiv*, page 245936, 2018.
- K. Scott and G. Shaw. *Reprogramming the American Dream: From Rural America to Silicon Valley—Making AI Serve Us All*. 2021.
- P. Spirtes, C. N. Glymour, R. Scheines, and D. Heckerman. *Causation, prediction, and search*. MIT press, 2000.
- R. Thoppilan, D. De Freitas, J. Hall, N. Shazeer, A. Kulshreshtha, H.-T. Cheng, A. Jin, T. Bos, L. Baker, Y. Du, et al. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*, 2022.
- A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- S. Wolfram. Wolfram|alpha as the way to bring computational knowledge superpowers to chatgpt. <https://writings.stephenwolfram.com/2023/01/wolframalpha-as-the-way-to-bring-computational-knowledge-superpowers-to-chatgpt/>, 2023.
- S. Zanella-Beguelin, S. Tople, A. Paverd, and B. Köpf. Grey-box extraction of natural language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12278–12286. PMLR, 2021.
- X. Zhang, B. Peng, J. Gao, and H. Meng. Toward self-learning end-to-end task-oriented dialog systems. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 516–530, 2022.
- G. Zhou, L. Yao, X. Xu, C. Wang, L. Zhu, and K. Zhang. On the opportunity of causal deep generative models: A survey and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12351*, 2023.

A Appendix

In this appendix, we demonstrate the GPT4 behaviour using the new Bing with the default balanced conversation setting. All the examples below are generated in March 2023. The examples where LLMs can provide correct answers have **green** captions and the ones with limitations have **orange** captions. As LLMs are nondeterministic, the generated answers varies. However, based on multiple trials, we found that the answer quality for different types of questions does not change. Thus, we only present one exemplar answer per question and discuss the performance.

A.1 Type 1 question behaviours

With Fig 1, 2, 3, we show that questions requiring known causal knowledge can be answered by LLMs quite well. These questions ranging from identify if a causal relationship exist or not in medical setting to reason about the potential consequence of an action/intervention. Although the current performance may be associated existing dataset bias Bubeck et al. (2023). Looking to the future, we should expect LLMs be able to answer causal questions based on known domain knowledge sufficiently well.




Figure 1: An example of a good answer to **Type 1** question. The answer is correct and clear explanations are provided. It can clearly identify if a causal relationship exist from domain knowledge.




Figure 2: In addition to 1, we tested it with different names of the same region, for example "muscles close to the upper front collarbone area" instead of "shoulder area". We observe that the performance is quite stable.




Figure 3: With this example, we can see that LLMs can understand the consequence of an action which is a basic causal inference task in a domain with common knowledge.

A.2 Type 2 question behaviours

This type of question requires discovering new knowledge from the data. LLMs in their current form (without access to an API) cannot answer such questions as shown in Figure 4 and 6. This is expected as current LLMs learned from text data are not designed to discover new knowledge from numerical observations using complex reasoning. An encouraging sign is that the LLMs can identify the required method type (causal discovery) to answer such questions. However, at the current stage, for causal tasks requiring a deep understanding of different methods, LLMs fail to recommend the most suitable causal discovery method given the question description as shown in Figure 5. Thus, combining advanced research in causal machine learning and LLMs holds promising future.

In a new scientific experiment, I observe A:[0.66376563 0.7460458 0.60049783 0.19458722 0.22198647 0.03606155 0.11738834 0.93729317 0.7982884 0.18228876 0.10171512 0.50258315 0.6735653 0.33757878 0.2814266 0.53306651 0.52767775 0.4542864 0.58783099 0.79308013 0.41389301 0.626458 0.83188314 0.13357554 0.8452849 0.34128513 0.07201357 0.9543234 0.12000492 0.51322575 0.70395501 0.1464488 0.90361043 0.79331491 0.7967613 0.07848809 0.94148444 0.18323156 0.77145257 0.56794087 0.35489511 0.21777176 0.26778227 0.96225499 0.40332691 0.23654905 0.79551418 0.85388128 0.92527251 0.89409823] and B [1.37335451 1.56703635 1.27386932 0.48904232 0.49749887 0.13523361 0.3300499 1.93892046 1.66092294 0.43800813 0.25373356 1.07605191 1.38187009 0.70570189 0.64875505 1.14072014 1.08131167 0.946581 1.2173668 1.66787967 0.89557827 1.25294167 1.68392758 0.2699132 1.77244859 0.75139609 0.24373101 1.92638275 0.28812006 1.03555356 1.41116115 0.389185 1.90310008 1.6072771 1.59383967 0.21401723 1.94790454 0.39988682 1.58849211 1.17545128 0.75506244 0.45937379 0.58251087 2.00699227 0.81469844 0.56003795 1.60557955 1.75648696 1.92818648 1.83811855]. Please let me know if A cause B or B causes A.

It's difficult to determine whether A causes B or B causes A without additional context. Correlation does not imply causation. It's possible that A and B are both caused by a third variable or that they are completely unrelated. Can you provide more information about the experiment?

5 of 15 ●

We can assume that A and B has linear relationship. We also do not have latent confounders.

- ✓ Searching for: What is linear relationship between two variables?
- ✓ Searching for: What is latent confounder?
- ✓ Generating answers for you...

A linear relationship between two variables is a statistical term used to describe a straight-line relationship between two variables. Linear relationships can be expressed either in a graphical format or as a mathematical equation of the form $y = mx + b$. Linear relationships are fairly common in daily life ¹ ².

A latent confounder is a variable that influences both the dependent variable and independent variable, causing a spurious association. Confounding is a causal concept, and as such, cannot be described in terms of correlations or associations ³ ⁴.

Learn more: [1. investopedia.com](#) [2. investopedia.com](#) [3. bing.com](#) [+8 more](#) 6 of 15 ●

Figure 4: GPT4 cannot answer this type of question. With more assumptions given, it can only explain the meaning of these assumptions without answering the causal question.




Figure 5: GPT4 can identify that such a question requires causal discovery methods and tries to recommend a causal discovery toolbox. This is a great step as this provides the possibility to answer such questions with API access and they can take advantage of the advances of the causal machine learning research. However, **the recommended methods are not suitable**. For the first question, I have already provided the assumption that the relationships are linear and the LLM recommends two non-linear methods, one of which is designed for time-series. For the second question, the recommended method is OK in theory but it is not the most efficient one to handle such scale data.




Figure 6: GPT can give generic explains for the context. However, it does not provide concrete suggestions which require causal inference and more real-world evidence. For this question, the answers are not wrong but it is not sufficient. In a desired world, the answer should identify that one need to know the impact of these two programs on revenue to make the recommendation (a causal inference question) and more information are required.

A.3 Type 3 question behaviours

GPT currently fails to answer high precision causal reasoning questions and shows hallucinatory behaviour with further prompting. However, given correct context (using ITE as memory augmentation), GPT can provide useful answers. **Type 3 Example 1** questions are shown in Figure ?? to Figure 9. **Type 3 Example 2** are shown in Figure ?? and 10.

I have 10 dealers for my products. There locations are [London, Cambridge, London, Bath, York, Cambridge, London, London], there revenues last year are [19k, 9k, 65k, 20k, 5k, 37k, 23k, 78k], I have give them discounts with following rate [10%, 5%, 10%, 20%, 5%, 0%, 5%, 15%, 5%, 10%]. Their membership status last year are [Yes, No, Yes, Yes, No, No, No, Yes, No, Yes]. I can give out three membership program again this year. I would like the membership card provides the highest revenue growth, a.k.a make the biggest difference. Which three dealers should I choose?

I see. You have 10 dealers with their locations, revenues last year, discounts given and membership status. You want to give out three membership programs again this year and would like to choose the three dealers that would provide the highest revenue growth.

To do this, you can calculate the revenue growth for each dealer by multiplying their revenue last year with the discount rate given and then add the revenue growth to their revenue last year. Then you can choose the three dealers with the highest revenue growth.

Here are the calculations for each dealer:

Dealer	Location	Revenue Last Year	Discount Rate	Membership Status	Revenue Growth
1	London	19k	10%	Yes	20.9k
2	Cambridge	9k	5%	No	9.45k
3	London	65k	10%	Yes	71.5k
4	Bath	20k	20%	Yes	24k
5	York	5k	5%	No	5.25k
6	Cambridge	37k	0%	No	37k
7	London	23k	5%	No	24.15k
8	London	78k	15%	Yes	89.7k

The dealers with the highest revenue growth are:

1. Dealer #8 with a revenue growth of **89.7k**
2. Dealer #3 with a revenue growth of **71.5k**
3. Dealer #4 with a revenue growth of **24k**

Therefore, you should choose these three dealers for your membership program this year.

1 of 15 ●

Figure 7: An example of decision making requiring causal reasoning with Bing. The computation of the revenue growth was revenue multiplied by discount. One hypothesis is that it may have not understood the header.

Company A will buy 88 K product more from us if I ask them to join our membership program. Company B will buy 105 K product more from us if I ask them to join our membership program. Company C will buy 95 K product more from us if I ask them to join our membership program. I can only give out 2 membership cards. Which 2 company should I choose?

I see. You have three companies that are interested in joining your membership program. Company A will buy 88k more products from you, Company B will buy 105k more products from you and Company C will buy 95k more products from you.

You can only give out two membership cards. To choose the two companies that would provide the highest revenue growth, you can calculate the revenue growth for each company by multiplying the additional products they will buy with their current price and then add the revenue growth to their current revenue. Then you can choose the two companies with the highest revenue growth.

Here are the calculations for each company:

Company	Additional Products	Current Price	Revenue Growth
A	88k	\$10	\$968k
B	105k	\$12	\$1.26M
C	95k	\$11	\$1.045M

The companies with the highest revenue growth are:

1. Company B with a revenue growth of **\$1.26M**
2. Company C with a revenue growth of **\$1.045M**

Therefore, you should choose these two companies for your membership program this year.

3 of 15 ●

Figure 8: Correct example of decision making to pick the highest ones. Following the question in Fig 7. However, as of March 2023, the performance is not stable as shown in Fig 9.

Company A will buy 88 K product more from us if I ask them to join our membership program. Company B will buy 105 K product more from us if I ask them to join our membership program. Company C will buy 95 K product more from us if I ask them to join our membership program. I can only give out 2 membership cards. Which 2 company should I choose?

It's great to hear that you have potential customers interested in your membership program. It's a tough decision to make when you have to choose between them.

If you want to maximize the total amount of product sold, you should choose Company B and Company C. This way, you will sell a total of 200K more products.

If you want to maximize the number of companies that join your membership program, you should choose Company A and Company B. This way, two companies will join your membership program.

Which one do you prefer?

1 of 15 ●

Figure 9: Wrong example of the same task as above. In this particular example, the third sentence seems out of the place. One explanation is that it understand the objective as to choose two companies. Instead of answering that any two companies will be fine if the objective is to choose just two companies. It give a specific example with confidence. This sentence is rather confusing to human audience. LLMs are stochastic but such mistakes are undesirable from a user trust perspective.

This is the third time that this patient returns with lumbago. The epidural steroid injections helped him before but not long. I injected 12 mg betamethasone last two times. What is the dose that I should use this time?

✓ Searching for: **betamethasone dose for epidural steroid injection**

✓ Generating answers for you...

According to a study published in 2015, administration of the lowest possible dose of epidural betamethasone is desired to minimize side effects while maintaining efficacy. The study hypothesized that a 3 mg or a 6 mg dose of betamethasone will demonstrate equivalent analgesic properties¹.

Another source suggests that the usual adult dose for epidural steroid injection is 6-12 mg².

It's important to note that the dose may vary depending on the patient's condition and other factors. It's best to consult with a doctor before administering any medication.

I hope this helps!

Learn more: [1. pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](#) [2. drugs.com](#) [3. bnf.nice.org.uk](#) [+1 more](#) 1 of 15 ●

The pain relief will last 1 month if I give 18mg, 2 weeks if I give 12mg and may not be so helpful if I give under 10mg. There is no other side effect. Which does should I use?

It's important to note that the dose may vary depending on the patient's condition and other factors. It's best to consult with a doctor before administering any medication.

However, based on the information you provided, it seems that 18mg would be the most effective dose for pain relief.

I hope this helps!

2 of 15 ●

Figure 10: With this medical example, compared to ChatGPT??, GPT 4 shows appropriate referrals on allowed categories as discussed in OpenAI (2023) as it gives a general answer on the dose guidance. It shows stronger safety guards, even when ITE information provided.