

---

# GPT-4 AS AN AGRONOMIST ASSISTANT? ANSWERING AGRICULTURE QUESTIONS USING LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

---

**Bruno Silva, Leonardo Nunes, Roberto Estevão, Vijay Aski, Ranveer Chandra**  
Microsoft Research  
{brunosilva, lnunes, robertode, vaski, ranveer}@microsoft.com

## ABSTRACT

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in natural language understanding and generation across various domains, including healthcare and finance. For some tasks that require intelligence, LLMs achieve similar or better performance than trained human beings, therefore it is reasonable to employ human exams (e.g., certification tests) to assess the performance of language models. In this study, we present a comprehensive evaluation of popular LLMs, such as Llama 2, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, on their ability to answer agriculture-related questions. In our evaluation, we also employ RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation) and ER (Ensemble Refinement) techniques, which combine information retrieval, generation capabilities, and prompting strategies to improve the models' performance. To demonstrate the capabilities of LLMs, we selected agriculture exams and benchmark datasets from three of the largest agriculture producer countries: Brazil, India, and the USA. Our analysis highlights GPT-4's ability to achieve a passing score on exams to earn credits for renewing agronomist certifications, answering 93% of the questions correctly and outperforming earlier general-purpose models (GPT-3.5), which achieved 88% accuracy. On one of our evaluation datasets that had published student scores, GPT-4 obtained the highest performance when compared to human subjects. This performance suggests that GPT-4 could potentially pass on major graduate education admission tests or even earn credits for renewing agronomy certificates. We also explore the models' capacity to address general agriculture-related questions and generate crop management guidelines for Brazilian and Indian farmers, utilizing robust datasets from the Brazilian Agency of Agriculture (Embrapa) and graduate program exams from India. The results suggest that GPT-4, ER, and RAG can contribute meaningfully to agricultural education, assessment, and crop management practice, offering valuable insights to farmers and agricultural professionals from Brazil, India, and the USA. Implications of these findings are discussed in terms of the potential uses of GPT-4, ER, and RAG in agricultural education, assessment, and practice. We emphasize the importance of addressing challenges related to accuracy and safety while harnessing the power of LLMs effectively and responsibly in the agriculture domain.

**Keywords** GPT-4 · Agriculture · Retrieval Augmented Generation · Prompt Engineering · Knowledge Exams

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs), such as GPT-4 and Llama 2, have made significant strides in showcasing remarkable capabilities across a wide range of domains and tasks (Touvron et al., 2023). These models exhibit a level of intelligence that surpasses prior Artificial Intelligence (AI) models, excelling in various fields like coding, medicine, law, agriculture, and psychology, often without requiring special prompts. Their performance is impressively close to human expertise, positioning them as potential early versions of artificial general intelligence (AGI) systems (Bubeck et al., 2023). The technology behind LLMs, which typically involves advanced deep learning techniques, large-scale transformers, and massive amounts of data, has fueled their rapid progress. As research on LLMs continues, it is vital to uncover their limitations and address the challenges in achieving more comprehensive AGI systems. Furthermore, the machine learning community must evolve beyond traditional benchmarking methods, moving towards evaluating LLMs in a manner that closely resembles the assessment of human cognitive abilities. In recent years, significant advancements in

LLMs based on the transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017) and trained in a self-supervised manner have led to substantial improvements (Nori et al., 2023; Devlin et al., 2019; Radford et al., 2018) in various natural language processing tasks. These models, trained on massive cross-disciplinary corpora, have the potential to offer valuable insights and assistance in specialized domains like agriculture, crop management, and advising.

Most prior work on AI in Agriculture has focused on extracting intelligence on satellite imagery and sensor data. In our research at Microsoft, through Project FarmBeats (Vasisht et al., 2017; Chandra et al., 2022) and Project FarmVibes (Microsoft, 2021), we have focused on artificial intelligence techniques to drive the adoption of data-driven agriculture. We use AI to clean data sources, for example, by seeing through clouds (Zhao et al., 2023b), to better data collection by predicting sampling locations, to making better predictions, for example of yields, microclimates (Kumar et al., 2021), and carbon sequestration (Sharma et al., 2022). While these advances have helped improve the state of the art in agricultural AI, tech-savviness of farmers and farm workers has limited the adoption of technology solutions.

In this paper, we look at the ability of LLMs to bridge the technology adoption gap in agriculture. Our first consideration is that of an agronomist’s assistant (a virtual agronomist). The vision is that an agronomist can ask questions to the virtual agronomist to remove ambiguity in the response. This can help better customize the answers for the farmer. Such a virtual agronomist can help an agronomist stay up to date with the latest information, can help remove paperwork, and can help them be more effective in their consultation with the farmer.

We build a virtual agronomist leveraging the advances in LLMs. Our goal is to leverage the LLM to pass an exam that an agronomist needs to pass, for example, the Certified Crop Advisor related Exams in the USA.

We first utilized diverse datasets to estimate the performance of Large Language Models (LLMs) in the field of agriculture. First, the Brazilian dataset from Embrapa’s database comprises a variety of complex, open agriculture-related questions and challenges (Embrapa, 2022). Second, we used questions from the American Society of Agronomy related to the Certified Crop Adviser (CCA), designed to evaluate an individual’s ability to provide competent advice on crop management, soil, and water conservation (Adviser, 2022). Lastly, the Indian dataset from AgriExam offers a collection of previous year questions from various agriculture-related exams for graduate programs, covering topics such as agronomy, horticulture, and soil science (Exam, 2022). These resources, featuring multiple-choice questions and short-answer questions enable us to assess the capabilities of LLMs in answering difficult agriculture-related questions and explore their potential applications in providing expert advice and support within the agricultural sector.

By using out-of-the-box models, this study assesses how these LLMs can be applied to provide valuable insights and assistance in the specialized domain of agriculture. These findings contribute to the understanding of LLMs’ potential in the agriculture domain and pave the way for their responsible and efficient use in addressing agricultural challenges and promoting sustainable practices.

In this paper, we make several noteworthy contributions to the understanding of LLMs in the agriculture domain. These contributions can be itemized as follows:

- We present a comprehensive evaluation of LLMs, such as Llama2-13B, Llama2-70B, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, in answering agriculture-related questions using benchmark datasets from major agriculture producer countries.
- We investigate the impact of retrieval techniques and prompting ensemble methods on the performance of these models, providing valuable insights into their capabilities and limitations.
- We discuss the implications of these findings in terms of potential uses of LLMs in agricultural education, assessment, and practice, emphasizing the importance of addressing challenges related to accuracy and safety while harnessing the power of LLMs effectively and responsibly in the agriculture domain.

## 2 Related Works

In this section, we review the relevant literature and studies that have explored the application of artificial intelligence, particularly large language models, in agriculture and related domains, as well as in educational settings and assessment methodologies. We present a brief introduction to each paper, discussing the contributions and potential improvements in each work, and comparing them to the proposed paper.

Nori et al. (2023) evaluated GPT-4 on medical competency examinations and benchmark datasets, such as the USMLE and MultiMedQA suite. Despite not being specialized for medical problems, GPT-4 demonstrated impressive capabilities in natural language understanding and generation. The study explored various aspects of model performance, including text and images in test questions, memorization during training, and probability calibration. Results showed GPT-4 outperforming earlier models and models fine-tuned on medical knowledge, with improved calibration. The authors discuss GPT-4’s ability to explain medical reasoning, personalize explanations, and craft counterfactual scenarios, considering implications for medical education and practice, while acknowledging accuracy and safety challenges.

Nunes et al. (2023) explored the capabilities of language models (LMs), specifically GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, in tackling high-stakes multiple-choice tests using the National High School Exam (Exame Nacional do Ensino Médio - ENEM), a multidisciplinary entrance examination widely adopted by Brazilian universities. The ENEM challenges LLMs due to its questions spanning multiple fields of knowledge and requiring understanding of information from diverse domains. The authors analyzed responses generated by GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 models for questions presented in the 2009-2017 exams, as well as for questions of the 2022 exam, which were made public after the training of the models was completed. Different prompt strategies were tested, including the use of Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompts to generate explanations for answers. The best-performing model, GPT-4 with CoT, achieved an accuracy of 87% on the 2022 edition, surpassing GPT-3.5 by 11 points.

In the context of applying Large Language Models (LLMs) for question-answering tasks, a notable study is the Med-PaLM 2 paper by Singhal et al. (2023). This model leverages base LLM improvements, medical domain fine-tuning, and prompting strategies, including a novel ensemble refinement (ER) approach that is also used in this research. The model has achieved remarkable results, scoring up to 86.5% on the MedQA dataset, while also demonstrating high performance on clinical topics datasets.

Dikli (2006) paper, titled "An overview of automated scoring of essays," discusses the state of research in automated essay grading (AEG) and its potential applications in educational settings. While it provides a comprehensive review of AEG methodologies and their implications for education, it focuses on a specific assessment method. "Show your work: Improved reporting of experimental results" by Dodge et al. (2019) emphasizes the importance of improved reporting of experimental results. The work contributes to more transparent and reproducible research practices in the field of natural language processing. In "Using Latent Semantic Analysis to evaluate the contributions of students in AutoTutor," Graesser et al. (2000) investigated the use of Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) for evaluating students' contributions in an intelligent tutoring system. The work focuses on AI-driven educational systems and their evaluation but is limited in scope, as it is centered around the AutoTutor system and LSA.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) techniques have been gaining attention for their ability to enhance the performance of large language models in various domains (Lewis et al., 2020). RAG techniques combine information retrieval and generation capabilities, allowing models to access and utilize relevant external knowledge to generate more accurate and informed responses. Specifically, RAG techniques employ a two-step process: first, retrieving relevant documents or passages from a knowledge source, and second, conditioning the generation process on the retrieved information. This approach has demonstrated success in improving the performance of language models in tasks such as question-answering and summarization, where access to external knowledge can be crucial for generating correct and coherent outputs. Kamilaris and Prenafeta-Boldú (2018) conducted a survey on "Deep learning in agriculture," outlining the use of deep learning techniques in various agricultural tasks. The paper provides a comprehensive review of deep learning applications in agriculture. "Crop yield prediction using deep neural networks" by Khaki and Wang (2019) explores the use of deep learning techniques to predict crop yields with high accuracy. Liakos et al. (2018) presented a review titled "Machine learning in agriculture," discussing various machine learning techniques for addressing agricultural challenges. The paper provides a comprehensive review of machine learning applications in agriculture but does not focus on large language models like GPT.

Zhao et al. (2023a) have explored ChatGPT's potential in agricultural text classification, resulting in a solution called ChatAgri. Evaluations on multi-linguistic datasets show competitive performance compared to existing PLM-based fine-tuning approaches. ChatAgri exhibits strengths in zero-shot learning, domain transferability, and minimal hardware requirements, suggesting its suitability as a low-cost AI technique for smart agriculture applications. The study provides a comprehensive analysis of the findings, contributing to future sustainable smart agriculture development. The paper "WINOGRANDE: An Adversarial Winograd Schema Challenge at Scale" by Sakaguchi et al. (2021) introduces a large-scale dataset for evaluating the common sense reasoning capabilities of AI models. This work contributes to the creation of a challenging benchmark for AI systems, fostering research in natural language understanding and common sense reasoning. "XLNet: Generalized Autoregressive Pretraining for Language Understanding," proposed by Yang et al. (2019), presents a novel pretraining method for natural language understanding tasks. This work develops a competitive language model that outperforms other methods on several benchmarks.

In summary, while the existing literature has demonstrated the potential of artificial intelligence, particularly LLMs, in various domains and applications, the specific context of agriculture has been less explored. Our proposed paper distinguishes itself from the reviewed works by focusing on employing large language models, such as GPT-4, within the agriculture domain. We aim to evaluate how these models can enhance human capabilities in the context of agriculture, including answering agriculture-related questions and providing guidelines for crop management. By bridging the gap between the advancements in large language models and the agricultural sector, our study offers a unique perspective and contributes to the understanding of AI's potential impact on agriculture by providing a baseline for future benchmarks about the use of large language models to solve agricultural problems.

### 3 Datasets

This study assesses advanced language models in addressing agriculture-related questions by utilizing three distinct datasets with different formats, each originating from three major crop producer countries.

#### 3.1 Certified Crop Adviser (CCA) Exam

During which stage of plant growth is an above-normal rainfall conducive to pod and stem blight as well as Phomopsis seed decay?

- a) Flowering
- b) Pod filling
- c) Early vegetative
- d) Mid vegetative

Answer: b) Pod filling

Listing 1: Adapted CEU question example, requiring specialized knowledge about Pod and Stem Blight and Phomopsis Seed Decay of Soybean.

The Certified Crop Adviser (CCA) Exam is a comprehensive evaluation program designed to assess the competency of agricultural professionals in agronomy and crop advising (Adviser, 2022). The CCA certification ensures that crop advisers possess the necessary knowledge and skills to provide accurate and reliable advice to farmers and other stakeholders in the agricultural sector. The certification process involves passing two exams: the International CCA Exam, which focuses on general agronomic principles, and a Local Board Exam tailored to specific regional conditions and regulations. To maintain their CCA certification, crop advisers are required to participate in continuing education activities and earn Continuing Education Units (CEUs) credits. These CEUs demonstrate that the advisers are staying up to date with the latest developments in agronomy and are committed to lifelong learning. A specific number of CEUs must be earned within a designated time frame to maintain the certification. The questions used for this evaluation are based on Continuing Education Unit (CEU) materials and not the actual Certified Crop Adviser (CCA) certification tests. The purpose of using CEU questions in this study is solely to assess the GPT models' ability to provide valuable insights and assistance in the specialized domain of agriculture, and not to replicate or undermine the CCA certification process.

The Crop Protection Network (CPN) is an excellent resource for CCAs seeking to earn CEUs. The CPN offers a variety of online quizzes related to continuing education units' credits<sup>1</sup>. These quizzes cover a wide range of topics in agronomy and crop management, such as disease management, pest control, nutrient management, and environmental stewardship. By participating in these quizzes and earning CEUs, CCAs can ensure that they remain knowledgeable and competent in their field, providing the best possible guidance to farmers and contributing to the overall sustainability and productivity of the agricultural sector.

The adapted CEU question example provided in Listing 1 highlights the specialized knowledge required to answer questions related to specific crop diseases, such as pod and stem blight and phomopsis seed decay of soybean.

#### 3.2 EMBRAPA Dataset

In this study, we use an extensive dataset, "500 Perguntas 500 Respostas - Embrapa/SCT" (500 Questions 500 Answers - Embrapa/SCT), provided by the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (Embrapa) (Embrapa, 2022). This dataset consists of a series of books containing questions and answers related to various aspects of crop cultivation and management in Brazil. These questions have been formulated by a diverse group of stakeholders, including producers, farmers, and farming associations, and are accompanied by responses from Embrapa specialists. Unlike CCA exams, the questions in this dataset are not presented in a multiple-choice format but as general text-based inquiries, requiring a deeper understanding of the subject matter to generate accurate and relevant answers.

The use of this robust dataset presents a unique opportunity to examine the effectiveness of advanced language models in answering domain-specific questions accurately and contextually. By rigorously evaluating LLM's performance on the Embrapa dataset, our goal is to explore the potential of artificial intelligence in providing reliable and efficient

<sup>1</sup><https://cropprotectionnetwork.org/cca-ceu-quizzes>

What are the symptoms and damages caused by the gall nematode in citrus plants?

Answer: The symptoms of the gall nematode in citrus plants include dysfunction in the roots, leading to smaller leaf size and marked chlorosis. This results in a reduction in production. The growth of the main root may be paralyzed, causing a proliferation of lateral roots. In severe infections, the plant may die before the nematode completes its cycle. However, not all citrus species are susceptible to this nematode, so it is essential to identify the species and monitor it in the soil and roots.

Listing 2: Example of an adapted question from the Embrapa dataset, focusing on the symptoms and damages caused by the gall nematode in citrus plants.

solutions to real-world agricultural challenges. Through this analysis, we aim to bridge the gap between state-of-the-art technology and sustainable agricultural practices, ultimately contributing to the improvement of agricultural productivity and resource management on a global scale.

Listing 2 illustrates an example of an adapted question from the Embrapa dataset, demonstrating the challenges of verifying the correctness of answers in this context. Since the dataset's questions are not multiple-choice and often have no single correct answer, assessing the accuracy of responses can be subjective. This highlights the importance of understanding the nuances of agricultural topics and the expertise required to evaluate the relevance and correctness of AI-generated answers. The Embrapa dataset, translated as "500 Questions 500 Answers," not only targets agronomists but also serves as a valuable resource for farmers. It encompasses a wide range of topics essential to both groups, contributing to the overall knowledge base and fostering sustainable agricultural practices.

### 3.3 AgriExams Questions

Which directorate/institute of ICAR coordinates/organizes Parthenium Awareness Week in India during the month of August each year?

- a) ICAR-DWR, Jabalpur
- b) ICAR-IARI, New Delhi
- c) ICAR-CSSRI, Karnal
- d) ICAR-IIFSR Modipuram

Answer: a) ICAR-DWR, Jabalpur

Listing 3: Adapted AgriExam question example, highlighting the multiple-choice style and focus on Indian agriculture.

The AgriExam dataset features a wide range of questions from various agriculture-related exams, primarily focusing on Indian agriculture (Exam, 2022). These questions are collected from different entrance exams, including those from prestigious institutions like JNKVV (Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya) and RVSKVV (Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya). The questions are designed to assess candidates' knowledge and understanding of diverse agricultural topics, ranging from crop production and soil science to agricultural economics and extension, with a specific focus on India's farming practices and conditions.

Listing 3 shows an example of a multiple-choice question style adapted from the AgriExam dataset. Note that this is not the exact question from the source but serves as a representation of the question style. The questions are often structured as multiple-choice or descriptive questions, requiring test-takers to demonstrate a deep understanding of the subject matter. In this paper, we evaluated only the Agriexams multiple-choice questions. Additionally, the questions may focus on the application of scientific principles to real-world agricultural challenges, particularly those relevant to Indian agriculture, thereby encouraging problem-solving and critical thinking skills.

## 4 Method Overview

This section outlines the method that was employed to execute experiments using LLMs to answer agriculture-related questions (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Answering and Evaluation Scheme

**1. Data Collection:** The first step in the process involved collecting the data required for the experiments. This was done through manual extraction of questions and answers from various sources, such as books, articles, or online resources. Alternatively, custom scripts were developed to automate the data collection process, particularly when dealing with large datasets or multiple sources.

**2. Data Handling:** Once the data was collected, it needed to be transformed from text into structured data. This was done by converting the questions into either a multiple-choice format using JSON or an open question format, depending on the nature of the questions and the desired output of the experiment. Structuring the data in this way allowed for easier integration with the LLMs and facilitated subsequent analysis of the results.

**3. Data Cleaning:** The next step was data cleaning, which involved removing questions that were not answerable without visual capabilities, such as questions based on images. To clean the data, both LLMs and manual inspection were used. This step ensured that the remaining questions were suitable for the LLMs and would yield meaningful results in the context of agriculture-related inquiries.

**4. Prompting Creation:** With the cleaned and structured data in hand, the next step was to create prompts for the LLMs to generate answers to the questions. The prompts were designed to include contextual information, such as background knowledge about the subject matter, to improve the accuracy and relevance of the generated responses. This step was crucial in guiding the LLMs to produce high-quality answers that addressed the specific needs of the agriculture-related questions.

**5. LLM Call:** In this step, the LLMs were called and could use RAG and/or ER depending on the contextual data availability and computational resources budget. These models generated responses to the prompts created in the previous step.

**6. Checking Answers:** Finally, after the LLMs generated answers to the questions, it was essential to check and evaluate the responses for accuracy and relevance. This step involved comparing the generated answers to the original answers provided by experts, as well as assessing the overall quality of the responses in terms of their applicability to the agriculture domain. In this step, LLMs were utilized to help check the correctness of answers, especially for open questions.

#### 4.1 Prompting Strategy




Figure 2: Prompting Scheme

```

template_question = """
{preamble}

Answer the following question and provide the correct answer.

The question is a multiple-choice question with a unique correct answer.

{question}

Answer the question by providing the correct alternative (example: the correct
option is b).

Do not provide an empty answer.

"""
    
```

Listing 4: GPT question answering prompt.

In this research, we employ two distinct LLM agents to perform separate tasks. The first agent (Answer Agent) is responsible for answering the questions provided. The second agent (Evaluation Agent) is assigned the task of evaluating the correctness of the answers generated by the first agent. This dual-agent setup allows for a more thorough examination of the AI models' performance, as one focuses on generating responses while the other ensures the accuracy and relevance of the answers produced. We also use the Orchestrator to manage the message passing between the models.

Figure 2, shows the prompting process. Initially, the User submits raw questions to the Orchestrator, which then presents a raw question to the Answer Agent. The Answer Agent creates a question prompt for the language model, and the LLM processes the prompt, generating an answer sent back to the Orchestrator. Listing 4 shows the question prompt used by the Answer Agent and passed to the LLM. In the listing, the placeholder {preamble} is used to pass some

```

template_evaluation = """
You are an expert professor specialized in checking students' answers to
questions.

You are checking the following question:

{query}

Here is the real answer:

{answer}

You are checking the following student's answer:

{result}

What grade do you give, where 0 is incorrect and 1 is correct? Give me only 0 or
1 as response.

If the student's answer is not related to the question, give me 0.
"""

```

Listing 5: GPT answer evaluation prompt.

contextual information (e.g., exam name and/or location) to the answering agent while the placeholder {question} is replaced with the user questions.

Next, the Orchestrator forwards the original question, LLM's answer, and the ground truth answer to the Evaluation Agent. Subsequently, the Evaluation Agent formulates an evaluation prompt and delivers it to the LLM. The evaluation prompt used by the Evaluation Answer is presented in Listing 5 where {query} is placeholder for the question, {answer} is the ground truth question, and {result} is the answer provided by the Answer Agent. The LLM evaluates the prompt and returns a score (either 0 or 1) to the Orchestrator. Finally, the Orchestrator communicates the score to the User, concluding the process.

## 4.2 Context Provisioning

In this study, we used the Llama Index (Liu, 2022) to create context-based questions for LLMs when addressing questions related to agricultural applications, specifically for USA and India datasets. As Embrapa's dataset is composed of open questions, the process of providing context is not applicable as the answer for the questions would be directly presented in the background material. Remember Embrapa's dataset is composed of direct questions and answers related to Brazilian agriculture.

The Llama Index organized and indexed the same text material provided to certified agronomists when obtaining credits to renew their certificates. By incorporating the Llama Index, we aimed to improve the LLMs' performance on domain-specific tasks by aligning the context of a given question with the knowledge embedded in the models. The Llama Index organizes and indexes a large collection of domain-specific information, like agricultural texts, research articles, and expert opinions, into a structured and easily accessible format. This indexed information can then be used to create context-based questions for the LLMs, providing them with the necessary background knowledge to generate informed and accurate responses to questions in the agriculture domain. To generate a context-based question using the Llama Index, we extract important contextual information from the identified resources, select key facts, and concepts directly related to the questions. Finally, we crafted context-based questions by combining the original questions with the extracted contextual information, ensuring that the GPT models had access to the necessary background knowledge for generating accurate responses.

## 4.3 Ensemble Refinement Method

Ensemble Refinement (ER) is a prompting strategy proposed by Singhal et al. (2023) that builds on techniques like chain-of-thought and self-consistency (Wei et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023), leveraging the idea of conditioning a LLM

on its own generations before producing a final answer. ER is a two-stage process designed to improve the performance of the LLM when answering questions, particularly in the context of agriculture-related questions.

In the first stage of ER, a (few-shot) chain-of-thought prompt and a question are given to the model. The model then generates multiple possible explanations and answers stochastically via temperature sampling. Each generation consists of an explanation and an answer for a question. In the second stage, the model is conditioned on the original prompt, the question, and the concatenated generations from the previous step. The model is then prompted to produce a refined explanation and answer. This can be viewed as a generalization of self-consistency, where the LLM aggregates answers from the first stage instead of conducting a simple vote. By considering the strengths and weaknesses of the generated explanations, the LLM can produce more refined answers.

To further improve performance, the second stage is performed multiple times. The final answer is then determined by a plurality vote over the generated answers. In this paper, due to the resource cost associated with repeated samplings from a model, ER is only applied for multiple-choice evaluation.

## 5 Results

This section presents the results for establishing a baseline for LLMs in agriculture, evaluating their performance on various datasets and question types. Our findings provide insights into LLM strengths and limitations, guiding future research and novel strategies for enhancing their capabilities. Table 1 presents the number of questions and the adopted preambles for each dataset. In our experiments, we used Azure Open AI deployments for GPT-3.5 and GPT-4. Additionally, for inference, we employed Llama2 models, specifically 13B on a single Nvidia-H100 and 70B on two Nvidia-H100s.

Dataset	#Questions	Preamble
CCA Video-Based Questions	89	The following question is related to agriculture and is part of the process of earning credits that are necessary for the renewal of the Certified Crop Adviser (CCA) certification. It is question related to the agricultural industry in the United States.
CCA Text-Based Questions	312	Same as Previous preamble.
Embrapa	18,955	The following question is related to Brazilian agriculture and is part of a series of questions and answers for Brazilian farmers distributed by Embrapa.
AgriExams	1,723	The following question is related to Indian agriculture and is part of an exam to ingress in an important graduate program from an Indian university.

Table 1: Number of questions and preambles for each dataset.

### 5.1 USA Dataset Results

In our evaluation, we split the CCA-related questions into two categories: video-based questions and text-based questions. For the text-based questions, we assessed the performance of LLMs both with and without the use of the RAG, ER, and using or not a preamble. Just like in the original ER paper, we adopted for all experiments 11 samplings for the first stage and 33 samplings for the second stage. For video-based questions, we evaluated LLM performance without using retrieval techniques, as there is no textual information available in the videos to serve as context. This approach helps us understand how well LLMs can answer agriculture-related questions based solely on their pre-trained knowledge, without relying on external context provided by RAG techniques.

Scenario	ER	Preamble	Llama2-13B	Llama2-70B	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
1			55%	74%	74%	79%
2		✓	58%	72%	74%	83%
3	✓	✓	–	–	80%	83%

Table 2: Video-based questions results.

The results presented in Table 2 demonstrate the performance of Llama2-13B, Llama2-70B, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 on video-based questions under various conditions. In the baseline scenario (Scenario 1), GPT-4 exhibited the best performance, achieving a score of 79%, followed by GPT-3.5 and Llama2-70B at 74%, and Llama2-13B at 55%.

When a preamble was introduced in Scenario 2, GPT-3.5’s performance remained unchanged at 74%, while GPT-4’s score increased to 83%, indicating the effectiveness of a preamble in boosting GPT-4’s performance. In this scenario, Llama2-13B and Llama2-70B scored 58% and 72%, respectively. In our trials, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 consistently exceeded the performance of Llama2-13B and Llama2-70B. Consequently, to reduce evaluation costs and focus our efforts on the most promising outcomes, we opted to employ ensemble refinement techniques solely on GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, for all experiments in this paper. In Scenario 3, ER was applied to GPT-3.5 and GPT-4. For GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, both models experienced improved scores, with GPT-3.5 achieving 80% and GPT-4 maintaining its 83% score. The findings suggest that GPT-4 consistently outperforms other models across all scenarios, with further enhancements observed when incorporating a preamble or ER.

Scenario	RAG	ER	Preamble	Llama2-13B	Llama2-70B	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
1				47%	55%	64%	79%
2			✓	48%	60%	66%	82%
3		✓	✓	–	–	71%	84%
4	✓			70%	81%	82%	93%
5	✓		✓	71%	81%	88%	93%

Table 3: Multiple choice questions results (CCA-related exams - text based).

The results from Table 3 demonstrate the performance of Llama2-13B, Llama2-70B, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 in answering text-based multiple-choice questions from CCA-related exams under various scenarios. GPT-4 consistently outperforms all other models in every scenario, with a noticeable increase in performance when provided with assistance. For instance, when a preamble was introduced in Scenario 2, GPT-4’s performance increased from 79% to 82%. The combination of ER and a preamble in Scenario 3 further enhanced GPT-4’s score to 84%.

Interestingly, the most significant improvement for all models was observed when employing the RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation) technique in Scenarios 4 and 5. GPT-4 achieved an impressive 93% score, while Llama2-13B and Llama2-70B both saw substantial improvements, reaching 70% and 81%, respectively. GPT-3.5’s performance also improved, reaching 82% in Scenario 4 and 88% in Scenario 5.

While the contextual information provided in preambles is static, RAG retrieves information dynamically, allowing for better adaptation to the context of the questions and potentially resulting in more accurate responses. ER also improves results by harnessing hidden knowledge within LLMs using different temperatures for each GPT call, enabling the extraction of diverse and domain-specific insights for more accurate and contextually relevant answers.

For some questions, LLMs give wrong answers within the context of agriculture. For instance, Listing 6 shows an example of how GPT-4 incorrectly answers the question.

<p>Which biotic stress factors have received the least attention in terms of commercially released transgenes?</p> <p>a) Insects b) Diseases c) Weeds d) Mammals</p> <p>Answer: b GPT Answer: d - Mammals</p>
---

Listing 6: Adapted example of incorrect answer from CCA dataset (GPT-4 with preamble and no RAG).

According to previous results, we can see that both RAG and ER methods can improve the quality of answers generated by LLMs. However, combining these methods to answer each question in the dataset can increase the computational costs for each question-answering task. Therefore, to evaluate the impact of ER and RAG simultaneously on GPT-X, we sampled 100 multiple-choice questions and assessed the models’ performance. We also used preambles for the sampled dataset in all scenarios.

Table 4 shows the results related to incorporating Ensemble Refinement (ER) and Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) methods to the text-based CCA sampled dataset. Our findings indicate that the combination of these techniques significantly improves the quality of answers generated by Large Language Models (LLMs). In particular, GPT-4 demonstrated the highest performance, reaching 97% accuracy when both RAG and ER were applied. Interestingly,

Scenario	RAG	ER	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
1			70%	85%
2		✓	70%	92%
3	✓		92%	93%
4	✓	✓	92%	97%

Table 4: RAG + ER Evaluation table (CCA-related exams - sampled text-based questions).

while ER alone showed a substantial impact on GPT-4’s performance, increasing accuracy from 85% to 92%, it did not have a noticeable effect on GPT-3.5’s performance. In contrast, RAG alone greatly improved GPT-3.5’s accuracy from 70% to 92%, while only slightly increasing GPT-4’s accuracy from 85% to 93%. These results suggest that incorporating retrieval and ensemble refinement techniques can enhance LLMs’ performance, with the combination of RAG and ER yielding the most significant improvements.

While these techniques can significantly improve the quality of answers generated by Large Language Models (LLMs), it is important to note that the combination of RAG and ER comes with increased computational costs for each question-answering task. ER, in particular, involves multiple samplings in its two-stage process, which can be resource-intensive and time-consuming. RAG, on the other hand, combines retrieval with generative models, which may require additional processing time and resources for accessing and integrating external knowledge. Despite the increased costs, the substantial improvements in model performance, as demonstrated by the results, may justify the use of these techniques in certain applications. However, it is essential to carefully weigh the trade-offs between performance gains and resource requirements when deciding whether to employ RAG, ER, or both in a given context.

## 5.2 Embrapa Results

Scenario	Preamble	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
1		59%	72%
2	✓	78%	84%

Table 5: Embrapa questions results.

Question: Some countries have used in the culture of sorghum protectors known as safeners. Can this technology be used to use herbicides in sorghum crops?

Answer: Although the effect of seed protectors used to protect plants against the phytotoxic effect of herbicides is known, their use in sorghum is not allowed in Brazil, as it is not registered on the Map.

GPT Answer: Yes, the use of safeners in sorghum crops can help protect the plants from potential damage caused by herbicides. Safeners are chemicals that selectively protect the crop from the harmful effects of herbicides, allowing for better weed control without harming the sorghum plants. This technology has been successfully used in some countries and can be a valuable tool for managing weeds in sorghum crops.

Listing 7: Adapted example of incorrect answer from Embrapa dataset (GPT-4 with preamble).

Table 5 highlights the performance of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 on open-ended questions related to Brazilian agriculture. One challenge in assessing the correctness of the answers generated by the models for Embrapa questions lies in their open-ended nature, which allows for multiple valid responses. Moreover, the RAG technique was not applied in these experiments to ensure a fair comparison, given that the Embrapa dataset already contains question-answer pairs. General models like GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 may struggle to provide accurate responses tailored to the Brazilian context due to potential limitations in their training data concerning Brazil’s unique agricultural conditions and practices (e.g., Listing 7). Despite these challenges, the results suggest that GPT-4 is more capable of understanding and answering open-ended questions related to Brazilian agriculture than GPT-3.5, even without using RAG and accounting for the dataset’s specific characteristics. Additionally, when a preamble is added to the questions specifying the fact they are related to the Brazilian agriculture, we can see an improvement on the accuracy for both models.

### 5.3 AgriExams Results

Scenario	RAG	ER	Preamble	Llama2-13B	Llama2-70B	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
1				47%	50%	54%	65%
2			✓	45%	48%	55%	66%
3		✓	✓	–	–	59%	70%
4	✓			48%	52%	68%	78%
5	✓		✓	48%	52%	68%	79%

Table 6: AgriExams questions results.

The results from Table 6 demonstrate the performance of Llama2-13B, Llama2-70B, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 in answering AgriExams questions under various scenarios. As observed in the previous experiments, GPT-4 consistently outperforms all other models in every scenario, with noticeable increases in performance when provided with different methods. For instance, when a preamble was introduced in Scenario 2, GPT-4’s performance increased from 65% to 66%, while Llama2-13B’s and Llama2-70B’s scores slightly decreased. Sometimes, Llama2-13B and Llama2-70B may not be as effective at utilizing the contextual information provided by the preamble as GPT-3.5 and GPT-4. The latter models have been trained on larger datasets and possess more advanced architectures, which may enable them to better understand and integrate contextual information in their responses.

The combination of Expert Refinement (ER) and a preamble in Scenario 3 further enhanced GPT-4’s score to 70%. Interestingly, the most significant improvement for GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 was observed when employing the RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation) technique in Scenarios 4 and 5, with GPT-4 achieving scores of 78% and 79%, respectively. Llama2-13B and Llama2-70B also experienced improvements in Scenarios 4 and 5, reaching scores of 48% and 52%, respectively. These findings underscore the importance of incorporating additional information and techniques, such as a preamble, ER, and RAG, to enhance the performance of large-scale language models in specialized question-answering tasks, such as those found in AgriExams.

Considering that the AgriExams questions are tailored to India’s agriculture, the models may face challenges when answering questions specific to the region. Additionally, the background material provided<sup>2</sup> is not explicitly designed for these questions, unlike the USA dataset. They are general guidelines related to Indian’s agriculture which may help to answer the questions or not depending on how they are formulated. Listing 8 shows an example of question that was not able to be responded correctly by GPT-4 model.

```

Who is the advocate of the "Marthandam" Rural Development Programme?
a) Spencer Hatch
b) Daniel Hamilton
c) A.T. Mosher
d) M.K. Gandhi

Answer: a
GPT Answer: b) M.K. Gandhi

```

Listing 8: Adapted example of incorrect answer from Agriexams dataset (GPT-4 without RAG and with preamble).

Just like the CCA-based text exams, we sampled 100 questions from the Agriexams dataset to evaluate the GPT-X performance using ER and RAG (Table 7). In this case, we used the questions from the JNKVV & RVSKVV M.Sc Entrance exam (2022)<sup>3</sup> which contains multiple choice questions related to Indian agriculture and focused only on GPT-X architectures. Besides the questions and answers we also had access to the human results for this dataset (kvv, 2022). Figure 3 presents the human scores’ cumulative distribution function (CDF) and the GPT results for versions 3.5 and 4, with and without RAG and ER. The results are also presented in Table 7 with scores, ranks and percentile for each scenario of GPT-X evaluation. For each scenario, we just compared GPT-X results to the human available scores.

Just like the previous results, we can see GPT-4 consistently outperforms GPT-3.5 across all scenarios, with noticeable improvements when provided with additional methods. In particular, GPT-4 maintains the top rank ER or RAG is introduced. Furthermore, the combination of RAG and ER in Scenario 4 led to the highest performance for both models, with GPT-3.5 reaching a 99.66% percentile and GPT-4 maintaining a top 1 rank. These findings underscore the value of

<sup>2</sup><https://www.agriexam.com/agriculture-pdf-notes><sup>3</sup><https://www.agriexam.com/jnkvv-rvskvv-m-sc-entrance-paper>




Figure 3: GPT-X results compared to human scores for JNKVV & RVSKVV M.Sc Entrance exam (2022). Rank represents the hypothetical position of GPT-X on the exam. Percentile is the CDF percentile for the hypothetical GPT-X score.

Scenario	RAG	ER	GPT-3.5			GPT-4		
			Score	Rank	Percentile	Score	Rank	Percentile
1			62%	57	97.35%	71%	6	99.72%
2		✓	65%	24	98.99%	80%	1	100%
3	✓		68%	11	99.55%	79%	1	100%
4	✓	✓	69%	8	99.66%	83%	1	100%

Table 7: RAG + ER Evaluation table (JNKVV & RVSKVV M.Sc Entrance exam (2022)).

utilizing multiple techniques, such as RAG and ER, to improve the performance of language models in domain-specific question-answering tasks like the JNKVV & RVSKVV M.Sc Entrance Exam (2022). In contrast, GPT-3.5 experienced more modest increases in accuracy across all scenarios. When both RAG and ER were applied, its accuracy reached 69%, only slightly higher than the 68% achieved when using RAG alone. These results highlight the potential benefits of employing RAG and ER techniques to enhance the performance of Large Language Models (LLMs) in specific contexts, such as the Agriexams sampled dataset. However, the effectiveness of each method may vary depending on the particular model and dataset being used.

## 6 Conclusion

This study aimed to establish a baseline for assessing the capabilities of large language models, such as LLama 2, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, in addressing complex problems in agriculture. By evaluating their performance on various datasets and question types, the study provides valuable insights into the strengths and limitations of LLMs within the agricultural domain. It also highlights the importance of leveraging AI in a responsible and effective manner, addressing challenges related to accuracy, safety, and potential biases.

The primary contributions of the paper include the establishment of performance baselines for LLMs on agriculture-related problems, enabling researchers and practitioners to compare their results with the current state of LLM performance on these problems. Furthermore, the exploration of the RAG and ER technique’s impact on LLMs demonstrates its potential in improving the performance of LLMs on region-specific questions, although GPT-4 remains superior even without using RAN and ER.

The results demonstrated that GPT-4 consistently outperforms other models across different datasets and question types, including video-based, text-based, and open-ended questions. This superior performance can be attributed to GPT-4's larger model size and more extensive training dataset, which enables it to capture complex patterns and relationships more effectively. The findings emphasize the potential of GPT-4, particularly when combined with retrieval techniques like RAG, in solving complex agriculture-related problems and answering questions accurately.

By providing a starting point for further investigation, this study hopes to foster innovation and collaboration among researchers, ultimately leading to the effective application of LLMs in agriculture. This, in turn, can contribute to the development of more efficient and sustainable farming practices, addressing critical challenges in global food security and environmental conservation. As we move forward, it is crucial to continue refining our understanding of GPT-4's capabilities and explore richer prompting strategies, alignment techniques, and metacognitive capabilities. Additionally, future research should focus on mitigating the risks associated with erroneous generations and biases while maximizing the benefits of AI integration in agriculture. Overall, this study serves as a stepping stone towards unlocking the potential of AI in agriculture, paving the way for innovative solutions, improved resource management, and more resilient agricultural systems capable of adapting to the challenges posed by climate change and growing global food demand.

## References

- Merit list of appeared candidates for pg course, 2022. URL <https://kvv.mponline.gov.in/Quick%20Links/Quick%20Links/Documents/2022/Merit%20List%20of%20Appeared%20Candidates%20for%20PG%20Course.pdf>.
- Certified Crop Adviser. Become certified: Certifications, 2022. URL <https://www.certifiedcropadviser.org/become-certified/certifications/>. Accessed: 2022-02-21.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4, 2023.
- Ranveer Chandra, Swami Manohar, Tusher Chakraborty, Jian Ding, Zerina Kapetanovic, Peeyush Kumar, and Deepak Vasisht. Democratizing data-driven agriculture using affordable hardware. *IEEE Micro*, 42(1):69–77, January 2022. URL <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/democratizing-data-driven-agriculture-using-affordable-hardware/>.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, 2019.
- Semire Dikli. An overview of automated scoring of essays. *The Journal of Technology, Learning and Assessment*, 5(1), 2006.
- Jesse Dodge, Suchin Gururangan, Dallas Card, Roy Schwartz, and Noah A Smith. Show your work: Improved reporting of experimental results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03004*, 2019.
- Embrapa. Mais500p500r, 2022. URL <https://mais500p500r.sct.embrapa.br/view/index.php>. Accessed: 2022-02-21.
- Agri Exam. Agriculture previous year question paper, 2022. URL <https://www.agriexam.com/agriculture-previous-year-question-paper>. Accessed: 2022-02-21.
- Arthur C Graesser, Peter Wiemer-Hastings, Katja Wiemer-Hastings, Derek Harter, Tutoring Research Group Tutoring Research Group, and Natalie Person. Using latent semantic analysis to evaluate the contributions of students in autotutor. *Interactive learning environments*, 8(2):129–147, 2000.
- Andreas Kamilaris and Francesc X Prenafeta-Boldú. Deep learning in agriculture: A survey. *Computers and electronics in agriculture*, 147:70–90, 2018.
- Saeed Khaki and Lizhi Wang. Crop yield prediction using deep neural networks. *Frontiers in plant science*, 10:621, 2019.
- Peeyush Kumar, Ranveer Chandra, Chetan Bansal, Shivkumar Kalyanaraman, Tanuja Ganu, and Michael Grant. Microclimate prediction-multi scale encoder-decoder based deep learning framework. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 3128–3138, 2021.
- Patrick Lewis, Yuxiang Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2020.

- Konstantinos G Liakos, Patrizia Busato, Dimitrios Moshou, Simon Pearson, and Dionysis Bochtis. Machine learning in agriculture: A review. *Sensors*, 18(8):2674, 2018.
- Jerry J. Liu. Llama-index. GitHub repository, 2022. Available at: [https://github.com/jerryjliu/llama\\_index](https://github.com/jerryjliu/llama_index).
- Microsoft. Farmvibes: Precision agriculture with ai, 2021. URL <https://github.com/microsoft/farmvibes-ai>. GitHub repository.
- Harsha Nori, Nicholas King, Scott Mayer McKinney, Dean Carignan, and Eric Horvitz. Capabilities of gpt-4 on medical challenge problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13375*, 2023.
- Desnes Nunes, Ricardo Primi, Ramon Pires, Roberto Lotufo, and Rodrigo Nogueira. Evaluating gpt-3.5 and gpt-4 models on brazilian university admission exams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17003*, 2023.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106, 2021.
- Somya Sharma, Swati Sharma, Andy Neal, Sara Malvar, Eduardo Rodrigues, John Crawford, Emre Kiciman, and Ranveer Chandra. Causal modeling of soil processes for improved generalization. In *NeurIPS 2022 Workshop Tackling Climate Change with Machine Learning*, November 2022. URL <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/causal-modeling-of-soil-processes-for-improved-generalization/>.
- Karan Singhal, Tao Tu, Juraj Gottweis, Rory Sayres, Ellery Wulczyn, Le Hou, Kevin Clark, Stephen Pfohl, Heather Cole-Lewis, Darlene Neal, Mike Schaeckermann, Amy Wang, Mohamed Amin, Sami Lachgar, Philip Mansfield, Sushant Prakash, Bradley Green, Ewa Dominowska, Blaise Aguera y Arcas, Nenad Tomasev, Yun Liu, Renee Wong, Christopher Semturs, S. Sara Mahdavi, Joelle Barral, Dale Webster, Greg S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Shekoofeh Azizi, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Towards expert-level medical question answering with large language models, 2023.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, and Others. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023.
- Deepak Vasisht, Zerina Kapetanovic, Jongho Won, Xinxin Jin, Ranveer Chandra, Sudipta Sinha, Ashish Kapoor, Madhusudhan Sudarshan, and Sean Stratman. FarmBeats: An IoT platform for data-driven agriculture. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 17)*, pages 515–529, 2017.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models, 2023.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models, 2023.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V Le. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Biao Zhao, Weiqiang Jin, Javier Del Ser, and Guang Yang. Chatagri: Exploring potentials of chatgpt on cross-linguistic agricultural text classification, 2023a.
- Mingmin Zhao, Peder Olsen, and Ranveer Chandra. Seeing through clouds in satellite images. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2023b.