

ChemDFM: Dialogue Foundation Model for Chemistry

Zihan Zhao^{1*}, Da Ma^{1*}, Lu Chen^{1,2}, Liangtai Sun¹, Zihao Li³, Hongshen Xu¹
Zichen Zhu¹, Su Zhu⁴, Shuai Fan⁴, Guodong Shen², Xin Chen² and Kai Yu^{1,2}

¹X-LANCE Lab, Department of Computer Science and Engineering

MoE Key Lab of Artificial Intelligence, SJTU AI Institute

Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

²Suzhou Laboratory, Suzhou, China

³Shanghai Key Laboratory for Molecular Engineering of Chiral Drugs

School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering

Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

⁴AI Speech Co., Ltd., Suzhou, China

{zhao_mengxin, chenlusz, kai.yu}@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have established great success in the general domain of natural language processing. Their emerging task generalization and free-form dialogue capabilities can greatly help to design Chemical General Intelligence (CGI) to assist real-world research in chemistry. However, the existence of specialized language and knowledge in the field of chemistry, such as the highly informative SMILES notation, hinders the performance of general-domain LLMs in chemistry. To this end, we develop **ChemDFM**, the first LLM towards CGI. ChemDFM-13B is trained on 34B tokens from chemical literature, textbooks, and instructions as well as various data from the general domain. Therefore, it can store, understand, and reason over chemical knowledge and languages while still possessing advanced free-form language comprehension capabilities. Extensive quantitative evaluation shows that ChemDFM can significantly outperform the representative open-sourced LLMs. Moreover, ChemDFM can also surpass GPT-4 on a great portion of chemical tasks, despite the significant size difference. Further qualitative evaluations demonstrate the efficiency and effectiveness of ChemDFM in real-world research scenarios. We will open-source the ChemDFM model soon.

1 Introduction

With the rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI), utilizing AI systems to assist chemical research has garnered increasing attention from researchers [Hatakeyama-Sato *et al.*, 2023; Boiko *et al.*, 2023]. Ideally, AI models can simultaneously handle multiple chemical tasks such as target proposing, property prediction, and reaction analysis, while

assisting chemists with real-world experiments through natural language dialogues. In this paper, we call them **Chemical General Intelligence** (CGI). To achieve CGI, models need to not only exhibit a diverse range of chemical capabilities but also possess the ability to comprehend and reason in both chemical and natural languages for achieving dialogue-based free-form collaboration with human researchers.

Traditional AI models in chemistry research [Zhou *et al.*, 2022; Edwards *et al.*, 2022; Christofidellis *et al.*, 2023; Liu *et al.*, 2023; Cao *et al.*, 2023] fall far short of the requirements for CGI. These models are either limited to some specific tasks, such as single property prediction [Zhou *et al.*, 2022; Wu *et al.*, 2023b], or lack of free-form dialogue capabilities. Meanwhile, the emerging field of large language models (LLMs) has achieved rapid and substantial progress [Touvron *et al.*, 2023a; Du *et al.*, 2022; Xu *et al.*, 2023]. Numerous studies have demonstrated the extraordinary capabilities of LLMs, encompassing robust natural language understanding and task generalization [Xu *et al.*, 2023; Wei *et al.*, 2021], deducing and reasoning [Wei *et al.*, 2022; Kojima *et al.*, 2022], and tool-using [Schick *et al.*, 2023; Bran *et al.*, 2023]. Therefore, LLMs have shown promising potential for AGI in general domains, which opens possibilities for the development of CGI.

However, different from general domains, tasks in chemical domains necessitate models to possess additional chemical comprehension capabilities for understanding and reasoning over chemical-specialized language and knowledge. Specifically, molecules play a vital part in the field of chemistry. Molecules, as structures of atoms in the 3-dimensional space, have fundamental differences from natural language in terms of information density and conveyance. Therefore, to perform chemical tasks, models need to understand molecular notations, such as SMILES, IUPAC names, and molecular formulas, and further discover the chemical nature of the corresponding molecules. Due to the lack of these capabilities, current LLMs often fall short of fulfilling the needs of chemical tasks and chemists, with a large performance gap

*Zihan Zhao and Da Ma contribute equally to this work.




Figure 1: The relation among task-specific models, general-domain LLMs, and Chemical General Intelligence and their capabilities.

compared to small models. We argue that CGI models must store and reason about both general-domain knowledge and chemical knowledge as illustrated in Figure 1.

In this work, we detail our progress toward such a CGI and propose **ChemDFM**, a Dialogue Foundation Model for Chemistry. ChemDFM takes advantage of the pre-trained LLaMa-13B model [Touvron *et al.*, 2023a] and is continuously trained on web-scale chemical data, including: 1) near 34B tokens from over 3.8M chemical papers and 1.4K textbooks and 2) over 2.7M instructions crafted from various chemical databases. With this extensive and diverse data, we specialized LLaMa with two phases: **Domain Pre-training**, where the model harvests the chemical knowledge from papers and textbooks, and **Instruction Tuning**, where the model familiarizes the chemical language and patterns, especially molecule notations. Apart from chemical data, we also incorporate a large amount of general-domain data in both phases. Therefore, ChemDFM is able to acquire chemical knowledge while maintaining comprehension and reasoning capabilities of natural language. Therefore, ChemDFM can perform free-form dialogues in the field of chemistry, thus enabling human-AI collaboration in chemical research.

To illustrate the prowess of ChemDFM, we conduct extensive experiments on two major benchmarks, ChemLLM-Bench [Guo *et al.*, 2023] and SciEval [Sun *et al.*, 2023]. The tasks encompass molecular recognition and grounding, property prediction, reaction analysis, and question-answering. Results show that ChemDFM reaches advanced performances, surpassing the typical open-sourced LLMs. It even outperforms GPT-4 on a remarkable portion of the tasks despite the notable difference in model size. We further compare the performance between ChemDFM and existing LLMs in real-world scenarios. The testing examples are constructed based on the latest chemical papers to avoid data leakage. Results show that ChemDFM has potent potential for human-AI collaboration in chemical research. To the best of our knowledge, ChemDFM is the first LLM towards CGI that possesses the ability to simultaneously handle a diverse range of tasks as well as analyze and reason over both chemical and natural languages.

2 Related Work

Since the appearance of BERT [Devlin *et al.*, 2019] and GPT [Radford *et al.*,], many works have leveraged language models in the field of chemistry to solve various chemical tasks, encompassing property prediction [Zhou *et al.*, 2022; Wu *et al.*, 2023b], molecular captioning [Edwards *et al.*, 2022; Christofidellis *et al.*, 2023], and reaction predictions in both directions [Schwaller *et al.*, 2019; Schwaller *et al.*, 2020; Toniato *et al.*, 2020]. Although small language models can generalize to various chemical tasks with task-specific fine-tuning [Zeng *et al.*, 2022; Liu *et al.*, 2023], they still suffer from poor task generalization ability and low user interactivity compared to Large Language Models (LLMs) [Du *et al.*, 2022; Touvron *et al.*, 2023a; Taylor *et al.*, 2022]. LLMs for Chemistry have become a growing focus of researchers. For example, InstructMol [Cao *et al.*, 2023] adopts Vicuna¹ to multiple chemical tasks with task-specific fine-tuning. ChemCrow [Bran *et al.*, 2023] leverages chemical tools to help LLM better solve chemical questions. However, previous works are built upon generic LLMs, lacking large-scale pre-training in the domain of chemistry. This deficiency results in the model’s lack of chemistry knowledge, making it challenging to achieve satisfactory performance. In contrast, our model, with only 13 billion parameters, has attained performance comparable to GPT-4 through chemical pre-training and instruction tuning.

Due to the extraordinary capabilities of LLMs, numerous works have made attempts to specialize generic LLMs for other different science domains. For example, MedPaLM [Singhal *et al.*, 2023] and PMC-LLaMa [Wu *et al.*, 2023a] attempt to specialize LLMs for biology and medicine domains with domain-specific instruction tuning. ChatDoctor [Li *et al.*, 2023] and DrugChat [Liang *et al.*, 2023] also specialize LLMs for medicine domains but focus specifically on medical inquiries and drug discoveries. Other domains on which LLMs have been studied include education [Dan *et al.*, 2023], materials [Xie *et al.*, 2023], and geography [Deng *et al.*, 2023]. It is worth noticing that most of the formerly mentioned works still focus on the natural language only. The domain-specific languages, such as SMILES, that may differ significantly from the natural language are often overlooked.

3 ChemDFM

In this section, we will introduce the two-stage specialization process for ChemDFM, namely Domain Pre-training (§ 3.1) and Instruction Tuning (§ 3.2). The overall training pipeline and capabilities of ChemDFM are illustrated in Figure 2².

3.1 Domain Pre-training

The web-scale data used to train general-domain LLMs usually contain knowledge covering a wide range of topics, while being relatively shallow in each. Therefore, they have successfully gained strong natural language understanding and reasoning capabilities, but often fall short when involving in-depth specialized knowledge. Hence, in the domain

¹<https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>

²<https://stability.ai/>




Figure 2: The training pipeline and supporting tasks of ChemDFM. The icons are generated by the SDXL model provided by Stability AI.

pre-training stage, we continue to pre-train the base LLM, LLaMa, on our corpus rich in chemical knowledge.

Specifically, our corpus mainly comprises the two most authoritative sources for chemical knowledge: published papers and textbooks. The published papers have undergone peer reviews and therefore can reflect cutting-edge chemical knowledge, while the textbooks represent the more widely accepted knowledge and basic principles of chemistry. In detail, we filter out published papers which are of chemical-related topics on the Internet before January 2022, as well as collect chemistry books from LibreTexts³ and Gold Books⁴. After further pre-processing and deduplication, we get 34B tokens from 3.9M chemical papers and 49M tokens from 1.4K books. To maintain the general-domain knowledge and capabilities of LLMs, we also leverage the corpora from the general domain, including Wikipedia, Arxiv, Books, StackExchange, GitHub code, WuDao Corpora [Yuan *et al.*, 2021], etc.

We continue to pre-train LLaMa-13B [Touvron *et al.*, 2023a] on our corpus with the help of Megatron-DeepSpeed⁵ framework. More details about the domain pre-training can be found in the appendix.

3.2 Instruction Tuning

The key challenge of LLMs as CGI lies in the fact that information and knowledge in the field of chemistry are not only conveyed through natural language but are also inherently embedded in the notations for molecules and reactions. In fact, the latter usually carries richer and more diverse knowledge. Therefore, during the instruction tuning stage, our goal is to familiarize ChemDFM with the languages and patterns in the field of chemistry, especially the molecule representations.

SMILES (short for Simplified Molecular-Input Line-Entry System) is one of the most popular line notations of molecules. It can translate 3-dimensional molecules into flattened sequences while retaining a significant portion of their

structures, thereby largely preserving the inherent information and knowledge embedded in the molecules. Therefore, we choose SMILES as the main representation for molecules and construct the chemical instruction tuning dataset.

Specifically, the chemical instruction tuning dataset comprises three main components.

SMILES understanding. This component mainly focuses on enabling the model to comprehend SMILES and harvest information and knowledge from SMILES. To do so, we introduce three kinds of data:

- 1. Molecule description (MD) and text-based molecule design (TBMD).** We collect all the molecules with descriptions from PubChem⁶, a web-scale chemical database that contains more than 100M compounds. Based on these SMILES-description pairs, we instruct the model to generate the description of the molecule or the molecule that fits the description. We repeat the samples whose descriptions have more than 2 sentences twice to further improve the quality of this dataset. In addition, we exclude the data that may appear in the evaluations based on SMILES matching⁷.
- 2. Molecular property prediction (MPP).** Based on the widely used molecular property prediction benchmark, Molecule Net [Wu *et al.*, 2018], we instruct the model to predict the properties of the given molecule.
- 3. Reaction completion (RC).** Reactions are crucial in terms of understanding the chemical nature of molecules and can also be represented by SMILES. We instruct the model to complete chemical reactions which are masked randomly. Reactions are sampled from USPTO [Lowe, 2012], the largest chemical reaction database.

Molecular notation alignment (MNA). Apart from SMILES, there are other widely used notations of molecules. Therefore, we instruct the model to conduct translation between them, allowing it to understand these alternative

³<https://libretexts.org/>

⁴<https://goldbook.iupac.org/>

⁵<https://github.com/microsoft/Megatron-DeepSpeed>

⁶<https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>

⁷All the data mentioned later has also undergone this process. For the sake of conciseness, we will not repeat it later.




Figure 3: An example of the final structure of instruction tuning data

Data Type	# prompts	Data Source
MD	575853	PubChem
TBMD	575853	PubChem
MPP	101753	MoleculeNet
RC	299997	USPTO
MNA	120000	PubChem
QA from datasets	131004	ARC, PIQA, SciQ, HendrycksTest
Exam questions	915162	Crawled from Internet

Table 1: The detailed composition of our instruction tuning dataset. MD: Molecule Description, TBMD: Text-Based Molecule Design, MPP: Molecular Property Prediction, RC: Reaction Completion, MNA: Molecular Notation Alignment.

notations. Specifically, we consider another two kinds of notation in this work, IUPAC names and molecular formulas.

Chemical knowledge in natural language. In real-world usage, researchers may also describe chemical knowledge using natural language. Therefore, we also include natural language question-answering data specialized in chemistry to enhance the model’s capability to process chemistry-related natural language. Specifically, the data we use can be categorized into two groups. The first group of data is coming from the existing question-answering datasets, encompassing ARC [Clark *et al.*, 2018], PIQA [Bisk *et al.*, 2020], SciQ [Welbl *et al.*, 2017], and HendrycksTest [Hendrycks *et al.*, 2021]. The second group of data is questions from the exams for middle school students. We collect open-sourced questions of middle school exams through the Internet and construct them into question-answer pairs (along with the key points or problem-solving thoughts if provided) for the instruction tuning of ChemDFM.

To diversify the instructions, we use GPT-4 to rephrase instructions for all the tasks. The number of different instructions for each task ranges from 20 to 200. Finally, to enhance the dialogue capabilities of ChemDFM, all data are constructed in the dialogue format. In summary, all the data samples can be viewed as (prompt, returns) tuples, where prompt is composed of dialogue format, instruction, and example input and returns is the expected return. A detailed example is illustrated in Figure 3.

The detailed composition of our instruction tuning dataset is illustrated in Table 1. Moreover, to maintain the advanced natural language comprehension capabilities of the model,

Model	S2I	I2S	S2MF	I2MF
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>				
STOUT	55	70	-	-
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>				
GPT-4	0	1.2	8.6	8.4
LLaMa2-13B-chat	0	0	1.0	0
Galactica-30B	0	0	0	0
ChemDFM-13B	4.0	11.0	73.0	51.0

Table 2: The Results of name prediction tasks in exact match scores. The baseline results are from Guo *et al.*[2023]. S2I: SMILES to IUPAC names translation, I2S: IUPAC names to SMILES translation, S2MF: SMILES to molecule formulas translation, I2MF: IUPAC names to molecule formulas translation.

we also leverage a comparable number of instruction-tuning data in the general domain during the instruction tuning of ChemDFM. The ratio of the data from the chemical and general domains is roughly 1:2. We mix the data of the two domains to get the final dataset and tune our pre-trained ChemDFM on it.

To fully exploit the capabilities of the pre-trained model, we employed full-parameter tuning during the instruction tuning stage. More details about the instruction tuning stage can be found in the appendix.

4 Evaluation

We evaluate ChemDFM on two benchmarks designed specifically to assess the performance of LLMs in the field of chemistry, namely ChemLLMBench [Guo *et al.*, 2023] and SciEval [Sun *et al.*, 2023].⁸ ChemLLMBench mainly focuses on the evaluation of chemical capabilities, while SciEval mainly contains science questions asked in natural language.

In this work, we mainly focus on the comparison between LLM-based generalist models to evaluate their capabilities towards CGI. Specifically, we use GPT-4⁹ and two typical open-sourced LLMs in terms of AI for science, namely LLaMa-2 [Touvron *et al.*, 2023b] and Galactica [Taylor *et al.*, 2022], as our baselines.

4.1 ChemLLMBench

ChemLLMBench is a newly proposed benchmark composed of a wide range of chemical tasks to comprehensively evaluate the understanding and reasoning abilities of LLMs in chemistry. Note that the evaluations in Guo *et al.*[2023] are conducted on 100 samples randomly sampled from their respective test sets. For the sake of comparability, our evaluations were also conducted on the same 100 samples, unless otherwise specified.¹⁰

⁸All the metrics we used below are larger-is-better unless otherwise specified.

⁹<https://openai.com/research/gpt-4>

¹⁰As the evaluations of task-specific specialist models are usually on full test sets, the performances of task-specific specialist models are listed in the tables only for references. Direct performance comparisons between them and general-domain LLMs are not fair.

Model	BLUE-2	BLUE-4	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	METEOR
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>						
MolXPT [Liu <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.594	0.505	0.660	0.511	0.597	0.626
Text+Chem T5 [Christofidellis <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.625	0.542	0.682	0.543	0.622	0.648
Mol-Instruction [Fang <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.249	0.171	0.331	0.203	0.289	0.271
InstructMol [Cao <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.475	0.371	0.566	0.394	0.502	0.509
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>						
GPT-4 (10-shot) [†]	0.464	0.365	0.545	0.362	0.459	0.519
LLaMa-2-13B-chat (10-shot) [†]	0.197	0.140	0.331	0.193	0.265	0.372
Galactica (30B) [†]	0.008	0.002	0.019	0.004	0.015	0.043
ChemDFM-13B	0.446	0.291	0.490	0.374	0.483	0.402

Table 3: The Results of molecule captioning. †: results from Guo *et al.*[2023].

Molecule Recognition

The ability to recognize molecules is essential for CGI models to perform complex chemical tasks. There are two series of tasks in ChemLLMBench that directly evaluate this capability of LLMs, name prediction and molecule captioning.

The results of the two series of tasks are reported in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively. ChemDFM outperforms the open-source LLMs by a significant margin. Specifically, in the name prediction tasks, the zero exact match scores show that other open-sourced LLMs have almost no concept of molecules. On the other hand, after specialization, ChemDFM can even outperform GPT-4 in all the name prediction tasks, despite the limited size of our model. The outstanding performance of ChemDFM proves its strong molecule recognition capability and the effectiveness of our specialization process. As for the molecule description task, ChemDFM also achieves the best performance among the open-source LLMs, while comparable to GPT-4. The results show that ChemDFM can not only recognize the molecule but also infer its underlying chemical essence and nature.

Molecular Property Prediction

The ability to infer properties of molecules is widely needed during the chemical research process. To evaluate the models’ molecular property prediction capabilities, ChemLLMBench leverages the widely used benchmark, MoleculeNet [Wu *et al.*, 2018], and chooses five typical classification tasks from it. We conduct our evaluation on the same five tasks. However, to increase the difficulty of the tasks, we utilize a more challenging dataset split provided by the DeepChem library [Ramsundar *et al.*, 2019], where the dataset is split in a scaffold-vertical manner¹¹.

The results are illustrated in Table 4. The Area Under the Curve of the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUC-ROC) metric is introduced to tackle the significant label imbalance in these tasks. In general, ChemDFM outperforms the LLMs on almost all the tasks including GPT-4. These results demonstrate that ChemDFM better establishes the capability to infer molecular properties, reflecting its enhanced

¹¹Specifically, the molecule is first grouped based on the Bemis-Murcko scaffold representation, and then the splitting makes sure that no molecule in the training set belongs to the same group as any molecule in the test set.

Model	bace	bbbp	CT	HIV	T21
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>					
Uni-Mol	85.7	72.9	91.9	80.8	79.6
MolXPT	88.4	80.0	95.3	78.1	77.1
InstructMol	85.9	64.0	-	74.0	-
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>					
GPT-4	62.5	61.5	51.6	65.9	55.2
LLaMa-2-13B-chat	26.0	60.3	45.7	29.0	51.7
Galactica (30B)	72.7	59.6	82.2	75.9	68.5
ChemDFM-13B	78.4	66.7	89.9	73.6	79.8

Table 4: The Results of molecular property prediction tasks in AUC-ROC scores. AUC-ROC stands for the Area Under the Curve of the Receiver Operating Characteristic. The results of Uni-Mol, MolXPT, InstructMol, and Galactica are from Zhou *et al.*[2022], Liu *et al.*[2023], Cao *et al.*[2023], and Taylor *et al.*[2022], respectively. Others are reproducing results. CT: ClinTox, T21: Tox21.

proWess to identify and understand the underlying chemical essence of molecules.

Text-Based Molecule Design

To evaluate the capability of making qualified molecule designs, ChemLLMBench reverses the above-mentioned molecule description tasks and asks the models to generate the molecule based on its description.

The results are shown in Table 5. ChemDFM outperforms not only the generalist LLMs but also the traditional task-specific specialist models on almost all the matrix.¹² On the one hand, the results demonstrate that our specialization process has effectively helped the LLMs to establish the relationship between the SMILES notations (which roughly represent the structures of molecules) and the chemical nature of the compound. Therefore, our model can outperform the LLMs including GPT-4, despite the notable gap in model size. On the other hand, with the help of the strong natural language comprehension capability inherited and preserved from LLaMa, ChemDFM can not only better understand the chemical information in the descriptions but also establish connections between knowledge in different tasks. There-

¹²To achieve fair comparison with task-specific specialist models, we additionally evaluate ChemDFM on the full test set. The results can be found in the appendix.

Model	Exact	BLUE	Dis (↓)	Validity	MACCS	RDK	Morgan
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>							
MolXPT [Liu <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	21.5	-	-	98.3	0.859	0.757	0.667
Text+Chem T5 [Christofidellis <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	32.2	0.853	16.87	94.3	0.901	0.816	0.757
Mol-Instruction [Fang <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.2	0.345	41.4	100	0.412	0.231	0.147
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>							
GPT-4 (10-shot) [†]	17.4	0.816	21.2	88.8	0.867	0.738	0.672
LLaMa-2-13B-chat (10-shot) [†]	2.0	0.626	34.0	78.2	0.679	0.568	0.454
Galactica (30B) [†]	0.0	0.004	2738	95.6	0.233	0.109	0.053
ChemDFM-13B	45.0	0.874	9.9	98.0	0.922	0.871	0.798

Table 5: The Results of text-based molecule design. Dis: Levenshtein distance. †: results from Guo *et al.*[2023].

Model	YP	RP	RS	Retro
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>				
Advanced Results*	96.1	93.8	-	53.6
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>				
GPT-4 [†]	<u>78.2</u>	<u>23.0</u>	45.3	<u>11.4</u>
LLaMa-2-13B-chat [†]	<u>0.7</u>	<u>3.2</u>	16.0	0.0
Galactica (30B) [†]	0.4	3.6	8.0	1.6
ChemDFM-13B	81.0	49.0	<u>23.7</u>	12.0

Table 6: The Results of reaction prediction and retrosynthesis tasks. We report the average accuracy of each task group. Please refer to the appendix for the complete results. YP: Yield Prediction, RP: Reactant Prediction, RS: Reagent Selection, Retro: Retrosynthesis. *: advanced results of different specialist models (YP: UAGNN [Kwon *et al.*, 2022], RP & Retro: Chemformer [Irwin *et al.*, 2022]) †: results from Guo *et al.*[2023].

fore, ChemDFM can build a more comprehensive knowledge system in chemistry, thereby outperforming the task-specific specialist models.

Reaction Prediction and Retrosynthesis

Chemical reaction is a key component of the chemical world. The capability to understand chemical reactions is more challenging but also necessary for chemical AGIs. In ChemLLM-Bench, there are four types of tasks targeted at evaluating models’ capabilities of reaction understanding, encompassing Yield Prediction (YP), Reaction Prediction (RP), Reagent Selection (RS), and Retrosynthesis (Retro).

The results are illustrated in Table 6. ChemDFM can significantly outperform the open-sourced LLMs. The superior performance shows that with the help of our specialization process, ChemDFM can establish the basic sense of chemical interaction between molecules while LLaMa-2 and Galactica can not. It is worth noticing that our ChemDFM can also outperform GPT-4 on most of the tasks, which indicates the significant effectiveness of our specialization process.

4.2 SciEval

SciEval is a newly proposed benchmark to evaluate the capabilities of LLMs targeted at scientific domains. Specifically, it is mainly composed of knowledge-intense questions in the fields of physics, chemistry, and biology.

The results are illustrated in Table 7. As an AGI in

Model	Bio	Chem	Phy	Avg
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>				
GPT-4	84.49	69.38	65.22	73.93
Galactica (30B)	66.48	50.16	44.65	54.96
LLaMa-2-13B-chat	<u>68.08</u>	47.90	45.47	54.33
ChemDFM-13B	67.98	<u>54.66</u>	<u>47.29</u>	<u>58.25</u>

Table 7: The Results of SciEval benchmark, where Bio, Chem, and Phy stands for biology, chemistry, and physics, respectively. The baseline results are from Sun *et al.*[2023].

the field of chemistry, ChemDFM achieves the best performance among the open-sourced LLMs in the chemistry sub-task, showing the effectiveness of our specialization process. Moreover, due to the general domain data integration in both domain pre-training and instruction tuning stages, ChemDFM can largely preserve acquired capabilities and knowledge when learning new domain-specific knowledge of chemistry. Therefore, ChemDFM can also achieve comparable or even better performances in the fields of biology and physics, thereby resulting in a better overall performance.

5 Qualitative Analysis

In addition to the chemical and natural language comprehension and reasoning abilities evaluated in Section § 4, another crucial and challenging capability for CGI is free-form human-AI collaboration in real-world scenarios. Models need to establish a universal language protocol with human researchers where both chemical language (such as SMILES) and natural language are involved. In this section, we will evaluate the performance of our model in two typical scenarios, paper reading (§ 5.1) and experimental design (§ 5.2). Notably, we randomly select chemistry papers published in 2023 and constructed most of the questions and dialogues based on their content. In this way, we get novel scenarios that are not exposed to ChemDFM in its training.

5.1 Paper Reading

During paper reading, researchers may encounter questions hindering them from fully understanding the papers. Therefore, to be a practical CGI model, ChemDFM needs to possess the capabilities to answer these questions that are often unforeseen and frequently involve new reactions or

LLMs	<p>Q1: Please briefly introduce the effect of norbornene in Catellani-type reactions.</p> <p>Q2: What is the use of NaH in the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H](C)C(C)C(C)C(H)[C@@H]2C=C1</chem> and <chem>CC(=O)C(O)C(O)C=O</chem>? [Yin <i>et al.</i>, 2023]</p> <p>Q3: I want to enhance the acidity of catalyst <chem>C=C[C@@H]1C[N@@]2C[C@@H]1[C@@H]2[C@@H]1NC(=S)NC1cc(C(F)F)F)c(C(F)F)F1c1cnc2ccc(O)cc12</chem>. How should I modify the catalyst? [Dargo <i>et al.</i>, 2023]</p>
GPT-4	<p>Norbornene plays a crucial role in Catellani-type reactions as a mediator or a template. It helps to control the ortho-alkylation and palladium steps, enabling the palladium to move from one ortho position to another. This movement allows for the selective functionalization of arenes at the ortho and ipso positions. Without norbornene, the reaction would not proceed in the desired manner, leading to different products. Therefore, norbornene is essential for the success of Catellani-type reactions.</p> <p>NaH, or Sodium Hydride, is a strong base that is often used in organic chemistry as a deprotonating agent. In the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H](C)C(C)C(C)C(H)[C@@H]2C=C1</chem> and <chem>CC(=O)C(O)C(O)C=O</chem>, NaH would likely be used to deprotonate one of the reactants, making it more nucleophilic and therefore more reactive. This would allow it to react more readily with the other reactant, facilitating the overall reaction.</p> <p>To enhance the acidity of a catalyst, you can introduce more electronegative atoms or functional groups that can donate protons. In your case, you can consider the following modifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce more sulfonic acid groups (-SO₃H)[...] 2. Add more halogen atoms [...] 3. Introduce carbonylic acid groups (-COOH)[...] 4. Introduce phosphoric acid groups (-PO₃H₂)[...] <p>Remember, the modification should not affect the catalyst's ability to catalyze the reaction. It's always a good idea to consult with a chemist or a chemical engineer before making any modifications to a catalyst.</p>
Galactica-30B	<p>The norbornene is used to generate a 7-membered palladacycle. The norbornene is not a substrate in the reaction, but rather a reagent that is used to generate the catalyst. The norbornene is not consumed in the reaction, and is not a product.</p> <p>The use of S_{ee}[NaH]S is to deprotonate the carboxylic acid. The resulting carboxylate is a better leaving group than the carboxylic acid.</p> <p>The catalyst you have is a [Bromsted acid](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bronsted_acid). The acidity of the catalyst is determined by the strength of the conjugate base. The stronger the conjugate base, the stronger the acid. The conjugate base of your catalyst is the carbon on the nitrogen. The stronger the carbon, the stronger the acid. The carbon is stabilized by the adjacent double bond. The more electron-withdrawing the double bond, the stronger the acid. The double bond is conjugated with the nitrogen lone pair. The more electron-withdrawing the nitrogen lone pair, the stronger the acid. The nitrogen lone pair is stabilized by the adjacent double bond.</p>
LLaMa-2-7B-chat	<p>[...]</p> <p>In general, norbornene acts as a "cage" around the reacting molecules, facilitating their interaction and promoting the formation of the desired products. The cyclic structure of norbornene also allows for the formation of complexes with the reacting molecules, which can enhance the reaction rate and selectivity.</p> <p>The specific effects of norbornene in Catellani-type reactions can vary depending on the reaction conditions and the nature of the reacting molecules. However, some common effects include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhanced reaction rate: [...] 2. Improved selectivity: [...] 3. Increased yield: [...] 4. Control over product distribution: [...] <p>[...]</p> <p>NaH is used as a reducing agent in the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H](C)C(C)C(C)C(H)[C@@H]2C=C1</chem> and <chem>CC(=O)C(O)C(O)C=O</chem>. The reaction is a conjugate addition of the alkene <chem>O=C1C@H](C)C(C)C(C)C(H)[C@@H]2C=C1</chem> to the alkylnyl <chem>CC(=O)C(O)C(O)C=O</chem>.</p> <p>The NaH acts as a reducing agent by donating a pair of electrons to the carbon-carbon triple bond of the alkylnyl group, reducing it to a carbon-carbon double bond. This process is known as hydrogenation. The resulting double bond is then attacked by the alkene <chem>O=C1C@H](C)C(C)C(C)C(H)[C@@H]2C=C1</chem>, leading to the formation of a new carbon-carbon single bond.</p> <p>The use of NaH as a reducing agent in this reaction is advantageous because it allows for the formation of a stable, saturated product, which is important for many organic synthesis reactions. Additionally, NaH is a mild reducing agent, which means that it can reduce the alkylnyl group without causing unwanted side reactions or over-reduction of the alkene. [...]</p> <p>The catalyst you provided is a complex molecule with multiple functional groups, and enhancing its acidity may require careful modification. Here are some strategies that may help:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction of acidic functional groups [...] 2. Substitution with acidic groups [...] 3. Increase the number of acidic sites [...] 4. Use of acidic additives [...] 5. Modification of the support [...] <p>It is important to note that modifying the catalyst to enhance its acidity can also affect its other properties, such as its stability and selectivity. Therefore, it is important to carefully optimize the modification of the catalyst to achieve the desired balance of properties. Additionally, the optimal modification of the catalyst may depend on the specific reaction conditions and the substrate being used, so it may be necessary to perform experiments under different conditions to find the best modification strategy.</p>
ChemDFM-13B	<p>Norbornene is a key component in Catellani-type reactions, which are a class of palladium-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions that allow for the efficient formation of carbon-carbon bonds. In these reactions, norbornene serves as a transient directing group, which helps to control the regioselectivity of the reaction and enables the formation of challenging cross-coupled products that are difficult to access using traditional cross-coupling methods. Specifically, norbornene undergoes oxidative addition to a palladium(0) catalyst to form a palladium(II) complex, which can then react with an organic halide and a boronic acid or ester to form the cross-coupled product. The norbornene group is then removed from the product under acidic conditions, regenerating the palladium(0) catalyst and completing the catalytic cycle.</p> <p>The use of NaH in the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H](C)C(C)C(H)[C@@H]2C=C1</chem> and <chem>CC(=O)C(O)C(O)C=O</chem> is to deprotonate the acidic alpha-hydrogen of the keto group in <chem>CC(=O)C(O)C(O)C=O</chem>, resulting in the formation of an enolate anion. This anion can then react with the enol group of <chem>O=C1C@H](C)C(C)C(H)[C@@H]2C=C1</chem> to form a new C-C bond and produce the product.</p> <p>To enhance the acidity of the catalyst, you could consider introducing electron-withdrawing groups on the aromatic ring of the <chem>[C@@H]1NC(=S)NC1cc(C(F)F)F)c1c1cnc2ccc(O)cc12</chem> moiety. This could draw electron density away from the amino group and increase its acidity. Some examples of such groups could be fluoro, chloro, or bromo substituents. However, it is important to note that the introduction of these groups could also affect the binding affinity of the catalyst to its target, so careful optimization would be required.</p>

Figure 4: The examples of paper reading scenario. We mark correct and relevant information in the replies in green, the correct but irrelevant information in yellow, and the wrong information in red. In addition, the key points of the answer are marked in bold if they appear in the reply. Due to space constraints, some content has been omitted ([...] in the paragraphs). Please refer to the appendix to find the full replies.

Round 1

I aim to protect the carbonyl group located on the six-membered ring while selectively ONLY oxidizing the carbonyl group in the five-membered ring within the molecule CC1(C)C2C(C)C(C)C3C4=O(C)C4)C2C3=O(C)C1. How can I achieve this?

To achieve selective oxidation of the carbonyl group in the five-membered ring within the molecule CC1(C)C2C(C)C(C)C3C4=O(C)C4)C2C3=O(C)C1, you can use an oxidizing agent such as DDQ (2,3-dichloro-5,6-dicyano-1,4-benzoquinone) in the presence of a catalyst such as cerium ammonium nitrate (CAN). This will selectively oxidize the carbonyl group in the five-membered ring to the corresponding enone, while leaving the carbonyl group in the six-membered ring unaffected.

Round 2

The selective oxidation has not been achieved, and the carbonyl group on the six-member ring has been oxidized. What should I do to prevent oxidation of the carbonyl group on the six-member ring?

To prevent oxidation of the carbonyl group on the six-membered ring, you can try using a less powerful oxidizing agent or adjust the reaction conditions to be less oxidizing. For example, you could try using a weaker oxidizing agent such as tert-butyl hydroperoxide (TBHP) or a catalytic amount of oxidant such as molecular oxygen with a catalyst such as copper. Additionally, you could try adjusting the reaction temperature or solvent to be less oxidizing. It may also be helpful to perform the reaction in the presence of a protecting group on the carbonyl group in the six-membered ring to prevent its oxidation.

Round 3

Using a protecting group sounds like a good idea. What reactant should I use to protect the carbonyl group on the six-membered ring to prevent its oxidation? Please give me a typical example.

To protect the carbonyl group on the six-membered ring, you can use a protecting group such as a ketal or a methyl group. A typical example of a protecting group for a carbonyl group is a ketal, which is a cyclic acetal formed by reaction of a carbonyl compound with a diol. For example, you could protect the carbonyl group in the six-membered ring of CC1(C)C2C(C)C3C4=O(C)C4)C2C3=O(C)C1 by forming a ketal with a diol such as ethylene glycol. This would prevent the carbonyl group from being oxidized while still allowing the oxidation of the carbonyl group in the five-membered ring to proceed.

Figure 5: The example showing the potential of ChemDFM to assist researchers in experimental design through dialogue-based human-AI collaboration. We highlight the key points in bold.

molecules. In this section, we evaluate ChemDFM's performance in the paper reading scenario and compare it with other typical LLMs. Figure 4 lists the typical examples and corresponding results. More examples are listed in the appendix.

The results show that while open-sourced LLMs perform well when asked about existing knowledge (Q1), only ChemDFM can provide correct and comprehensive answers when questions involve new molecules and reactions (Q2 [Yin *et al.*, 2023] & Q3 [Dargo *et al.*, 2023]). Specifically, LLaMa-2 and Galactica primarily rely on retrieving knowledge from memory, resulting in numerous correct knowledge points but irrelevant or even unusable under the situations of the questions. In contrast, ChemDFM can apply its acquired chemical knowledge to identify and comprehend unknown molecules and reactions, thereby solv-

ing researchers' problems. Moreover, apart from answering the key point, ChemDFM will also attempt to elaborate on the mechanism of the asked reactions or proposed solutions, making its answers more detailed but occasionally leading to errors. We also test the same questions on GPT-4. Results indicate that GPT-4 has the capability to integrate memory-based knowledge with real-world scenarios. However, it still performed poorly in Q3 compared with ChemDFM, showcasing the strong real-world problem-solving capabilities of ChemDFM. Please refer to the appendix to find the detailed analysis of each question.

5.2 Experimental design

Experiments are the fundamental component of chemical research. The capability to assist chemists during experiments is indispensable for a CGI. In this section, we use one unexposed example inspired by Yin *et al.*[2023] to demonstrate ChemDFM's potential to assist researchers in experimental design through dialogue-based human-AI collaboration. More examples can be found in the appendix.

The collaboration process is illustrated in Figure 5. During the dialogue, the researcher wants to selectively oxidize one of the two carbonyl groups of a molecule. However, the initial solution given by ChemDFM results in both carbonyl groups being oxidized. Through the correction given by the researcher, ChemDFM adjusts its proposal and provides two possible solutions. Finally, the researcher chooses to use protecting groups and ChemDFM further details its advice.

In the process, ChemDFM shows promising capabilities regarding error correction (Round 2) and detailing (Round 3). This dialogue demonstrates the great prowess of ChemDFM to comprehend both natural language and chemical language. Through this prowess, ChemDFM can establish the universal language protocol with human researchers to achieve meaningful human-AI collaboration.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce ChemDFM, a pioneer attempt towards Chemical General Intelligence (CGI). Through domain pre-training and instruction tuning, ChemDFM has established strong comprehension and reasoning capabilities for chemical knowledge and patterns, leading to advanced performance in chemical tasks such as molecular design, reaction analysis, and knowledge-intense question-answering. Besides, ChemDFM also possesses strong abilities in comprehending both chemical and natural languages, which enables it to assist researchers in real-world scenarios through dialogue-based free-form human-AI collaboration. We will open-source the ChemDFM model and encourage researchers from both AI and chemistry communities to explore it.

As the primary attempt towards CGI, ChemDFM has much room for improvement. For example, considering that there are various informative modalities in chemistry, such as molecular graphs and spectroscopies, we believe multimodalities are necessary for CGI. In addition, tool-using methods are also worth exploring, as they can significantly improve the reliability of LLMs. We leave these as future work.

References

- [Ahneman *et al.*, 2018] Derek T Ahneman, Jesús G Estrada, Shishi Lin, Spencer D Dreher, and Abigail G Doyle. Predicting reaction performance in c–n cross-coupling using machine learning. *Science*, 360(6385):186–190, 2018.
- [Bisk *et al.*, 2020] Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439, 2020.
- [Boiko *et al.*, 2023] Daniil A Boiko, Robert MacKnight, Ben Kline, and Gabe Gomes. Autonomous chemical research with large language models. *Nature*, 624(7992):570–578, 2023.
- [Bran *et al.*, 2023] Andres M Bran, Sam Cox, Oliver Schilter, Carlo Baldassari, Andrew D White, and Philippe Schwaller. Chemcrow: Augmenting large-language models with chemistry tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05376*, 2023.
- [Cao *et al.*, 2023] He Cao, Zijing Liu, Xingyu Lu, Yuan Yao, and Yu Li. Instructmol: Multi-modal integration for building a versatile and reliable molecular assistant in drug discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16208*, 2023.
- [Catellani *et al.*, 1997] Marta Catellani, Franco Frignani, and Armando Rangoni. A complex catalytic cycle leading to a regioselective synthesis of o, o'-disubstituted vinylarenes. *ChemInform*, 28(16), 1997.
- [Christofidellis *et al.*, 2023] Dimitrios Christofidellis, Giorgio Giannone, Jannis Born, Ole Winther, Teodoro Laino, and Matteo Manica. Unifying molecular and textual representations via multi-task language modelling. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [Clark *et al.*, 2018] Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.
- [Dan *et al.*, 2023] Yuhao Dan, Zhikai Lei, Yiyang Gu, Yong Li, Jianghao Yin, Jiaju Lin, Linhao Ye, Zhiyan Tie, Yougen Zhou, Yilei Wang, Aimin Zhou, Ze Zhou, Qin Chen, Jie Zhou, Liang He, and Xipeng Qiu. Educhat: A large-scale language model-based chatbot system for intelligent education. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02773*, 2023.
- [Dargo *et al.*, 2023] Gyula Dargo, David Kis, Martin Gede, Sushil Kumar, Jozsef Kupai, and Gyorgy Szekely. Mesesamol, a bio-based and versatile polar aprotic solvent for organic synthesis and depolymerization. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, page 144365, 2023.
- [Deng *et al.*, 2023] Cheng Deng, Tianhang Zhang, Zhongmou He, Yi Xu, Qiyuan Chen, Yuanyuan Shi, Luoyi Fu, Weinan Zhang, Xinbing Wang, Chenghu Zhou, Zhouhan Lin, and Junxian He. K2: A foundation language model for geoscience knowledge understanding and utilization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05064*, 2023.
- [Dess and Martin, 1983] DB Dess and JC Martin. Readily accessible 12-i-5 oxidant for the conversion of primary and secondary alcohols to aldehydes and ketones. *The Journal of Organic Chemistry*, 48(22):4155–4156, 1983.
- [Devlin *et al.*, 2019] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the NAACL*, 2019.
- [Du *et al.*, 2022] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. GLM: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. In *Proceedings of the ACL*, 2022.
- [Edwards *et al.*, 2021] Carl Edwards, ChengXiang Zhai, and Heng Ji. Text2Mol: Cross-modal molecule retrieval with natural language queries. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021.
- [Edwards *et al.*, 2022] Carl Edwards, Tuan Lai, Kevin Ros, Garrett Honke, Kyunghyun Cho, and Heng Ji. Translation between molecules and natural language. In *Proceedings of the EMNLP*, 2022.
- [Fang *et al.*, 2023] Yin Fang, Xiaozhuan Liang, Ningyu Zhang, Kangwei Liu, Rui Huang, Zhuo Chen, Xiaohui Fan, and Huajun Chen. Mol-instructions: A large-scale biomolecular instruction dataset for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08018*, 2023.
- [Guo *et al.*, 2023] Taicheng Guo, Kehan Guo, Bozhao Nan, Zhenwen Liang, Zhichun Guo, Nitesh V. Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xiangliang Zhang. What can large language models do in chemistry? a comprehensive benchmark on eight tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18365*, 2023.
- [Hao *et al.*, 2023] Yu Hao, Zi-Hao Li, Zhi-Gang Ma, Ru-Xin Liu, Rui-Tian Ge, Quan-Zhe Li, Tong-Mei Ding, and Shu-Yu Zhang. Axially chiral styrene-based

- organocatalysts and their application in asymmetric cascade michael/cyclization reaction. *Chemical Science*, 14(35):9496–9502, 2023.
- [Hatakeyama-Sato *et al.*, 2023] Kan Hatakeyama-Sato, Naoki Yamane, Yasuhiko Igarashi, Yuta Nabaie, and Teruaki Hayakawa. Prompt engineering of gpt-4 for chemical research: what can/cannot be done? *Science and Technology of Advanced Materials: Methods*, (1):2260300, 2023.
- [Hendrycks *et al.*, 2021] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *ICLR*, 2021.
- [Irwin *et al.*, 2022] Ross Irwin, Spyridon Dimitriadis, Jiazhen He, and Esben Jannik Bjerrum. Chemformer: a pre-trained transformer for computational chemistry. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 3(1):015022, 2022.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2017] Wengong Jin, Connor Coley, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. Predicting organic reaction outcomes with weisfeiler-lehman network. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [Kloetzel, 1948] Milton C Kloetzel. The diels-alder reactions with maleic anhydride. *Org React*, 4:1–59, 1948.
- [Kojima *et al.*, 2022] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *NeurIPS*, 35:22199–22213, 2022.
- [Kwon *et al.*, 2022] Youngchun Kwon, Dongseon Lee, Youn-Suk Choi, and Seokho Kang. Uncertainty-aware prediction of chemical reaction yields with graph neural networks. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 14:1–10, 2022.
- [Li *et al.*, 2023] Yunxiang Li, Zihan Li, Kai Zhang, Ruilong Dan, Steve Jiang, and You Zhang. Chatdoctor: A medical chat model fine-tuned on a large language model meta-ai (llama) using medical domain knowledge. *Cureus*, 15(6), 2023.
- [Liang *et al.*, 2023] Youwei Liang, Ruiyi Zhang, Li Zhang, and Pengtao Xie. Drugchat: Towards enabling chatgpt-like capabilities on drug molecule graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03907*, 2023.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023] Zequn Liu, Wei Zhang, Yingce Xia, Lijun Wu, Shufang Xie, Tao Qin, Ming Zhang, and Tie-Yan Liu. MolXPT: Wrapping molecules with text for generative pre-training. In *Proceedings of the ACL*, 2023.
- [Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [Lowe, 2012] Daniel Mark Lowe. *Extraction of chemical structures and reactions from the literature*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2012.
- [Morgan, 1965] H. L. Morgan. The generation of a unique machine description for chemical structures—a technique developed at chemical abstracts service. *Journal of Chemical Documentation*, 5(2):107–113, 1965.
- [Perera *et al.*, 2018] Damith Perera, Joseph W Tucker, Shalini Brahmabhatt, Christopher J Helal, Ashley Chong, William Farrell, Paul Richardson, and Neal W Sach. A platform for automated nanomole-scale reaction screening and micromole-scale synthesis in flow. *Science*, 359(6374):429–434, 2018.
- [Radford *et al.*,] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.
- [Rajbhandari *et al.*, 2020] Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, SC '20. IEEE Press, 2020.
- [Ramsundar *et al.*, 2019] Bharath Ramsundar, Peter Eastman, Patrick Walters, Vijay Pande, Karl Leswing, and Zhenqin Wu. *Deep Learning for the Life Sciences*. O'Reilly Media, 2019. <https://www.amazon.com/Deep-Learning-Life-Sciences-Microscopy/dp/1492039837>.
- [Reizman *et al.*, 2016] Brandon J Reizman, Yi-Ming Wang, Stephen L Buchwald, and Klavs F Jensen. Suzuki-miyaura cross-coupling optimization enabled by automated feedback. *Reaction chemistry & engineering*, 1(6):658–666, 2016.
- [Schick *et al.*, 2023] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04761*, 2023.
- [Schneider *et al.*, 2016] Nadine Schneider, Nikolaus Stiefl, and Gregory A Landrum. What's what: The (nearly) definitive guide to reaction role assignment. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 56(12):2336–2346, 2016.
- [Schwaller *et al.*, 2019] Philippe Schwaller, Teodoro Laino, Théophile Gaudin, Peter Bolgar, Christopher A Hunter, Costas Bekas, and Alpha A Lee. Molecular transformer: a model for uncertainty-calibrated chemical reaction prediction. *ACS central science*, 5(9):1572–1583, 2019.
- [Schwaller *et al.*, 2020] Philippe Schwaller, Riccardo Pe-traglia, Valerio Zullo, Vishnu H Nair, Rico Andreas Haeuselmann, Riccardo Pisoni, Costas Bekas, Anna Iuliano, and Teodoro Laino. Predicting retrosynthetic pathways using transformer-based models and a hyper-graph exploration strategy. *Chemical science*, 11(12):3316–3325, 2020.
- [Singhal *et al.*, 2023] Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, et al. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972):172–180, 2023.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2023] Liangtai Sun, Yang Han, Zihan Zhao, Da Ma, Zhennan Shen, Baocai Chen, Lu Chen, and Kai

- Yu. Scieval: A multi-level large language model evaluation benchmark for scientific research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.13149*, 2023.
- [Tanimoto, 1958] Taffee T Tanimoto. Elementary mathematical theory of classification and prediction. *Journal of Biomedical Science and Engineering*, 1958.
- [Taylor *et al.*, 2022] Ross Taylor, Marcin Kardas, Guillem Cucurull, Thomas Scialom, Anthony Hartshorn, Elvis Saravia, Andrew Poulton, Viktor Kerkez, and Robert Stojnic. Galactica: A large language model for science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09085*, 2022.
- [Toniato *et al.*, 2020] Alessandra Toniato, Philippe Schwaller, Antonio Cardinale, Joppe Geluykens, and Teodoro Laino. Unassisted noise reduction of chemical reaction datasets. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3:485–494, 2020.
- [Touvron *et al.*, 2023a] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [Touvron *et al.*, 2023b] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [und David Metzener, 1988] John W. Ratcliff und David Metzener. Pattern matching: The gestalt approach. *Dr. Dobb's Journal*, 1988.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2023] Ai-Fang Wang, Jin-Miao Tian, Xiao-Jing Zhao, Zi-Hao Li, Ye Zhang, Ka Lu, Hong Wang, Shu-Yu Zhang, Yong-Qiang Tu, Tong-Mei Ding, et al. Asymmetric intramolecular hydroalkylation of internal olefin with cycloalkane to directly access polycyclic systems. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 62(39):e202308858, 2023.
- [Wei *et al.*, 2021] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *ICLR*, 2021.
- [Wei *et al.*, 2022] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *NeurIPS*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [Welbl *et al.*, 2017] Johannes Welbl, Nelson F Liu, and Matt Gardner. Crowdsourcing multiple choice science questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06209*, 2017.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2018] Zhenqin Wu, Bharath Ramsundar, Evan N Feinberg, Joseph Gomes, Caleb Geniesse, Aneesh S Pappu, Karl Leswing, and Vijay Pande. Moleculenet: a benchmark for molecular machine learning. *Chemical science*, 9(2):513–530, 2018.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2023a] Chaoyi Wu, Weixiong Lin, Xiaoman Zhang, Ya Zhang, Yanfeng Wang, and Weidi Xie. Pmc-llama: Towards building open-source language models for medicine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14454*, 2023.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2023b] Fang Wu, Dragomir Radev, and Stan Z Li. Molformer: Motif-based transformer on 3d heterogeneous molecular graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI*, volume 37, pages 5312–5320, 2023.
- [Xie *et al.*, 2023] Tong Xie, Yuwei Wan, Wei Huang, Zhenyu Yin, Yixuan Liu, Shaozhou Wang, Qingyuan Linghu, Chunyu Kit, Clara Grazian, Wenjie Zhang, Imran Razzak, and Bram Hoex. Darwin series: Domain specific large language models for natural science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.13565*, 2023.
- [Xu *et al.*, 2023] Canwen Xu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, and Julian McAuley. Baize: An open-source chat model with parameter-efficient tuning on self-chat data. In *Proceedings of the EMNLP*, 2023.
- [Yao *et al.*, 2023] Zhewei Yao, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Olatunji Ruwase, Samyam Rajbhandari, Xiaoxia Wu, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jeff Rasley, Minjia Zhang, Conglong Li, Connor Holmes, Zhongzhu Zhou, Michael Wyatt, Molly Smith, Lev Kurilenko, Heyang Qin, Masahiro Tanaka, Shuai Che, Shuaiwen Leon Song, and Yuxiong He. DeepSpeed-Chat: Easy, Fast and Affordable RLHF Training of ChatGPT-like Models at All Scales. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01320*, 2023.
- [Yin *et al.*, 2023] Jun-Jie Yin, Yun-Peng Wang, Jun Xue, Feng-Fan Zhou, Xing-Qian Shan, Rong Zhu, Kun Fang, Lei Shi, Shu-Yu Zhang, Si-Hua Hou, et al. Total syntheses of polycyclic diterpenes phomopsene, methyl phomopsenone, and iso-phomopsene via reorganization of c–c single bonds. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 145(39):21170–21175, 2023.
- [Yuan *et al.*, 2021] Sha Yuan, Hanyu Zhao, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Xiao Liu, Yukuo Cen, Xu Zou, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Wudaocorpora: A super large-scale chinese corpora for pre-training language models. *AI Open*, 2:65–68, 2021.
- [Zeng *et al.*, 2022] Zheni Zeng, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. A deep-learning system bridging molecule structure and biomedical text with comprehension comparable to human professionals. *Nature communications*, 13(1):862, 2022.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2022] Gengmo Zhou, Zhifeng Gao, Qiankun Ding, Hang Zheng, Hongteng Xu, Zhewei Wei, Linfeng Zhang, and Guolin Ke. Uni-mol: A universal 3d molecular representation learning framework. In *ICLR*, 2022.
- [Zhuang *et al.*, 2023] Qing-Bo Zhuang, Jin-Rui Tian, Ka Lu, Xiao-Ming Zhang, Fu-Min Zhang, Yong-Qiang Tu, Rong Fan, Zhi-Hao Li, and Yu-Dong Zhang. Catalytic asymmetric polycyclization of tertiary enamides with silyl enol ethers: Total synthesis of (-)-cephalocyclidin a. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 145(49):26550–26556, 2023.

A Experimental Setups

A.1 Domain Pre-training

ChemDFM is pre-trained using the popular framework with Zero-2 [Rajbhandari *et al.*, 2020] optimization technique based on LLaMa-13B [Touvron *et al.*, 2023a]. We train ChemDFM using AdamW [Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019] with $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (0.9, 0.95)$. During training, our model deals with 4M tokens per batch with a maximum sequence length of 6K. The maximum learning rate is 5e-5 under the cosine learning rate scheduler.

A.2 Instruction Tuning

To fully exploit the capabilities of the pre-trained model, we employed full-parameter tuning during the instruction tuning stage. The popular framework DeepSpeed-Chat [Yao *et al.*, 2023] is leveraged with the Zero-3 optimization technique. We set the learning rate to 1e-5 with a global batch size of 256. To encourage the model to focus more on responding to the requires rather than memorizing the patterns in prompts, we performed gradient back-propagation only on the tokens of the returns. Specifically, the loss function of our instruction tuning is

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log P(r_j | \text{prompt}_i, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{j-1}),$$

where $|\mathcal{D}|$ is the size of the instruction tuning dataset and $\text{returns}_i = (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{n_i})$. We train ChemDFM using AdamW with $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (0.9, 0.95)$ and a cosine learning rate scheduler.

B Details about ChemLLMBench Evaluations

B.1 Molecule Recognition

Task Introduction

The name prediction tasks take advantage of the different notations of molecules, including SMILES, IUPAC name, and molecular formula, and ask the models to translate between them. Specifically, it consists of four tasks: SMILES to IUPAC name translation (S2I), IUPAC name to SMILES translation (I2S), SMILES to Molecular Formula translation (S2MF), and IUPAC name to Molecular Formula translation (I2MF). Exact match scores are utilized to measure the performances of these tasks.

The Molecule Captioning tasks further require the LLMs to not only recognize what the molecule given by SMILES is but also understand the basic chemical nature of the molecule so as to generate a brief description of it. Specifically, ChemLLMBench leverages the test set of ChEBI-20 [Edwards *et al.*, 2021] for this task. To measure the performance of this task, ChemLLMBench utilizes a series of traditional captioning metrics, including BLUE, ROUGE, and METEOR.

Prompt Format

For the name prediction tasks, we use a simpler prompt compared with that introduced in Guo *et al.*[2023]. An example is shown in Figure 6

For the molecule captioning task, we use the same prompt introduced in Guo *et al.*[2023].




Figure 6: The prompt format of the name prediction tasks

B.2 Molecular Property Prediction

Task Introduction

The molecular property prediction tasks in ChemLLMBench consist of five tasks from MoleculeNet benchmark [Wu *et al.*, 2018], including BACE, BBBP, HIV, ClinTox, and Tox21. Among them, BACE and BBBP are each a balanced binary classification task. HIV is an unbalanced binary classification task. ClinTox and Tox21 comprise two and twenty-one unbalanced binary classification tasks, respectively.

Prompt Format

We use the same prompts introduced in Guo *et al.*[2023].

Additional Results

During evaluation, we leverage a popular and more challenging dataset split provided by DeepChem library [Ramsundar *et al.*, 2019]. We reproduce the results of the baseline models, including GPT-4, LLaMa-2-13B-chat, and Galactica (30B). Apart from the results in Section 4.1, we also conduct few-shot experiments. The results are shown in Table 8. It is worth noticing that the performances under the few-shot setting are not always better than those under the zero-shot setting. That may be a result of the scaffold-vertical dataset split we use in our experiments. Because under the scaffold-vertical setting, the exemplars provided by the training split may be less helpful for the test samples.

B.3 Text-Based Molecule Design

Task Introduction

The test set of ChEBI-20 is also exploited for this task in ChemLLMBench. Models are asked to predict the SMILES of the molecule that fits the given description. Two kinds of metrics are utilized to measure the performance of this task. The first set of metrics measures the text-based similarity of the predicted SMILES compared to the golden SMILES, which includes exact match, BLUE, and Levenshtein distance. The second set of metrics measures the chemical similarity of the predicted molecules compared to the golden molecules. That is mainly composed of the validity of the predicted SMILES and the FTS (fingerprint Tanimoto Similarity) [Tanimoto, 1958] in terms of MACCS [und David Metzner, 1988], RDK¹³, Morgan [Morgan, 1965].

Prompt Format

We use the same prompt introduced in Guo *et al.*[2023].

Additional Results

To achieve a fair comparison with task-specific specialist models, we evaluate the performance of ChemDFM on the

¹³<https://www.rdkit.org/>

Model	BACE	BBBP	ClinTox	HIV	Tox21
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>					
GPT-4 (0-shot) [†]	62.5	61.5	51.6	65.9	55.2
GPT-4 (8-shot) [†]	45.9	61.8	59.3	50.8	60.6
LLaMa-2-13B-chat (0-shot) [†]	26.0	60.3	45.7	29.0	51.7
LLaMa-2-13B-chat (8-shot) [†]	72.9	52.3	42.1	70.8	45.9
Galactica (30B) [Taylor <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	72.7	59.6	82.2	75.9	68.5
ChemDFM-13B (0-shot)	<u>78.4</u>	<u>66.7</u>	89.9	<u>73.6</u>	79.8
ChemDFM-13B (8-shot)	81.7	67.9	<u>85.3</u>	73.3	<u>76.7</u>

Table 8: The Results of molecular property prediction tasks in AUC-ROC scores. AUC-ROC stands for the Area Under the Curve of the Receiver Operating Characteristic. †reproducing results.

Model	Exact	BLUE	Dis (↓)	Validity	MACCS	RDKit	Morgan
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>							
MolXPT [Liu <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	21.5	-	-	98.3	0.859	0.757	0.667
Text+Chem T5 [Christofidellis <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	32.2	0.853	16.87	94.3	0.901	0.816	0.757
Mol-Instruction [Fang <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.2	0.345	41.4	100	0.412	0.231	0.147
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>							
Galactica (30B) (10-shot) [†]	0.3	0.295	64.3	82.2	0.356	0.239	0.186
ChemDFM-13B	43.2	0.839	16.9	97.6	0.901	0.829	0.759

Table 9: The results of the full test set of text-based molecule design. We highlight the best results among specialist and generalist models, respectively, in bold. Dis: Levenshtein distance. †: reproducing results.

full test set of ChEBI-20 on this task. The results are illustrated in Table 9. ChemDFM surpasses the performance of the advanced specialist models on the major metrics while achieving comparable performance on others. Specifically, ChemDFM outperforms the specialist models on exact match scores and all three FTS-based similarity scores, which indicates that ChemDFM can make more reliable predictions based on the descriptions compared with specialist models.

B.4 Reaction Prediction and Retrosynthesis

Task Introduction

In ChemLLMBench, there are four types of tasks targeted at evaluating models’ capabilities of reaction understanding. The yield prediction tasks ask models to predict whether the given reaction is a high-yield reaction and are constructed based on two High-Throughput experimentation (HTE) datasets: the Buchwald-Hartwig dataset [Ahneman *et al.*, 2018] and the Suzuki-Miyaura dataset [Reizman *et al.*, 2016]. The reaction prediction task asks the model to predict the product of the given reaction. ChemLLMBench utilizes the USPTO-MIT dataset [Jin *et al.*, 2017] for this task. The reagent selection tasks focus on selecting the reagent that can maximize the yield of the reaction from a list of candidates. ChemLLMBench constructs three reagent selection tasks based on the dataset proposed by Perera *et al.*[2018]. The retrosynthesis task focuses on predicting the reactants of the given reactions and is constructed based on the USPTO-50K dataset [Schneider *et al.*, 2016]. Accuracy is utilized to measure the performances except for the ligand selection task which uses top 50% accuracy.

Model	B-H	Suzuki
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>		
UAGNN [Kwon <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	96.5	95.7
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>		
GPT-4 [†]	<u>80.0</u>	<u>76.4</u>
LLaMa-2-13B-chat [†]	0.8	0.6
Galactica (30B) [†]	0.0	0.8
ChemDFM-13B	82.7	79.3

Table 10: The Results of the yield prediction tasks. B-H and Suzuki stand for the Buchwald-Hartwig dataset and the Suzuki-Miyaura dataset, respectively. We report the result in accuracy scores. †denote the results from Guo *et al.*[2023].

Prompt Format

We reformat the prompt provided by Guo *et al.*[2023] using the SMILES notations for reactions. Specifically, the examples of our prompts are illustrated in Figure 7.

Additional Results

The complete results for the yield prediction tasks, the reaction prediction task, the reagent selection tasks, and the retrosynthesis tasks are shown in Table 10, Table 11, Table 12, and Table 13, respectively.

C More Qualitative Analysis

C.1 Paper Reading

We first test the models with questions that only involve known knowledge (Figure 8).

Q-A1 (Q1) is an example of knowledge-intensive questions. Models only need to memorize the details and mechanisms of




Figure 7: The prompt format of the reaction prediction and retrosynthesis tasks

LLMs	Q-A1 (Q1): Please briefly introduce the effect of norbornene in Catellani-type reactions.	Q-A2: What is the regioselectivity of Diels-Alder reaction?	Q-A3: What is Dess-Martin periodinane used for?
GPT-4	Norbornene plays a crucial role in Catellani-type reactions as a mediator or a template. It helps to control the ortho-alkylation and palladation steps, enabling the palladium to move from one ortho position to another. This movement allows for the selective functionalization of arenes at the ortho and ipso positions. Without norbornene, the reaction would not proceed in the desired manner, leading to different products. Therefore, norbornene is essential for the success of Catellani-type reactions.	Regioselectivity in the Diels-Alder reaction refers to the preference for formation of one constitutional isomer over another. It is determined by the relative stability of the transition state leading to the different products. The reaction is typically controlled by the electronic and steric properties of the diene and dienophile. The most common outcome is the formation of a product where electron-rich areas of the diene interact with electron-poor areas of the dienophile. This is often referred to as the "normal electron demand" Diels-Alder reaction.	Dess-Martin periodinane is a chemical reagent used primarily for the oxidation of primary and secondary alcohols to aldehydes and ketones, respectively. It is popular in organic chemistry due to its high selectivity, mildness, and ease of use.
Gauche-30B	The norbornene is used to generate a 7-membered palladacycle. The norbornene is not a substrate in the reaction, but rather a reagent that is used to generate the catalyst. The norbornene is not consumed in the reaction, and is not a product.	The regioselectivity of the Diels-Alder reaction is determined by the stability of the diene and the dienophile. The diene is usually the more stable of the two.	Dess-Martin periodinane is used to oxidize alcohols to aldehydes or ketones. It is also used to oxidize primary alcohols to carboxylic acids.
LLaMa-2, Flan-t5	Norbornene is a cyclic molecule that has been widely used as a catalyst in Catellani-type reactions. The presence of norbornene in these reactions has been found to have a significant effect on the reaction mechanism and the final product distribution.	The regioselectivity of the Diels-Alder reaction is a critical aspect of the reaction, as it determines which carbon atoms of the diene participate in the reaction and which ones remain unreacted. The regioselectivity of the Diels-Alder reaction is influenced by several factors, including the type of diene and the type of dienophile used, as well as the reaction conditions.	Dess-Martin periodinane (DMP) is a highly effective and versatile reagent used in organic synthesis for the oxidation of various functional groups. It is a combination of periodinane (H2C=CH-O-O-H) and 4-dimethylaminopyridine (DMAP), which enhances the reactivity of the periodinane moiety. DMP is commonly used for the following reactions:
ChemBuddy, DB	In general, norbornene acts as a "cage" around the reacting molecules, facilitating their interaction and promoting the formation of the desired products. The cyclic structure of norbornene also allows for the formation of complexes with the reacting molecules, which can enhance the reaction rate and selectivity.	In general, the Diels-Alder reaction is highly regioselective, meaning that it preferentially forms one or a few major products over a wide range of possible minor products. This is due to the fact that the diene and dienophile molecules have a high degree of complementarity, which allows them to form a stable and energetically favorable complex.	1. Epoxidation: DMP is a powerful oxidizing agent for the epoxidation of unsaturated compounds, such as alkenes and alkynes. It can introduce an epoxide group at the carbon-carbon double bond, which is useful for further synthetic modifications. 2. Hydroxylation: DMP can hydroxylate various substrates, including aromatic and aliphatic compounds, at the positions bearing an electron-withdrawing group. This reaction is particularly useful for the synthesis of alcohols, carboxylic acids, and amides. 3. Alkylation: DMP can alkylate various substrates, including aromatic and aliphatic compounds, at the positions bearing an electron-rich group. This reaction is useful for the synthesis of alkylated compounds, which are important intermediates in the production of pharmaceuticals and other chemicals. 4. Cyclization: DMP can induce cyclization reactions, such as the formation of lactones and lactams, by oxidizing the substrate at the carbon-carbon double bond. This reaction is useful for the synthesis of complex molecules, such as natural products and pharmaceuticals. 5. Fluorination: DMP can also be used for the fluorination of various substrates, including aromatic and aliphatic compounds. This reaction is useful for the synthesis of fluorinated compounds, which are important in the production of pharmaceuticals and other chemicals.
LLaMa-2, Flan-t5	The specific effects of norbornene in Catellani-type reactions can vary depending on the reaction conditions and the nature of the reacting molecules. However, some common effects include:	There are several factors that influence the regioselectivity of the Diels-Alder reaction:	
ChemBuddy, DB	Overall, the use of norbornene in Catellani-type reactions can provide a powerful tool for controlling the reaction mechanism and the final product distribution, allowing for the synthesis of a wide range of complex organic molecules with high precision and selectivity.	In general, the regioselectivity of the Diels-Alder reaction is influenced by a combination of these factors, and the exact regioselectivity of the reaction can vary depending on the specific diene and dienophile molecules being used. However, the reaction is highly regioselective, and the major product is usually formed with high yield and purity.	Dess-Martin periodinane is a reagent commonly used in organic chemistry for the oxidation of alcohols to aldehydes and ketones. It is particularly useful for the oxidation of secondary alcohols to ketones, which can be challenging to achieve with other oxidizing agents. Dess-Martin periodinane is a relatively mild reagent, which makes it useful for the oxidation of sensitive compounds. It is also used in the synthesis of complex natural products and pharmaceuticals.

Figure 8: The examples of paper reading scenario. We mark correct and relevant information in the replies in green, the correct but irrelevant information in yellow, and the wrong information in red. In addition, the key points of the answer are marked in bold if they appear in the reply.

LLM	<p>Q-A4 (Q2): What is the use of NaH in the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H(C(C)C)C2(H)C@H(C)C1</chem> and <chem>CC(P(OCC)(OCC)=O)C(OCC)=O</chem>? [Yin et al., 2023]</p>	<p>Q-A5: What is the use of DIBAL-H to react with <chem>C=C1C2C(C)C(C)C2(C)C12CCC(OCOC)C2C#N</chem>? [Yin et al., 2023]</p>	<p>Q-A6: How does <chem>C[C@H](c1ccc2ccc12)N1C(=O)CC[C@H]2CCC[C@H]2N</chem> react with <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/C(=O)CC2(Cc3ccc3)CC(=O)C2)c2ccc12</chem> to form <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/C(=O)CC2(Cc3ccc3)CC(=O)C2)c2ccc12</chem>? [Wang et al., 2023]</p>
GPT-4	<p>NaH, or Sodium Hydride, is a strong base that is often used in organic chemistry as a deprotonating agent. In the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H(C(C)C)C2(H)C@H(C)C1</chem> and <chem>CC(P(OCC)(OCC)=O)C(OCC)=O</chem>, NaH would likely be used to deprotonate one of the reactants, making it more nucleophilic and therefore more reactive. This would allow it to react more readily with the other reactant, facilitating the overall reaction.</p>	<p>DIBAL-H (Diisobutylaluminum hydride) is a reducing agent commonly used in organic chemistry. It is particularly useful for the reduction of esters, carboxylic acids, and amides to aldehydes.</p> <p>In the case of the compound you provided, DIBAL-H would likely be used to reduce the ester group (OCC) to an aldehyde. This would result in the formation of an aldehyde group (-CHO) and an alcohol group (-OH) in place of the ester.</p> <p>However, the structure you provided seems to be a bit complex and may not be entirely accurate. It would be helpful to have a more accurate structure to provide a more precise answer.</p>	<p>This reaction is a complex organic synthesis involving multiple steps. Here is a simplified version of the reaction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The first step is a nucleophilic attack by the nitrogen atom of the amine group on the carbonyl carbon of the second molecule. This forms a tetrahedral intermediate. The intermediate then undergoes a rearrangement, leading to the formation of a new carbon-nitrogen bond and the release of a water molecule. The newly formed amide undergoes a cyclization reaction, forming a new ring structure. The final step is a dehydration reaction, where a water molecule is removed, leading to the formation of the final product. <p>Please note that this is a simplified version of the reaction and the actual mechanism may involve additional steps and intermediates. The stereochemistry of the reaction is also not detailed in this explanation.</p>
Gedaliah-308	<p>The use of <chem>S=vee(Na)H</chem> is to deprotonate the carboxylic acid. The resulting carboxylate is a better leaving group than the carboxylic acid.</p>	<p>The use of DIBAL-H is to reduce the double bond.</p>	<p>The first step is the formation of a [carbene][https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carbene]. The carbene is then attacked by the oxygen of carbon monoxide. The resulting [acyl][https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Acyl_group] is then attacked by the nitrogen of the amide.</p>
LLaMA-2.1B-chat	<p>NaH is used as a reducing agent in the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H(C(C)C)C2(H)C@H(C)C1</chem> and <chem>CC(P(OCC)(OCC)=O)C(OCC)=O</chem>. The reaction is a conjugate addition of the alkene <chem>O=C1C@H(C(C)C)C2(H)C@H(C)C1</chem> to the alkynyl <chem>CC(P(OCC)(OCC)=O)C(OCC)=O</chem>.</p> <p>The NaH acts as a reducing agent by donating a pair of electrons to the carbon-carbon triple bond of the alkynyl group, reducing it to a carbon-carbon double bond. This process is known as hydrogenation. The resulting double bond is then attacked by the alkene <chem>O=C1C@H(C(C)C)C2(H)C@H(C)C1</chem>, leading to the formation of a new carbon-carbon single bond.</p> <p>The use of NaH as a reducing agent in this reaction is advantageous because it allows for the formation of a stable, saturated product, which is important for many organic synthesis reactions. Additionally, NaH is a mild reducing agent, which means that it can reduce the alkynyl group without causing unwanted side reactions or over-reduction of the alkene.</p> <p>Overall, the use of NaH in the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H(C(C)C)C2(H)C@H(C)C1</chem> and <chem>CC(P(OCC)(OCC)=O)C(OCC)=O</chem> is essential for the formation of the desired product, which is a saturated alkane.</p>	<p>DIBAL-H (diisobutylaluminum hydride) is a strong reducing agent that is commonly used to react with carbon-carbon double bonds (C=C) and carbon-carbon triple bonds (C≡C) in organic compounds.</p> <p>In the case of the molecule you provided, C=C1C2C(C)C(C)C2(C)C12CCC(OCOC)C2C#N, DIBAL-H can be used to react with the carbon-carbon triple bond (C≡C) and the carbon-carbon double bond (C=C) present in the molecule.</p> <p>The reaction of DIBAL-H with the C=C triple bond in the molecule would proceed through the formation of a metal complex, where the aluminum center of DIBAL-H coordinates with the carbon atoms of the triple bond. This would result in the reduction of the triple bond to a double bond, leading to the formation of a new C=C double bond.</p> <p>Similarly, the reaction of DIBAL-H with the C=C double bond in the molecule would also proceed through the formation of a metal complex, where the aluminum center of DIBAL-H coordinates with the carbon atoms of the double bond. This would result in the reduction of the double bond to a single bond, leading to the formation of a new C-C single bond.</p> <p>Overall, the use of DIBAL-H to react with <chem>C=C1C2C(C)C(C)C2(C)C12CCC(OCOC)C2C#N</chem> would result in the reduction of the carbon-carbon triple bond and the carbon-carbon double bond present in the molecule, leading to the formation of a new C-C single bond and a C=C double bond. This reaction would be a key step in the synthesis of the molecule, as it would allow for the formation of the desired C-C and C=C bonds.</p>	<p>The reaction of <chem>C[C@H](c1ccc2ccc12)N1C(=O)CC[C@H]2CCC[C@H]2N</chem> with <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/C(=O)CC2(Cc3ccc3)CC(=O)C2)c2ccc12</chem> is a complex process that involves multiple steps and reactions. Here's a simplified outline of the major steps involved in the reaction:</p> <p>Step 1: Formation of a carbon-carbon bond</p> <p>The first step in the reaction is the formation of a carbon-carbon bond between the carbon atom of <chem>C[C@H](c1ccc2ccc12)N1C(=O)CC[C@H]2CCC[C@H]2N</chem> and the carbon atom of <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/C(=O)CC2(Cc3ccc3)CC(=O)C2)c2ccc12</chem>. This forms a new carbon-carbon bond, which is shown in the figure as a double-headed arrow.</p> <p>Step 2: Formation of a nitrogen-carbon bond</p> <p>The next step is the formation of a nitrogen-carbon bond between the nitrogen atom of <chem>C[C@H](c1ccc2ccc12)N1C(=O)CC[C@H]2CCC[C@H]2N</chem> and the carbon atom of the newly formed carbon-carbon bond. This forms a new nitrogen-carbon bond, which is shown in the figure as a single-headed arrow.</p> <p>Step 3: Formation of a carbon-oxygen bond</p> <p>The third step is the formation of a carbon-oxygen bond between the carbon atom of the newly formed carbon-carbon bond and the oxygen atom of <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/C(=O)CC2(Cc3ccc3)CC(=O)C2)c2ccc12</chem>. This forms a new carbon-oxygen bond, which is shown in the figure as a single-headed arrow.</p> <p>Step 4: Formation of a nitrogen-oxygen bond</p> <p>The final step is the formation of a nitrogen-oxygen bond between the nitrogen atom of <chem>C[C@H](c1ccc2ccc12)N1C(=O)CC[C@H]2CCC[C@H]2N</chem> and the oxygen atom of the newly formed carbon-oxygen bond. This forms a new nitrogen-oxygen bond, which is shown in the figure as a single-headed arrow.</p> <p>Overall, the reaction of <chem>C[C@H](c1ccc2ccc12)N1C(=O)CC[C@H]2CCC[C@H]2N</chem> with <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/C(=O)CC2(Cc3ccc3)CC(=O)C2)c2ccc12</chem> results in the formation of a new carbon-carbon bond, a new nitrogen-carbon bond, a new carbon-oxygen bond, and a new nitrogen-oxygen bond. The resulting molecule is <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/C(=O)CC2(Cc3ccc3)CC(=O)C2)c2ccc12</chem>.</p>
Claude-3.5	<p>The use of NaH in the reaction between <chem>O=C1C@H(C(C)C)C2(H)C@H(C)C1</chem> and <chem>CC(P(OCC)(OCC)=O)C(OCC)=O</chem> is to deprotonate the acidic alpha-hydrogen of the keto group in <chem>CC(P(OCC)(OCC)=O)C(OCC)=O</chem>, resulting in the formation of an enolate anion. This anion can then react with the enol group of <chem>O=C1C@H(C(C)C)C2(H)C@H(C)C1</chem> to form a new C-C bond and produce the product.</p>	<p>DIBAL-H is a reducing agent that can be used to reduce carbonyl groups to the corresponding alcohols. In the case of 2-[5-(methoxymethoxy)-2-methyl-1-oxo-10-azaspiro[5.5]undecan-4-yl]ethylidene-1,1,3,3-tetramethylcyclohexane-6-carbonitrile, DIBAL-H can be used to reduce the carbonyl group of the nitrile to the corresponding aldehyde. This reduction is a key step in the synthesis of the anti-cancer drug, Pifidien.</p>	<p>The reaction involves the formation of a covalent bond between the ketone group of the benzenoid aromatic compound and the amino group of the (2S)-1-[(2R)-2-phenyl-2-propyl]-3,4-dihydro-1H-isoquinoline-5-carboxamide. The stereochemistry of the resulting product is consistent with the reaction of the (E)-enol tautomer of the benzenoid aromatic compound with the (2S)-enantiomer of the (2R)-1-[(2R)-2-phenyl-2-propyl]-3,4-dihydro-1H-isoquinoline-5-carboxamide.</p>

Figure 9: The examples of paper reading scenario. We mark correct and relevant information in the replies in green, the correct but irrelevant information in yellow, and the wrong information in red. In addition, the key points of the answer are marked in bold if they appear in the reply.

LLMs	Q-A7 (Q3): I want to enhance the acidity of catalyst <chem>C=C[C@@H][C]N[C@@H]2[C@@H]1[C@@H]2[C@@H]1NC(=S)NC1cc(C(F)F)cc(C(F)F)F)c1)ccncc2cc(OC)cc12</chem> . How should I modify the catalyst? [Dargó et al., 2023]	Q-A8: I want to change the chiral environment of catalyst <chem>CN1CCC(Nc2c(Nc3ccc4ccc4c3C(=C)c3ccc3)c3[nH]c4ccc34)c(=O)c2=O)C1</chem> . How should I modify the catalyst? [Hao et al., 2023]	Q-A9: Which part of <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/COCC2(Cc3ccc3)C=C[N]([C@@H]3CCC[C@@]34CCCC(=O)N4)[C@@H](C)c3ccc4ccc34)C2)c2ccc12</chem> has chance to connect with palladium? [Wang et al., 2023]
	To enhance the acidity of a catalyst, you can introduce more electronegative atoms or functional groups that can donate protons. In your case, you can consider the following modifications: 1. Introduce more sulfonic acid groups (-SO3H): Sulfonic acid groups are highly acidic and can significantly increase the acidity of your catalyst. You can replace some of the existing functional groups with -SO3H. 2. Add more halogen atoms: Halogens are highly electronegative and can increase the acidity of the catalyst. You already have fluorine atoms in your catalyst. You can consider adding more fluorine atoms or other halogens like chlorine or bromine. 3. Introduce carboxylic acid groups (-COOH): Carboxylic acid groups are also highly acidic. You can replace some of the existing functional groups with -COOH. 4. Introduce phosphoric acid groups (-PO3H2): Nitro groups are also highly electronegative and can increase the acidity of the catalyst. Remember, the modification should not affect the catalyst's ability to catalyze the reaction. It's always a good idea to consult with a chemist or a chemical engineer before making any modifications to a catalyst. The catalyst you have is a [Bromsted acid] (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B%9C%34B8sted_acid). The acidity of the catalyst is determined by the strength of the conjugate base. The stronger the conjugate base, the stronger the acid. The conjugate base of your catalyst is the carbanion on the nitrogen. The stronger the carbanion, the stronger the acid. The carbanion is stabilized by the adjacent double bond. The more electron-withdrawing the double bond, the stronger the acid. The double bond is conjugated with the nitrogen lone pair. The more electron-withdrawing the nitrogen lone pair, the stronger the acid. The nitrogen lone pair is stabilized by the adjacent double bond. The catalyst you provided is a complex molecule with multiple functional groups, and enhancing its acidity may require careful modification. Here are some strategies that may help: 1. Introduction of acidic functional groups: You can introduce acidic functional groups such as carboxylic acids, sulfonic acids, or phosphoric acids into the catalyst molecule. These groups can increase the acidity of the catalyst and enhance its ability to activate the substrate. 2. Substitution with acidic groups: You can substitute some of the non-acidic functional groups in the catalyst with acidic groups. For example, you can replace some of the hydrogen atoms with acidic groups such as hydroxyl (-OH), carboxyl (-COOH), or sulfonic acid (-SO3H) groups. 3. Increase the number of acidic sites: You can increase the number of acidic sites in the catalyst by introducing more acidic functional groups or by increasing the number of existing acidic sites. This can be done by modifying the molecular structure of the catalyst to increase the number of carboxylic acid, sulfonic acid, or phosphoric acid groups. 4. Use of acidic additives: You can add acidic additives such as sulfuric acid, hydrochloric acid, or acetic acid to the reaction mixture to enhance the acidity of the catalyst. These additives can increase the concentration of acidic sites in the reaction mixture and improve the catalytic activity of the catalyst. 5. Modification of the support: The support material can also affect the acidity of the catalyst. You can modify the support material to increase its acidity. For example, you can use a support material that is more acidic, such as silica gel or alumina, or you can modify the support material with acidic functional groups such as carboxylic acids or sulfonic acids. It is important to note that modifying the catalyst to enhance its acidity can also affect its other properties, such as its stability and selectivity. Therefore, it is important to carefully optimize the modification of the catalyst to achieve the desired balance of properties. Additionally, the optimal modification of the catalyst may depend on the specific reaction conditions and the substrate being used, so it may be necessary to perform experiments under different conditions to find the best modification strategy.	The chiral environment of a catalyst can be modified by changing the chiral center or introducing a new chiral center. The chiral center is the atom in a molecule that is attached to four different groups, usually carbon. In the given catalyst, the chiral center seems to be the carbon atom in the cyclohexane ring (CN1CCC) . To modify the chiral environment, you can: 1. Change the groups attached to the chiral center: You can replace one or more of the groups attached to the chiral center with different groups. This will result in a different arrangement of groups around the chiral center, thus changing the chiral environment. 2. Introduce a new chiral center: You can add a new chiral center to the molecule by attaching a carbon atom to four different groups. This will create a new chiral environment in the molecule. 3. Use a different chiral catalyst: If modifying the existing catalyst is not feasible, you can consider using a different chiral catalyst that provides the desired chiral environment. Remember, any changes to the catalyst should not affect its ability to catalyze the reaction. It's always recommended to consult with a chemist or a chemical engineer before making any changes to a catalyst. The catalyst you have is a [diaminomethylbenzimidazole] (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diaminomethylbenzimidazole). The chiral environment is created by the two amino groups. You can change the chiral environment by changing the amino groups. The palladium catalyst is used to form the carbon-carbon bond between the two molecules. The carbon-carbon bond is formed between the carbon in the alkyne and the carbon in the arene. The carbon in the alkyne is the one that is attached to the nitrogen.	
GP-4			The part of the molecule that has the chance to connect with palladium is the C=C double bond in the (C=C/ section) . Palladium is often used as a catalyst in reactions involving double bonds, such as in the Heck reaction or Suzuki coupling.
ChemRxiv-10B			
LLM-2-13B-40t		To change the chiral environment of the catalyst <chem>CN1CCC(Nc2c(Nc3ccc4ccc4c3C(=C)c3ccc3)c3[nH]c4ccc34)c(=O)c2=O)C1</chem> , you could consider modifying the chiral substituents on the nitrogen atoms . One approach could be to introduce a chiral auxiliary group, such as a quaternary amine or a chiral sulfonamide, on one of the nitrogen atoms. This would allow you to control the stereochemistry of the reaction and potentially improve the enantioselectivity of the catalyst. Another approach could be to modify the ligand environment around the metal center . For example, you could introduce a chiral ligand, such as a chiral amine or a chiral phosphine, that coordinates to the metal center and influences the stereochemistry of the reaction. It is also possible to modify the metal center itself to introduce chirality . For example, you could use a chiral metal such as a chiral transition metal or a chiral main group element, or you could introduce a chiral ligand that coordinates to the metal center. It is important to note that modifying the catalyst can potentially affect its activity and selectivity, so it may be necessary to optimize the modified catalyst to achieve the desired properties. Additionally, the chiral environment of the catalyst may be sensitive to the conditions of the reaction, such as the solvent, temperature, and reaction time, so it may be necessary to optimize these conditions as well. Overall, modifying the chiral environment of the catalyst can be a powerful way to improve the enantioselectivity of the reaction, but it requires careful consideration of the specific modifications and their potential effects on the catalyst's activity and selectivity.	The molecule you provided, <chem>COc1ccc(NC(=O)C/C=C/COCC2(Cc3ccc3)C=C[N]([C@@H]3CCC[C@@]34CCCC(=O)N4)[C@@H](C)c3ccc4ccc34)C2)c2ccc12</chem> , contains several potential binding sites for palladium. Here are some possible ways that palladium could connect with this molecule: 1. Binding to the nitrogen atom: The nitrogen atom in the molecule is electronegative and could potentially form a coordinate covalent bond with a palladium center. 2. Binding to the carbon atoms: The carbon atoms in the molecule are sp3 hybridized and could potentially form a coordinate covalent bond with a palladium center. 3. Binding to the oxygen atom: The oxygen atom in the molecule is electronegative and could potentially form a coordinate covalent bond with a palladium center. 4. Binding to the sulfur atom: The sulfur atom in the molecule is electronegative and could potentially form a coordinate covalent bond with a palladium center. It's difficult to predict the exact binding site for palladium on this molecule without knowing the specific conditions of the reaction, but these potential binding sites could be important for the catalytic activity of the palladium center. It's worth noting that the molecule you provided is a complex molecule with many functional groups and atoms that could potentially participate in the catalytic process. The exact binding site for palladium may depend on the specific reaction conditions and the conformation of the molecule.
ChemRxiv-13B	To enhance the acidity of the catalyst, you could consider introducing electron-withdrawing groups on the aromatic ring of the <chem>[C@@H](NC(=S)NC1cc(C(F)F)cc(C(F)F)F)c1)ccncc2cc(OC)cc12</chem> moiety. This could draw electron density away from the amino group and increase its acidity. Some examples of such groups could be fluoro, chloro, or bromo substituents. However, it is important to note that the introduction of these groups could also affect the binding affinity of the catalyst to its target, so careful optimization would be required.	To change the chiral environment of the catalyst, you will need to modify the structure of the N-aryl substituent . This can be done by introducing a chiral element into the aryl group, such as a chiral center or a chiral substituent. You may also need to adjust the connectivity of the aryl group to the indole moiety to achieve the desired chirality . It is important to note that changing the chiral environment of the catalyst may also affect its activity and selectivity, so you may need to optimize the new structure to achieve the desired results.	The part of the molecule that has the greatest chance of connecting with palladium is the amide bond between the aniline moiety and the rest of the molecule. This bond is formed between the carboxylic acid group of the aniline and the amino group of the rest of the molecule, and is a common site for coordination with palladium.

Figure 10: The examples of paper reading scenario. We mark correct and relevant information in the replies in green, the correct but irrelevant information in yellow, and the wrong information in red. In addition, the key points of the answer are marked in bold if they appear in the reply.

Model	Accuracy	Validity
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>		
Chemformer [Irwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	93.8	100
Mol-Instruction [Fang <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	4.5	100
InstructMol [Cao <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	53.6	100
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>		
GPT-4 [†]	<u>23.0</u>	93.0
LLaMa-2-13B-chat [†]	3.2	72.2
Galactica (30B) [†]	3.6	<u>94.8</u>
ChemDFM-13B	49.0	98.0

Table 11: The Results of the reaction prediction task. †denote the results from Guo *et al.*[2023].

Model	Reactant	Solvent	Ligand
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>			
GPT-4 [†]	29.9	52.6	53.4
LLaMa-2-13B-chat [†]	14.5	5.0	28.4
Galactica (30B) [†]	10.7	10.4	3.0
ChemDFM-13B	<u>24.0</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>35.0</u>

Table 12: The Results of the reagent selection tasks. We report the result in accuracy scores except for Ligand Selection where we report the top 50% accuracy score. †denote the results from Guo *et al.*[2023].

Catellani-type reactions [Catellani *et al.*, 1997] to answer the question correctly. The key point of the answer to this question is “**regioselectivity**”. While Galactica can hardly answer the question and LLaMa-2 misses the key point of the answer, ChemDFM accurately captures the key point to answer the question and provides a comprehensive answer. GPT-4 gives the best reply as it not only points out “regioselectivity” but also gives the result of the regioselectivity of norbornene. ChemDFM is the only model that tries to provide a detailed description of the mechanism behind the reaction. However, it makes minor mistakes when doing so.

Q-A2 asks for the regioselectivity of the Diels-Alder reaction [Kloetzel, 1948]. Only ChemDFM successfully answers the key points to this question, which is the result of the regioselectivity. GPT-4 provides a detailed introduction to the Diels-Alder reaction and regioselectivity but fails to answer the specific regioselectivity of the Diels-Alder reaction, while LLaMa-2 only gives the factors that could influence the regioselectivity. They do not answer the question.

As for **Q-A3**, ChemDFM, Galactica, and GPT-4, all capture the key point to the answer (“**the oxidation of alcohols to aldehydes and ketones**”), while ChemDFM and GPT-4 further answer more properties of the Dess-Martin periodinane [Dess and Martin, 1983]. LLaMa-2, on the other hand, gives numerous wrong arguments and misses the key points.

Then, we ask the models about new molecules and new reactions which are published after January 2022. In this way, we can ensure minimal risk of data leakage and evaluate the models’ capability to handle unforeseen situations. The results are shown in Figure 9 and Figure 10.

Model	Accuracy	Validity
<i>task-specific specialist models</i>		
Chemformer [Irwin <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	53.6	100
<i>LLM-based generalist models</i>		
GPT-4 [†]	<u>11.4</u>	89.0
LLaMa-2-13B-chat [†]	0.0	72.8
Galactica (30B) [†]	1.6	94.8
ChemDFM-13B	12.0	<u>91.0</u>

Table 13: The Results of the retrosynthesis task. †denote the results from Guo *et al.*[2023].

Q-A4 (Q2) is constructed based on Yin *et al.*[2023]. Because the reaction mentioned in the question is a novel instance, models need to correctly identify the reaction and discover the mechanisms of it before answering the question. In practice, Galactica successfully identifies the key point of the answer, “**deprotonate**”, but fails to provide other useful information. LLaMa-2, in its reply, fails to identify the reaction mentioned in the question. Most of the information about NaH in its reply is correct but irrelevant to the reaction. GPT-4 identifies the key point of the answer but only gives a rough description of the mechanism of how it works. ChemDFM not only correctly identifies the key point of the answer but also provides an almost correct description of the mechanism.

Q-A5 is also constructed based on Yin *et al.*[2023]. All the models can recognize the DIBAL-H as a reducing agent, which is existing knowledge. However, only ChemDFM successfully identifies the reaction site of the new molecule, indicating its strong capabilities to handle unforeseen situations where new molecules and reactions are involved. The main mistake that ChemDFM makes is providing the wrong IUPAC name, which is a challenging task for LLMs even as a separate task (see Table 2).

Q-A6 is constructed based on Wang *et al.*[2023] and asks directly for the mechanism of the given reaction. Among the answers, the answer of ChemDFM is the most precise. Galactica and LLaMa-2 give nearly no correct information. Although GPT-4’s answer contains the correct reaction process, it also contains auxiliary processes that do not happen during the reaction, which masks the whole mechanism predicted by GPT-4 wrong. ChemDFM answers the correct reaction process with no excess. The only mistakes ChemDFM makes are again providing the wrong IUPAC names, which is a challenging task for LLMs even as a separate task (see Table 2).

We also ask several questions focusing more on molecules and less on reactions.

Q-A7 (Q3), constructed based on Dargo *et al.*[2023], focus on the modification of catalyst molecules. The molecule mentioned in the question is a novel instance and models need to infer the chemical properties of that molecule to answer the question. The key point of the answer is “**introducing electron-withdrawing groups on the aromatic rings**” as this method has the potential to increase the acidity while keeping the catalytic ability of the molecule. Among the

LLMs, only ChemDFM successfully answers the key point, while others either fail to provide any specific solutions or give wrong solutions which will damage the catalytic ability of the molecule.

Q-A8, constructed based on Hao *et al.*[2023], focus on the modification of chiral environment. In the given molecule, there are two chiral centers. GPT-4 identifies the point chiral center and provides candidate methods that are not all correct. The other three models identify the axial chirality which is challenging to identify with only the SMILES notation. Among the three models, Galactica gives almost no detailed method to change the chiral environment, LLaMa-2 gives one correct method with more wrong ones, and ChemDFM provides two correct methods one of which is targeting specifically the axial chirality.

Q-A9 is constructed on Wang *et al.*[2023]. It asks for the coordinate sites between the given molecule and palladium. There are a total of three coordinate sites. GPT-4 and ChemDFM each identify one of them, while Galactica and LLaMa-2 fail to identify any.

C.2 Dialogue-Based Human-AI Collaboration

We demonstrate two more examples of dialogue-based human-AI collaboration based on ChemDFM here. The dialogues are also inspired by the recently published papers to minimize the risk of data leakage and evaluate ChemDFM’s capability to handle unforeseen situations during human-AI collaboration.

The dialogue shown in Figure 11 is inspired by Yin *et al.*[2023]. During the dialogue, the human researcher first asks for the role of LiCl in the given reaction. ChemDFM successfully identifies the LiCl as a catalyst while misjudging the type of the reaction. To correct the answer, the human researcher points out the key error in the answer with some important details of the reaction (which can be easily discovered by comparing the product with the reactant). ChemDFM then corrects its mistake with even more details about the reaction process. To further validate whether ChemDFM fully understands the unforeseen reaction, we continue to ask about the post-processing procedure which is necessary to get the final product. ChemDFM successfully captures the key point to the question and gives the correct answer.

The dialogue shown in Figure 12 is inspired by Zhuang *et al.*[2023]. ChemDFM first gives a partially correct answer to the question from the human researcher where it misjudges the position of the newly formed C-C bond and the type of the reaction. With the help of human correction, ChemDFM then realizes the mistakes and corrects them. Then the human researcher further asks about the next reaction that is conducted in Zhuang *et al.*[2023] without clarifying the current molecule composition of the system or restating the previous reaction. ChemDFM can infer this information from the dialogue history and correctly answer the question.

In these dialogues, ChemDFM shows promising capabilities in handling unforeseen situations, error correction, and inferring information from dialogue history. These capabilities can be attributed to the fact that ChemDFM comprehends both natural language and chemical language. This allows a universal language protocol established between ChemDFM

and human researchers, enabling meaningful human-AI collaborations.

Round 1



What is **the role of LiCl** in the process of generating O=C1C=C2C3(CCC2)CC4(C)CCC(C)(C)C4C31C from O=C1C(C(OC)=O)=C2C3(CCC2)CC4(C)CCC(C)(C)C4C31C?

The role of LiCl in this process is to act **as a catalyst** for the reaction. LiCl is added to a solution of the reactants in dry acetone, and it helps to **facilitate the Diels-Alder reaction** between the diene and dienophile moieties of the two starting materials. In this reaction, LiCl **serves as a Lewis acid, coordinating with the carbonyl oxygen** of one of the starting materials and increasing the electrophilicity of the dienophile. This makes it more reactive towards the diene, which is then able to add to the dienophile to form the final product



Round 2



But it is **not Diels-Alder reaction**. The ester group on reactant leaves to form product.

You are correct, I apologize for the mistake in my previous response. The process you described is **not a Diels-Alder reaction**, but **rather a decarbonylation reaction**. In this reaction, **the LiCl catalyst helps to facilitate the loss of the carbonyl group** from one of the starting materials, **allowing the decarbonylated product to be formed**. The exact mechanism by which LiCl promotes this reaction is not entirely clear, but it is believed to **involve the formation of a carbanion intermediate that can undergo beta-elimination to remove the carbonyl group**.



Round 3



After using LiCl, a **lithium salt intermediate product** was obtained. **What should be added next to obtain the final product?**

After using LiCl to promote the decarbonylation reaction, the resulting intermediate product will contain a lithium salt. To obtain the final product, **the lithium salt can be hydrolyzed by adding water to the reaction mixture**. This will cause the lithium salt to precipitate out as a solid, and the resulting supernatant can be isolated and purified to obtain the final product. Alternatively, the lithium salt can be converted back into one of the starting materials by treating it with a proton source, such as acid.



Figure 11: The example showing the potential of ChemDFM to assist researchers through dialogue-based human-AI collaboration. We highlight **the key points** in bold and **the wrong information** in red. The dialogue is inspired by Yin *et al.*[2023].

Round 1



What intramolecular reactions will occur when AIBN and Bu₃SnH is added to CC(C)(C)[Si](C)(C)OC1(c2cc3c(cc2Br)OCO3)C(=O)N2CCCC23C=C(OC(=O)c2ccccc2)C(=O)C13?

When AIBN and Bu₃SnH is added to CC(C)(C)[Si](C)(C)OC1(c2cc3c(cc2Br)OCO3)C(=O)N2CCCC23C=C(OC(=O)c2ccccc2)C(=O)C13, an intramolecular reaction will occur to **form a new ring**. The reaction involves the **formation of a new C-C bond between the carbon adjacent to the carbonyl group and the carbon adjacent to the silicon group in the starting material**. This reaction is called the "ene" reaction.



Round 2



But this is a radical debromination reaction.

You are correct, I apologize for the error in my previous response. The reaction between AIBN and Bu₃SnH in the presence of CC(C)(C)[Si](C)(C)OC1(c2cc3c(cc2Br)OCO3)C(=O)N2CCCC23C=C(OC(=O)c2ccccc2)C(=O)C13 will **result in a debromination reaction**, not an ene reaction. **The debromination reaction will occur at the beta-position of the enone moiety, resulting in the formation of a new C-C bond and the release of bromine.**



Round 3



Subsequently, TBAF is added, and **what is its purpose?**

TBAF (tetrabutylammonium fluoride) is a source of fluoride ion and will be added to the reaction mixture after the debromination reaction. The purpose of adding TBAF is to **hydrolyze the silicon-containing group in the product**, thereby **removing the protecting group and revealing the alcohol functional group**. This step is necessary to allow for further functionalization of the molecule.



Figure 12: The example showing the potential of ChemDFM to assist researchers through dialogue-based human-AI collaboration. We highlight the **key points** in bold and the **wrong information** in red. The dialogue is inspired by Zhuang *et al.*[2023].