
MLLM-SR: Conversational Symbolic Regression base Multi-Modal Large Language Models

Yanjie Li¹, Weijun Li^{1,2,*}, Lina Yu^{1,*}, MinWu^{1,*}, JingyiLiu^{1,2}, WenqiangLi^{1,2}, MeilanHao¹,
ShuWei^{1,2}, and YusongDeng^{1,2}

¹AnnLab, Institute of Semiconductors, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

²School of Electronic, Electrical and Communication Engineering, University of Chinese Academy
of Sciences, Beijing, China

*Corresponding author: liyanjie@semi.ac.cn

Abstract

Formulas are the language of communication between humans and nature. It is an important research topic of artificial intelligence to find expressions from observed data to reflect the relationship between each variable in the data, which is called a symbolic regression problem. The existing symbolic regression methods directly generate expressions according to the given observation data, and we cannot require the algorithm to generate expressions that meet specific requirements according to the known prior knowledge. For example, the expression needs to contain \sin or be symmetric, and so on. Even if it can, it often requires very complex operations, which is very inconvenient. In this paper, based on multi-modal large language models, we propose MLLM-SR, a conversational symbolic regression method that can generate expressions that meet the requirements simply by describing the requirements with natural language instructions. By experimenting on the Nguyen dataset, we can demonstrate that MLLM-SR leads the state-of-the-art baselines in fitting performance. More notably, we experimentally demonstrate that MLLM-SR can well understand the prior knowledge we add to the natural language instructions. Moreover, the addition of prior knowledge can effectively guide MLLM-SR to generate correct expressions.

1 Introduction

Mathematical formulas are the language of communication between nature and human beings. With the succinct expression, we can obtain the potential relationship between the individual variables in the formula. Summarizing a concise expression to reflect the law behind the physical phenomenon from the observation data is the goal that scientists have been pursuing. Because manual discovery of formula theorems often requires a long period. Moreover, the demands on scientists are high. So people are trying to use artificial intelligence algorithms to make computers discover mathematical formulas from data on their own. This is where the symbolic regression problem comes in. Specifically, given observations $D = \{X, y\}$, SR seeks a function f that satisfies $y = f(X)$, where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, d, n are the dimension of variable and number of data points, respectively. f is composed of several basic primitive operators such as $+$, $-$, \times , \div , \sin , \cos , x_1, \dots

The traditional methods regard symbolic regression as a combinatorial optimization problem, and use GP algorithm and reinforcement learning algorithm to deal with symbolic regression problem. This kind of method is trained from scratch for each new data, which has good anti-noise and versatility. Moreover, certain constraints can be added to the search process to make the generated expression

meet some simple needs. (For example, if we want to generate expressions that don't contain 'sin', we can remove the sin symbol from the symbol library). Relatively flexible.

In actual scientific research, scientists have a lot of priors or assumptions when modeling observation data with expressions. For example, suppose we use time t as a variable and want a function $f(t)$ that models the intensity of light over a month. We almost know that $f(t)$ is a periodic function, so we tend to model $f(t)$ using periodic functions like $\sin()$ or $\cos()$. In addition, scientists may want to obtain expressions that conform to symmetry, periodicity, translation invariance, and so on. Although current methods based on reinforcement learning can achieve some of the people's needs by adding certain constraints to the search process. But it will be very troublesome, requiring us to change the code, which is very unfriendly to non-computer science people.

In recent years, multimodal large language models (MLLMs), represented by GPT-4v, have achieved significant advancements. MLLMs can answer our questions based on input from various modalities such as images, PDF files, or videos. For example, if we input an image containing a person and a dog and then ask the MLLM, 'Please describe in detail what is in the image?' it will describe the image by stating that 'there is a person and a dog'. If we add some conditions and ask, 'What pets are in the image?' it will respond that 'there is a pet dog in the image'.

So can we implement a large multi-modal language model that can automatically generate expressions that satisfy the user's needs only by describing the requirements through natural language?

In this paper, we propose a symbolic regression method based on MLLM called MLLM-SR. MLLM-SR only needs to describe the requirements in simple natural language, and it can generate an expression that satisfies the requirements and fits the observed data. Specifically, we will consider the observed data as one modality (pictures, videos, etc.) and then consider the text (containing the symbols that make up the expression) as another modality. We first freeze the Large Language Model(LLM) and SetTransformer and then perform feature alignment by training a fully connected layer to map the observed data features to the literal feature space. In the second step, we unfreeze the parameters of LLM and proceed to train MLLM-SR End-to-End.

- We propose MLLM-SR, a multi-modal large language model-based conversational symbolic regression method.
- We propose a symbolic regression method that can describe requirements in natural language and generate expressions that conform to the requirements.
- We provide new potential research directions for using multimodal large language models.

2 Relation work

2.1 Multi-modal Large Language Models

Recently, models such as CLIP Radford et al. [2021] and ALIGN Jia et al. [2021] have been pre-trained on noisy image and text pairs from the web using contrastive loss, which is recognized as one of the most effective methods for feature learning He et al. [2020]Chen et al. [2020]Li et al. [2020b]Li et al. [2020a]. These models achieve remarkable performance on image-text retrieval tasks but are limited in their ability to model more complex interactions between images and text necessary for other vision-and-language (V+L) tasks Kim et al. [2021], such as visual question answering (VQA) Antol et al. [2015]. Subsequent studies Wang et al. [2021] Wang et al. [2022a] Piergiovanni et al. [2022] have introduced encoder-decoder frameworks trained using generative loss functions, demonstrating robust performance across various vision-language benchmarks. Simultaneously, the visual encoders in these models maintain competitive accuracy in image classification tasks. Research Singh et al. [2022] Li et al. [2021] Li et al. [2022]Chen et al. [2023]Liu et al. [2024a] has explored the unification of image and text representations, which typically involves multiple pretraining stages for both unimodal and multimodal modules to achieve high performance. For instance, ALBEF Li et al. [2021] employs a dual-encoder architecture that integrates contrastive loss with Masked Language Modeling (MLM) to enhance learning efficiency. CoCa ? focuses on training an image-text foundation model from scratch in a single pretraining stage, thereby unifying these approaches in a simpler and more efficient manner. BEITv3 Wang et al. [2022b] treats images as a type of language, mapping images into the language space through a mapping layer before integrating them with encoded text features in a large GPT model. LLava Liu et al. [2024b] is an open-source multi-modal

large model that aligns image features with text features to transform images into a 'language' that a large language model (LLM) Chang et al. [2023]Zhao et al. [2023]Touvron et al. [2023]Zeng et al. [2022]Ouyang et al. [2022] can understand. These image features are then concatenated with text features and fed into the large language model.

2.2 Symbolic Regression

Based on genetic programming This kind of method is a classical kind of algorithm in the field of symbolic regression. GP Arnaldo et al. [2014], McConaghy [2011], Nguyen et al. [2017] is the main representative of this kind of method, its main idea is to simulate the process of human evolution. Firstly, it initialized an expression population, then generated new individuals by crossover and mutation, and finally generated a new population by fitness. The above process is repeated until the target expression is obtained. RSRMXu et al. integrates the GP algorithm with Double Q-learningHasselt [2010] and the MCTS algorithmCoulom [2006]. a Double Q-learning block, designed for exploitation, that helps reduce the feasible search space of MCTS via properly understanding the distribution of reward, In short, the RSRM model consists of a three-step symbolic learning process: RLbased expression search, GP tuning, and MSDB. In this paperFong et al. [2022], the fitness function of the traditional GP algorithm is improved, which promotes the use of an adaptability framework in evolutionary SR which uses fitness functions that alternate across generations.

Based on reinforcement learning Reinforcement learning-based algorithms treat symbolic regression as a combinatorial optimization problem. The typical algorithm is DSRPetersen et al. [2019], which uses a recurrent neural network as a policy network to generate a probability distribution P for sampling, and then samples according to the probability P to obtain multiple expressions. The reward value of the sampled expressions is calculated and the policy network is updated with the risky policy, and the loop continues until the target expression is obtained. DSOMundhenk et al. [2021] is based on DSR by introducing the GP algorithm. The purpose of the policy network is to generate a better initial population for the GP algorithm. Then, the risk policy gradient algorithm is also used to update the policy network. Although the above two algorithms are very good, the efficiency is low, and the expression is more complex, especially the DSO algorithm is more obvious. There have been many recent symbolic regression algorithms based on the Monte Carlo tree search. SPLSun et al. [2022] uses MCTS in the field of symbolic regression and introduces the concept of modularity to improve search efficiency. However, due to the lack of guidance of MCTS, the search efficiency of this algorithm is low. To improve the search efficiency of the algorithm, the two algorithms DGSR-MCTS Kamienny et al. [2023] and TPSR Shojaee et al. [2024] introduced the policy network to guide the MCTS process based on the previous algorithm. While maintaining the performance of the algorithm, it greatly improves the search efficiency of the algorithm. However, although the above two algorithms improve the search efficiency of the algorithm, they reduce the Versatility of the algorithm, and the noise robustness ability of the algorithm is also greatly reduced. To solve the above problems and balance the Versatility and efficiency of the algorithm, SR-GPT Li et al. [2024a] uses a policy network that learns in real time to guide the MCTS process. It achieves high performance while efficient search.

Based on pre-training Many SR methods based on reinforcement learning have good Versatility. However, its search efficiency is relatively low, and it often takes a long time to get a good expression. In contrast, pre-trained models treat the SR problem as a translation problem and train a transformer with a large amount of artificially synthesized data in advance. Each prediction only needs one forward propagation to get the result, which is relatively efficient. SymbolicGPTValipour et al. [2021] was the first large-scale pre-trained model to treat each letter in a sequence of symbols as a token, (e.g.['s', 'i', 'n', '(', 'x', ')']). A data feature extractor is used as the encoder, and then each token is generated by the Decoder in turn. Finally, the predicted sequence and the real sequence are used for cross-entropy loss. BFGS is used to optimize the constant at placeholder 'C'. NeSymReSBiggio et al. [2021] builds on symbolicGPT by not thinking of each individual letter in the sequence of expressions as a token. Instead, Nesymres represents the expression in the form of a binary tree, which is then expanded by preorder traversal, and considers each operator as a token (e.g. ['sin', 'x']). Then SetTransformer is used as the Encoder of the data, and finally, Decoder is used to generate the expression sequence. The overall framework and idea of the EndtoEndKamienny et al. [2022] algorithm are not much different from NeSymReS, but EndtoEnd abandons the constant placeholder 'C', encodes the constant, and directly generates the constant from the decoder. The constants are then




Figure 1: This figure shows a schematic diagram of the overall process of MLLM-SR.

further optimized by Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS) Liu and Nocedal [1989]. Based on EndtoEnd, NSRwHBendinelli et al. [2023] tries to apply some prefixes to prompt the model to generate expressions that conform to the prior. But the effect is not obvious. SymformerVastl et al. [2024] is slightly different from the previous pre-trained models in that it directly generates the constant values in the expression as well as the sequence of expressions. SNIPMeidani et al. [2023] first applies contrastive learning to train the feature encoder and then freezes the encoder to train the decoder. But SNIP works well only when combined with a latent space optimization (LSO)Bojanowski et al. [2017] algorithm. MMSRLi et al. [2024b] solves the symbolic regression problem as a pure multimodal problem, takes the input data and the expression sequence as two modalities, introduces contrastive learning in the training process, and adopts a one-step training strategy to train contrastive learning with other losses.

Based on deep learning This class of methods combines symbolic regression problems with artificial neural networks, where EQL replaces the activation function in ordinary neural networks with [sin, cos,...] And then applies pruning methods to remove redundant connections and extract an expression from the network. EQLKim et al. [2020] is very powerful, however, it can't introduce division operations, which can lead to vanishing or exploding gradients. The main idea of AI Feynman 1.0 Udrescu and Tegmark [2020] and AI Feynman 2.0Udrescu and Tegmark [2020] series algorithms are to "Break down the complex into the simple" by first fitting the data with a neural network, and then using the trained neural network to discover some properties (e.g. Symmetry, translation invariance, etc.) to decompose the function hierarchically. AI Feynman 2.0 introduces more properties based on AI Feynman 1.0, which makes the scope of its application more extensive relative to AI Feynman 1.0. MetaSymNetLi et al. [2023] takes advantage of the differences between symbolic regression and traditional combinatorial optimization problems and uses more efficient numerical optimization to solve symbolic regression.

3 Method

We manually generate 15M Q&A data about expressions. Each piece of data contains a set of observations, $[X, Y]$, and a question-answer pair. Where the problem contains our requirements for generating expressions. (e.g., $\sin()$ free, symmetry, etc.). The answer mainly consists of a preorder traversal that generates the expression, which is represented by a binary tree. We first train a SetTransformer as the data feature extractor E of MLLM-SR using contrastive learning with 1M pairs of $[X, Y]$ and the corresponding expression preorder traversal (e.g. $[\sin, *, x, x]$). Then, we freeze the parameters of E and LLM and separately pre-train the parameters of the projection layer to map data features to word features. Finally, only the E parameter is frozen, and the parameters of the projection layer and LLM are trained. Note the parameters of the LLM we trained with LoRAHu et al. [2021].


Data details

Expression: $y = 2 \sin(x_1) \cos(x_2)$

Preorder traversal : $[*, c, *, \sin, x_1, \cos, x_2]$

Properties: Periodicity, symmetry

Number of symbols: 7



Conversations

Conversation 1

Human: <Data> Generate an expression to fit the data for me based on the uploaded data.

Assistant: Of course, according to your requirements, the expression I generated is $[*, c, *, \sin, x_1, \cos, x_2]$.

Conversation 2

Human: : <Data> I want to expression with **periodicity** on the variable **x1** to fit the above data.

Assistant: According to your requirements, we will generate the expression for you is $[*, c, *, \sin, x_1, \cos, x_2]$.

Conversation 3

Human: : <Data> I want to generate an expression with symbols $[\sin, \cos]$ to fit the above data.

Assistant: Well, we get an expression for you is $[*, c, *, \sin, x_1, \cos, x_2]$.

Conversation 4

Human: : <Data> I want to generate an expression with **10** symbols or less to fit the above data.

Assistant: OK, the expression I found is $[*, c, *, \sin, x_1, \cos, x_2]$.

Conversation 5

Human: : <Data> I want to generate an expression consisting of the symbols $[*, \sin, \cos, x_1, x_2]$ to fit the above data.

Assistant: We generate the expression for you is $[*, c, *, \sin, x_1, \cos, x_2]$.

Conversation 6

Human: : <Data> Generate an expression to fit the data. Note that the data is noisy, so be careful about robustness.

Assistant: We generate the expression for you is $[*, c, *, \sin, x_1, \cos, x_2]$.

Figure 2: Schematic representation of the expression $y = 2 \sin(x_1) \cos(x_1)$ related question-answer pair generation.

3.1 Expressions generation

In MLLM-SR, we use symbols $[+, -, /, \sin, \cos, \log, \text{sqrt}, C, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$. Here, C denotes a constant placeholder (for example, $\sin(2.6x)$ can be written as $\sin(C*x)$, with its preorder traversal being $[\sin, *, C, x]$), and $[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ represents variables. Expressions composed of these symbols can be represented in the form of a binary tree. By performing a preorder traversal of the binary tree, we can obtain a sequence of symbols. Therefore, we randomly sample a sequence of symbols in the above symbol library. The sequence of symbols is then restored to an expression and sampled to obtain $[X, Y]$. Specifically, we introduce the $\text{Arity}(s)$ function if s is a binary operator. e.g. $[+, -, *, /]$, then $\text{Arity}(s)=2$; Similarly, if s is a unary operator. e.g. $[\sin, \cos, \exp, \log, \text{sqrt}]$, then $\text{Arity}(s)=1$; If s is a variable $[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ or a constant placeholder 'C', then $\text{Arity}(s)=0$.

3.1.1 Generation stop decision: $\text{count} = 0$

Before generating the expression, we import a counter variable, count , and initialize it to 1. We then randomly select a symbol, s , from the symbol library and update the count according to the formula $\text{count} = \text{count} - \text{Arity}(s) - 1$. This process is repeated until $\text{count} = 0$. At this point, we have constructed a complete sequence of expressions.

3.1.2 Generation constraints

To ensure the generated expressions are meaningful, we impose the following restrictions:

1. Trigonometric functions cannot be nested (e.g., $\sin(\cos(x))$), as such forms are rarely encountered in real-life scenarios.
2. For functions like $\log(x)$ and \sqrt{x} , the argument x cannot be negative. For instance, expressions like $\log(\sin(x))$ and $\sqrt{\cos(x)}$ are invalid because both $\sin(x)$ and $\cos(x)$ can take negative values.

3.2 Training data collection

In section 3.1, we generated a number of expressions, and for each expression, we can generate multiple $Q\&A$ data according to certain rules. For each expression, we have a specific form of the expression, preorder traversal, various properties (periodicity, symmetry), and preorder traversal length. With this information, we can generate question-answering data like the one in Fig.2. To be specific, For each piece of data. We generate question-answer pairs by the following method. Specifically, we have a $\langle \text{Data} \rangle$ symbol in front of each request sentence, indicating that this is a data feature.

- 1, we generate a question-answer pair that only asks the model to generate expressions that fit the data, as in traditional symbolic regression.
- 2, generate expressions that satisfy some property, such as the expression $y=x$, which is periodic with respect to both variables. We can then ask the model to generate expressions that are periodic with respect to x_1 , periodic with respect to x_2 , and periodic with respect to each variable. The same goes for symmetries.
- 3, For asking which symbols to include in the expression generated by MLLM-SR we randomly choose n symbols at a time from the preorder traversal S , where $n < \text{len}(S)$, is a random integer between 1 and $\text{len}(S)$. Then, the selected symbols are embedded into the corresponding sentence to obtain a complete sentence.
- 4, We require the length of the preorder traversal of the expression generated by MLLM-SR to be less than a certain number M_L . We will add a random integer between 0 and 20 to the length of the expression preorder traversal to obtain the number M_L . Then M_L is embedded into the corresponding statement to obtain a complete dialogue.
- 5, We want MLLM-SR to generate expressions using only certain symbols. We will process the preorder traversal of the expression to filter out repeated symbols and then embed the resulting sequence of symbols into the corresponding statement to obtain a complete dialogue.

- 6, If we want MLLM-SR to have some noise immunity, we randomly add some Gaussian noise with different levels to the clean data. We then generate question-answer pairs about generating robust expressions from noisy data.

3.3 Constant optimization

LLM will first generate the preorder traversal of the expression, and then for the expression with constant C, we will use function-calling technology to call BFGS and other numerical optimization algorithms to optimize the constant. Finally, we will output the optimized expression with a specific value. For example, if we get a preorder traversal of an expression, $[\ast, C, \sin, x]$, the corresponding expression is $C \ast \sin(x)$, then we need to use the BFGS algorithm to optimize the constant value at C with X as input and y as output.

3.4 Model architecture

In MLLM-SR1, we use SetTransformer trained with contrastive learning as the data feature extractor, whose parameters are frozen throughout. Then the data features extracted by SetTransformer are mapped to the word embedding space of LLM through the projection layer. Finally, we train the parameters of the projection layer and LLM together. We choose VicunaChiang et al. [2023] as our LLM f_φ parameterized by φ .

3.4.1 SetTransformer

The data information plays a crucial role in guiding the Decoder. To accommodate the permutation invariance of data features—where the dataset’s features should remain unchanged regardless of the input order—we utilize the SetTransformer as our data encoding method, as described by Lee et al. [2019]. Our encoder takes a set of data points $\mathcal{D} = \{X, y\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. These data points undergo an initial transformation via a trainable affine layer, which uplifts them into a latent space $h_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h}$. Subsequently, the data is processed through a series of Induced Set Attention Blocks (ISABs) Lee et al. [2019], which employ several layers of cross-attention mechanisms. Initially, a set of learnable vectors serves as queries, with the input data acting as the keys and values for the first cross-attention layer. The outputs from this first layer are then repurposed as keys and values for a subsequent cross-attention process, with the original dataset vectors as queries. Following these layers of cross-attention, we introduce a dropout layer to prevent overfitting. Finally, the output size is standardized through a final cross-attention operation that uses another set of learnable vectors as queries, ensuring that the output size remains consistent and does not vary with the number of inputs.

3.5 Model training

For each piece of data $X_D = [X, y]$, we have multi-turn question and answer pairs $[X_q^1, X_a^1, X_q^2, X_a^2, \dots, X_q^T, X_a^T]$. Where T stands for the total turns of question-answering. We organize them as a sequence $[X_D, X_q^1, X_a^1, X_q^2, X_a^2, \dots, X_q^T, X_a^T]$ by treating all answers as the assistant’s response, and the instruction $X_{instruct}^t$ at the t^{th} turn as follows:

$$X_{instruct}^t = \begin{cases} [X_v, X_q^1], & \text{When } t = 1 \\ X_q^t, & \text{When } t > 1 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We perform instruction-tuning of the LLM on the prediction tokens, using its original auto-regressive training objective. Specifically, for a sequence of length L, we compute the probability of the target answers X_a by:

$$p(X_a | X_v, X_{instruct}) = \prod_{i=1}^L p_\theta(x_i | X_v, X_{instruct, < i}, X_{a, < i}) \quad (2)$$

where θ is the trainable parameters, $X_{instruct, < i}$ and $X_{a, < i}$ are the instruction and answer tokens in all turns before the current prediction token x_i , respectively. We explicitly add X_D to emphasize the fact that the data is grounded for all answers. For MLLM-SR model training, we consider a two-stage instruction-tuning procedure.

Stage 1: Pre-training for Feature Alignment. In the first training step, we take 600K samples from all the datasets (including $[X_D, X_q, X_a]$) for feature alignment training. During training, we keep both the SetTransformer and LLM weights frozen and maximize the likelihood of Eq.2 using only the trainable parameters $\theta = W$ (the projection matrix). This allows the data features H_v to be aligned with the pre-trained LLM word embeddings. This stage can be understood as training a compatible data tokenizer for the frozen LLM.

Stage 2: Fine-tuning End-to-End. We always keep the SetTransformer weights frozen, and continue to update both the pre-trained weights of the projection layer and LLM in LLaVA; i.e., the trainable parameters are $\theta = \{W, \varphi\}$ in (3).

Table 1: At a 0.95 confidence level, a comparison of the coefficient of determination (R^2) was conducted between MLLM-SR and four baseline models. Bold values signify state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance.

Dataset	Name	MLLM-SR	MMSR	SNIP	SPL	NeSymReS
Nguyen-1	$x_1^3 + x_1^2 + x_1$	0.9999 ± 0.001	0.9999 ± 0.001	0.9993 ± 0.004	0.9983 ± 0.001	0.9925 ± 0.004
Nguyen-2	$x_1^4 + x_1^3 + x_1^2 + x_1$	0.9994 ± 0.004	0.9962 ± 0.002	0.9934 ± 0.002	0.9990 ± 0.002	0.9927 ± 0.002
Nguyen-3	$x_1^5 + x_1^4 + x_1^3 + x_1^2 + x_1$	0.9984 ± 0.002	0.9834 ± 0.003	0.9824 ± 0.004	0.9884 ± 0.001	0.9842 ± 0.001
Nguyen-4	$x_1^6 + x_1^5 + x_1^4 + x_1^3 + x_1^2 + x_1$	0.9909 ± 0.003	0.9889 ± 0.004	0.9899 ± 0.002	0.9902 ± 0.002	0.9831 ± 0.002
Nguyen-5	$\sin(x_1^2) \cos(x) - 1$	0.9804 ± 0.003	0.9626 ± 0.004	0.9824 ± 0.004	0.9833 ± 0.002	0.9642 ± 0.0003
Nguyen-6	$\sin(x_1) + \sin(x_1 + x_1^2)$	0.9782 ± 0.003	0.9836 ± 0.004	0.9823 ± 0.005	0.9872 ± 0.003	0.9637 ± 0.003
Nguyen-7	$\log(x_1 + 1) + \log(x_1^2 + 1)$	0.9828 ± 0.003	0.9811 ± 0.004	0.9725 ± 0.001	0.9622 ± 0.004	0.9505 ± 0.003
Nguyen-8	\sqrt{x}	1.0000 ± 0.000	0.9823 ± 0.003	0.9835 ± 0.004	0.9613 ± 0.003	0.9023 ± 0.002
Nguyen-9	$\sin(x) + \sin(x_2^2)$	1.0000 ± 0.000	0.9994 ± 0.005	0.9401 ± 0.004	0.9225 ± 0.004	0.8931 ± 0.004
Nguyen-10	$2 \sin(x) \cos(x_2)$	1.0000 ± 0.000	1.0000 ± 0.004	0.9702 ± 0.003	0.9633 ± 0.003	0.9264 ± 0.004
Nguyen-11	$x_1^{x_2}$	1.0000 ± 0.000	1.0000 ± 0.004	0.9622 ± 0.003	0.9354 ± 0.003	0.9096 ± 0.004
Nguyen-12	$x_1^4 - x_1^3 + \frac{1}{2}x_2^2 - x_2$	0.9979 ± 0.003	0.9829 ± 0.003	0.9734 ± 0.003	0.9524 ± 0.003	0.9042 ± 0.003
Average		0.9940	0.9884	0.9776	0.9703	0.9472

4 Experiment

To verify the performance of the MLLM-SR algorithm, we tested it on the Nguyen dataset. We selected four state-of-the-art baselines to compare with MLLM-SR. The details of the four baselines are as follows:

- **MMSR.** A pre-training method that treats symbolic regression as a multimodal problem and uses contrastive learning for modal alignment.
- **SPL.** An excellent algorithm that successfully applies the traditional MCTS to the field of symbolic regression.
- **NeSymReS.** This algorithm is categorized as a large-scale pre-training model.
- **SNIP.** A large-scale pre-trained model with a feature extractor trained with contrastive learning before training.

4.1 Comparison with baselines

The most important goal of symbolic regression is to find an expression from the observed data that accurately fits the given data. A very important indicator to judge the goodness of fit is the coefficient of determination (R^2). Therefore, we tested the five algorithms on Nguyen datasets, using R^2 as the standard. We run each expression in the dataset 20 times and then take the average of all the expressions in the dataset. And the confidence level Junk [1999], Costermans et al. [1992] is taken to be 0.95. The specific results are shown in Table 1. As we can see from the table, MLLM-SR is not optimal except on individual datasets. However, on the whole, MLLM-SR performs slightly better than the other four baselines. From the table, we can see that MLLM-SR performs worse than MMSR on Nguyen-6.




Figure 3: This figure shows the result comparison diagram of whether MLLM-SR introduces prior knowledge in the instruction. From the figure, we can see that introducing prior knowledge into the instruction can effectively improve the full recovery rate.

4.2 Instruction effect test

The full recovery rate of the algorithm is also an important index to evaluate the performance of the algorithm. The full recovery rate means that the final expression produced by the algorithm must be in the same form as the original expression ($R^2 \approx 1.0$), and not an approximate expression. To test whether natural language instructions can improve the quality of expressions generated by MLLM-SR, we test it on the Nguyen dataset as follows. First, in the instruction, we don't give it any prior knowledge (no requirements), we just ask it to generate an expression to fit the data. Then, we give the model some prior knowledge (requirements) in the instruction, combined with the expression situation. For example, for Nguyen-5, we'll ask it to generate an expression that contains the symbols sin and cos.

For each expression, we do the above two kinds of experiments 100 times each. Finally, the full recovery rate was calculated. The specific results are shown in Fig.3. From the figure, we can clearly see that giving prior knowledge of the instructions can significantly improve the quality of the expressions generated by MLLM-SR. This also proves that our aim of improving the quality of generated expressions by providing priors through natural language is achieved. More importantly, MLLM-SR does have the ability to generate expressions that match our needs.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we propose MLLM-SR, a conversational symbolic regression multi-modal large language model. All we need to do is upload our observations, and then we can talk to MLLM-SR via natural language commands and ask it to generate expressions that satisfy our requirements. For example, you need to generate expressions that contain the $\sin()$ operator, or you need to generate expressions that are symmetric. Specifically, we first manually generate a series of data expression pairs, and then generate a series of natural language question-answering pairs according to the characteristics of each expression to train MLLM-SR. We apply a SetTransformer trained with contrastive learning as the data feature extractor and freeze its parameters throughout. We first train a mapping layer to align the data feature space extracted by SetTransformer with the token space of LLM. Then, the parameters of the mapping layer and LLM are trained simultaneously.

Through experiments, we show that MLLM-SR can achieve expression generation by means of dialogue. When we give MLLM-SR natural language instructions with our prior knowledge, it can understand these instructions very well and generate expressions that meet the requirements according to the prior knowledge.

MLLM-SR significantly lowers the threshold for non-experts to use symbolic regression algorithms. This allows people in various fields to get large models to generate expressions that meet their requirements, just by means of natural language instructions. Next, we try to introduce more properties and functions.

Although MLLM-SR has achieved good results, it still has a lot of room for improvement. For example, some properties that are not in the training dataset are not well understood.

References

- Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2425–2433, 2015.
- Ignacio Araldo, Krzysztof Krawiec, and Una-May O’Reilly. Multiple regression genetic programming. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, pages 879–886, New York, NY, USA, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450326629. doi: 10.1145/2576768.2598291. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2576768.2598291>.
- Tommaso Bendinelli, Luca Biggio, and Pierre-Alexandre Kamienny. Controllable neural symbolic regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2063–2077. PMLR, 2023.
- Luca Biggio, Tommaso Bendinelli, Alexander Neitz, Aurelien Lucchi, and Giambattista Parascandolo. Neural symbolic regression that scales. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 936–945. PMLR, 2021.
- Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, David Lopez-Paz, and Arthur Szlam. Optimizing the latent space of generative networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.05776*, 2017.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 2023.
- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020.
- Xi Chen, Josip Djolonga, Piotr Padlewski, Basil Mustafa, Soravit Changpinyo, Jialin Wu, Carlos Riquelme Ruiz, Sebastian Goodman, Xiao Wang, Yi Tay, et al. Pali-x: On scaling up a multilingual vision and language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18565*, 2023.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023), 2(3):6, 2023.
- Jean Costermans, Guy Lories, and Catherine Ansay. Confidence level and feeling of knowing in question answering: The weight of inferential processes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 18(1):142, 1992.
- Rémi Coulom. Efficient selectivity and backup operators in monte-carlo tree search. In *International conference on computers and games*, pages 72–83. Springer, 2006.
- Kei Sen Fong, Shelvia Wongso, and Mehul Motani. Rethinking symbolic regression: Morphology and adaptability in the context of evolutionary algorithms. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Hado Hasselt. Double q-learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 23, 2010.
- Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9729–9738, 2020.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR, 2021.

- Thomas Junk. Confidence level computation for combining searches with small statistics. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, 434(2-3):435–443, 1999.
- Pierre-Alexandre Kamienny, Stéphane d’Ascoli, Guillaume Lample, and François Charton. End-to-end symbolic regression with transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:10269–10281, 2022.
- Pierre-Alexandre Kamienny, Guillaume Lample, Sylvain Lamprier, and Marco Virgolin. Deep generative symbolic regression with monte-carlo-tree-search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11223*, 2023.
- Samuel Kim, Peter Y Lu, Srijon Mukherjee, Michael Gilbert, Li Jing, Vladimir Čeperić, and Marin Soljačić. Integration of neural network-based symbolic regression in deep learning for scientific discovery. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(9):4166–4177, 2020.
- Wonjae Kim, Bokyung Son, and Ildoo Kim. Vilt: Vision-and-language transformer without convolution or region supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5583–5594. PMLR, 2021.
- Juho Lee, Yoonho Lee, Jungtaek Kim, Adam Kosiosek, Seungjin Choi, and Yee Whye Teh. Set transformer: A framework for attention-based permutation-invariant neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3744–3753. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/lee19d.html>.
- Junnan Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven CH Hoi. Mopro: Webly supervised learning with momentum prototypes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07995*, 2020a.
- Junnan Li, Pan Zhou, Caiming Xiong, and Steven CH Hoi. Prototypical contrastive learning of unsupervised representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04966*, 2020b.
- Junnan Li, Ramprasaath Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:9694–9705, 2021.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022.
- Yanjie Li, Weijun Li, Lina Yu, Min Wu, Jinyi Liu, Wenqiang Li, Meilan Hao, Shu Wei, and Yusong Deng. Metasymnet: A dynamic symbolic regression network capable of evolving into arbitrary formulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07326*, 2023.
- Yanjie Li, Weijun Li, Lina Yu, Min Wu, Jingyi Liu, Wenqiang Li, Meilan Hao, Shu Wei, and Yusong Deng. Discovering mathematical formulas from data via gpt-guided monte carlo tree search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14424*, 2024a.
- Yanjie Li, Jingyi Liu, Weijun Li, Lina Yu, Min Wu, Wenqiang Li, Meilan Hao, Su Wei, and Yusong Deng. Mmsr: Symbolic regression is a multimodal task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18603*, 2024b.
- Dong C Liu and Jorge Nocedal. On the limited memory bfgs method for large scale optimization. *Mathematical programming*, 45(1-3):503–528, 1989.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024a.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024b.
- Trent McConaghy. *FFX: Fast, Scalable, Deterministic Symbolic Regression Technology*. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2011. ISBN 978-1-4614-1770-5. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4614-1770-5_13. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-1770-5_13.

- Kazem Meidani, Parshin Shojaee, Chandan K Reddy, and Amir Barati Farimani. Snip: Bridging mathematical symbolic and numeric realms with unified pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02227*, 2023.
- T Nathan Mundhenk, Mikel Landajuela, Ruben Glatt, Claudio P Santiago, Daniel M Faissol, and Brenden K Petersen. Symbolic regression via neural-guided genetic programming population seeding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00053*, 2021.
- Su Nguyen, Mengjie Zhang, and Kay Chen Tan. Surrogate-assisted genetic programming with simplified models for automated design of dispatching rules. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 47(9):2951–2965, 2017. doi: 10.1109/TCYB.2016.2562674.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Brenden K Petersen, Mikel Landajuela, T Nathan Mundhenk, Claudio P Santiago, Soo K Kim, and Joanne T Kim. Deep symbolic regression: Recovering mathematical expressions from data via risk-seeking policy gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04871*, 2019.
- AJ Piergiovanni, Wei Li, Weicheng Kuo, Mohammad Saffar, Fred Bertsch, and Anelia Angelova. Answer-me: Multi-task open-vocabulary visual question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.00949*, 2022.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- Parshin Shojaee, Kazem Meidani, Amir Barati Farimani, and Chandan Reddy. Transformer-based planning for symbolic regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Amanpreet Singh, Ronghang Hu, Vedanuj Goswami, Guillaume Couairon, Wojciech Galuba, Marcus Rohrbach, and Douwe Kiela. Flava: A foundational language and vision alignment model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15638–15650, 2022.
- Fangzheng Sun, Yang Liu, Jian-Xun Wang, and Hao Sun. Symbolic physics learner: Discovering governing equations via monte carlo tree search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13134*, 2022.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- Silviu-Marian Udrescu and Max Tegmark. Ai feynman: A physics-inspired method for symbolic regression. *Science Advances*, 6(16):eaay2631, 2020.
- Mojtaba Valipour, Bowen You, Maysum Panju, and Ali Ghodsi. Symbolicgpt: A generative transformer model for symbolic regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14131*, 2021.
- Martin Vastl, Jonáš Kulhánek, Jiří Kubalík, Erik Derner, and Robert Babuška. Symformer: End-to-end symbolic regression using transformer-based architecture. *IEEE Access*, 2024.
- Peng Wang, An Yang, Rui Men, Junyang Lin, Shuai Bai, Zhikang Li, Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. Ofa: Unifying architectures, tasks, and modalities through a simple sequence-to-sequence learning framework. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 23318–23340. PMLR, 2022a.
- Wenhui Wang, Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Johan Bjorck, Zhiliang Peng, Qiang Liu, Kriti Aggarwal, Owais Khan Mohammed, Saksham Singhal, Subhojit Som, et al. Image as a foreign language: Beit pretraining for all vision and vision-language tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10442*, 2022b.

Zirui Wang, Jiahui Yu, Adams Wei Yu, Zihang Dai, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Yuan Cao. Simvlm: Simple visual language model pretraining with weak supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.10904*, 2021.

Yilong Xu, Yang Liu, and Hao Sun. Reinforcement symbolic regression machine.

Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, et al. Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02414*, 2022.

Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.