

FEM-BENCH: A STRUCTURED SCIENTIFIC REASONING BENCHMARK FOR EVALUATING CODE-GENERATING LLMs

A PREPRINT

 **Saeed Mohammadzadeh***

Department of Mechanical Engineering
Boston University
Boston, MA
saeedmh@bu.edu

 **Erfan Hamdi***

Department of Mechanical Engineering
Boston University
Boston, MA
erfan@bu.edu

 **Joel Shor**

1. Move37 Labs
2. Department of Mechanical Engineering, Boston University
joel.shor@move37labs.ai

 **Emma Lejeune**

Department of Mechanical Engineering
Boston University
Boston, MA
elejeune@bu.edu

December 25, 2025

ABSTRACT

As LLMs advance their reasoning capabilities about the physical world, the absence of rigorous benchmarks for evaluating their ability to generate scientifically valid physical models has become a critical gap. Computational mechanics, the discipline that develops and applies mathematical models and numerical methods to predict the behavior of physical systems under forces, deformation, and constraints, provides an ideal foundation for structured scientific reasoning based evaluation. Problems follow clear mathematical structure, enforce strict physical and numerical constraints, and support objective verification. The discipline also requires constructing explicit models of physical systems and reasoning about geometry, spatial relationships, and material behavior, which connects directly to emerging goals in AI related to physical reasoning and world modeling. We introduce FEM-Bench, a computational mechanics benchmark designed to evaluate the ability of LLMs to generate correct finite element method (FEM) and related code. FEM-Bench 2025 contains a suite of introductory but nontrivial tasks aligned with material from a first graduate course on computational mechanics. These tasks capture essential numerical and physical modeling challenges while representing only a small fraction of the complexity present in the discipline. Despite their simplicity, state-of-the-art LLMs do not reliably solve all of them. In a five attempt run, the best performing model at function writing, Gemini 3 Pro, completed 30/33 tasks at least one out of five times, and 26/33 tasks five out of five times. The best performing model at unit test writing, GPT-5, had an Average Joint Success Rate of 73.8%. Other popular models showed a broad range of performance on the benchmark. FEM-Bench establishes a structured foundation for evaluating AI-generated scientific code, and future iterations will incorporate increasingly sophisticated tasks to track progress as models evolve.

Keywords Large Language Models (LLMs) · Finite Element Method (FEM) · LLM Benchmark · Scientific Machine Learning · Computational Mechanics · Scientific Computing · Code Generation

*Saeed Mohammadzadeh and Erfan Hamdi are co-first authors

1 Introduction

Modern AI systems are increasingly evaluated on their ability to build internal models of the physical world, including reasoning about forces, geometry, spatial relationships, and the mechanical behavior of physical systems [Bakhtin et al., 2019, Wang et al., 2023]. Simultaneously, large language models (LLMs) show growing potential to assist with scientific and engineering workflows, including reasoning about physical systems and automated generation of simulation and analysis code [Cui et al., 2025]. As these models advance, a central question emerges: can LLMs produce implementations of physics-based numerical methods that are correct, reliable, and scientifically meaningful? Existing code-generation benchmarks test general programming logic [Austin et al., 2021a, Chen et al., 2021a], software engineering skills [Jimenez et al., 2023], and mathematical reasoning [Glazer et al., 2024], but no widely used benchmarks evaluate an LLMs ability to carry out the physical modeling, numerical discretization, and structured computational reasoning required for advanced scientific computing [Tian et al., 2024]. Computational mechanics, the discipline that formulates and solves mathematical models of physical systems using numerical methods, provides a natural and rigorous domain in which to investigate these capabilities.

Computational-mechanicsbased tasks represent a particularly important frontier for LLM capabilities [Jiang et al., 2025]. Physics-based simulations grounded in this discipline underpin real-world applications in domains as diverse as robotics [Huang et al., 2020], digital twins of aircraft and human systems [Niederer et al., 2021], climate modeling [Danabasoglu et al., 2020], and engineering design and optimization [Talischi et al., 2012]. Across these areas, several themes are consistent: successful simulation requires the seamless integration of mathematics, physics, geometry, numerical methods, and programming, and correctness is non-negotiable. A program that runs but produces a non-convergent, unstable, or physically impossible result is of no scientific value [Peng, 2011]. For this reason, computational mechanics has a long and mature tradition of verification, validation, and uncertainty quantification [Oberkampf and Roy, 2010], providing structured, quantitative tools for assessing whether a model is numerically consistent, physically plausible, and predictive. These practices make the domain especially well-suited for evaluating LLM-generated code, because failures are interpretable, quantitatively measurable, and can be traced not only to programming or structural errors but also to deeper mistakes in implementing governing equations, enforcing numerical consistency, handling geometric transformations, or managing floating-pointsensitive operations such as numerical integration and matrix assembly [Arndt et al., 2023, Alnæs et al., 2015].

Thus, this branch of scientific computing provides a well-structured and scientifically grounded testbed for critically evaluating the emerging capabilities of LLMs. Problems in computational mechanics follow a precise mathematical pipeline: e.g., governing equations are formulated, converted into weak or variational forms, discretized into finite-dimensional approximations, and assembled into global algebraic systems [Courant et al., 1994, Turner et al., 1956]. Solutions are then validated through objective numerical checks such as symmetry, consistency, and mesh convergence [Zienkiewicz and Taylor, 1997]. From the perspective of LLM reasoning, these tasks span multiple forms of structured cognition: hierarchical reasoning in which local element routines combine into global models; geometric transformations across coordinate systems; the construction of explicit models of physical systems; and careful handling of numerical integration, stability, and floating-pointsensitive operations. Moreover, the computational mechanics literature is extensive and mature. The computational mechanics literature spans classic textbooks [Hughes, 2003], widely taught graduate curricula in engineering [Garikipati, 2015, Shojaei et al., 2025], and ongoing research at the frontier of numerical methods development [Kamarei et al., 2026], offering a rich, well-understood space of problems with clear expectations for correctness and implementation quality [Szabó and Babuška, 2021].

In this work, we introduce FEM-Bench, a benchmark designed to evaluate the ability of LLMs to generate correct implementations of finite element method (FEM) and related computational mechanics tasks. FEM-Bench 2025 focuses on introductory but nontrivial tasks aligned with material from a first graduate course on FEM. These tasks isolate essential numerical and physical modeling challenges while remaining amenable to automated evaluation. Despite their relative simplicity, we find that state-of-the-art LLMs show significant room for improvement, revealing significant gaps between current model capabilities and the requirements of physics-based scientific computing.

The contributions of this paper are threefold. First, we present the FEM-Bench framework, including its design principles and scope. Second, we provide a suite of tasks and corresponding evaluation tools grounded in canonical computational mechanics concepts. Third, we conduct a baseline evaluation across several leading LLMs to characterize current performance. Looking forward, FEM-Bench establishes a foundation for increasingly challenging computational mechanics tasks in future iterations, enabling systematic tracking of progress in scientific computing specific code generation.


2 Background

This Section provides background on computational mechanics as a domain for evaluating LLMs, emphasizing physical grounding, algorithmic structure, and rigorous verification culture. We then motivate the need for FEM-Bench as a benchmark designed to probe these capabilities in a scientifically meaningful setting.

2.1 Computational Mechanics as a Test of Physical World Modeling

Computational mechanics provides the mathematical and numerical foundation for simulating the behavior of physical systems under forces, deformation, and constraints [Belytschko et al., 2014, Gurtin et al., 2010]. At its core, the field translates physical laws into solvable mathematical models, which are then discretized and implemented as algorithms suitable for computation [Langtangen, 2003]. In doing so, computational mechanics serves as a direct test of whether a model can correctly represent and reason about the physical world in algorithmic form. Among the many techniques used in computational mechanics, the Finite Element Method (FEM) and Matrix Structural Analysis (MSA) are two of the most widely taught and broadly applied approaches [Hughes, 2003, McGuire et al., 2000]. MSA predates FEM and was originally developed to analyze framed structures such as trusses and beams using stiffness matrices derived directly from structural mechanics [Argyris et al., 1960, Turner et al., 1956]. Although more specialized in scope, MSA shares the same foundational principles as FEM: local element stiffness relations, coordinate transformations, and global assembly and is often viewed as an early, specialized precursor to the broader finite element framework [Cook et al., 2007]. These shared ideas make MSA a natural companion to FEM in introductory mechanics curricula and a relevant component of the FEM-Bench task space [Felippa, 2004].

(i) Solid mechanics problem: Given loads and boundary conditions solve for deformation



(ii) Discretization with the finite element method (FEM)




Figure 1: Schematic overview of the finite element method (FEM). (i) A solid mechanics problem: given loads and boundary conditions on the reference configuration, solve for the deformation mapping to the deformed configuration. (ii) Discretization step: the continuous domain is approximated by a mesh of finite elements and nodes, enabling numerical solution of the relevant governing equations.

2.2 Computational Mechanics as a Test of Structured, Multistep Reasoning

At a high level, FEM proceeds through a well-defined sequence of modeling steps. Each step depends on the correct execution of preceding stages, requiring careful composition of intermediate representations and computations. As illustrated in Fig. 1, a continuous physical domain is first subdivided into a finite mesh of elements. Physical governing equations are expressed in a weak or variational form, enabling approximate solutions in finite-dimensional function spaces [Strang et al., 1973]. On each element, basis (or shape) functions define how the unknown field varies locally, and numerical quadrature is used to evaluate integrals appearing in the weak form [Hughes, 2003, Press, 2007]. These element-level contributions are then assembled into a global algebraic system whose solution approximates the physical equilibrium state or transient evolution of the system [Bathe, 1996]. A schematic illustration of the discretization appears in Fig. 1. This mathematical pipeline is central to nearly all engineering simulation software and forms the conceptual backbone of FEM-Bench.

The mechanics tasks underlying FEM, and by extension MSA, involve several forms of structured computational reasoning that are highly relevant for evaluating modern LLMs [Tian et al., 2024]. Hierarchical reasoning is required because global behavior emerges from local element routines combined through assembly operators [Arndt et al., 2023]. Geometric reasoning appears through coordinate transformations, Jacobians, and mappings between reference and global coordinate systems [Cottrell et al., 2009]. Numerical reasoning arises through quadrature rules, element stiffness derivations, matrix assembly, stability considerations, and floating-point-sensitive calculations [Higham, 2002]. Finally, physical reasoning is inherent to the discipline: implementations must faithfully encode conservation laws, constitutive relations, and boundary conditions [Holzapfel, 2002]. These components appear even in introductory FEM tasks, making the domain particularly suitable for probing LLM capabilities in scientific computing.

2.3 Verification and Evaluation in Computational Mechanics

An essential pillar of computational mechanics, equally relevant for benchmarking, is its strong culture of verification, validation, and uncertainty quantification (VUQ) [Oberkampf and Roy, 2010]. These practices transform numerical implementations into testable artifacts with well-defined correctness criteria, making them particularly suitable for diagnostic evaluation. Because simulation outputs must reflect real physical behavior, the field has developed rigorous practices for assessing correctness, including patch tests, equilibrium checks, symmetry requirements, energy consistency, and mesh convergence studies [Belytschko et al., 2014, Cook et al., 2007, Macneal and Harder, 1985, Roache, 1998]. These methods provide objective, quantitative signals of whether an implementation is functioning correctly. For evaluating LLM-generated code, such tests are especially valuable: they make failures interpretable and help distinguish mistakes in programming logic [Ammann and Offutt, 2017], geometry handling [Foley, 1996], numerical implementation [Trefethen and Bau, 2022], or floating-point-sensitive operations such as numerical integration and matrix assembly [Higham, 2002].

2.4 Motivation for FEM-Bench

The broader landscape of existing LLM benchmarks highlights the need for a physics-based alternative. Popular code-generation benchmarks such as HumanEval [Chen et al., 2021b], MBPP [Austin et al., 2021b], SWE-Bench [Jimenez et al., 2024], and DS-1000 [Lai et al., 2022] evaluate programming logic, tool use, or general software engineering skills. Datasets targeting physical reasoning often focus on qualitative judgments or simplified environments rather than implementation of scientific algorithms [Hamdi and Lejeune, 2026, Lejeune, 2020, Shor et al., 2025]. Likewise, benchmarks for mathematics [Hendrycks et al., 2021] or symbolic reasoning [Mirzadeh et al., 2025] do not require translating equations into stable, reliable numerical code. While recent efforts like FEABench [Mudur et al., 2024] introduce agent-based tasks that interact with professional simulation software, they primarily measure the ability to navigate complex software APIs and external tools; this highlights a critical need to decouple the interpretation of software documentation from the actual implementation of the underlying physical and numerical reasoning. As a result, there is a limited availability of benchmarks to evaluate whether LLMs can generate the kinds of physics-grounded, numerically consistent programs that underpin modern scientific computing [Tian et al., 2024].

Computational mechanics therefore provides both the conceptual structure and the evaluative tools needed for such an assessment [Oberkampf and Roy, 2010]. Its combination of mathematical rigor, geometric complexity, numerical precision, and physical grounding makes it an ideal basis for the development of FEM-Bench [Hughes, 2003, McGuire et al., 2000]. In short, FEM-Bench simultaneously tests a collection of general-purpose, high-value LLM capabilities that rarely naturally occur together: **self-verification**, **multi-step reasoning**, **algorithmic fidelity**, and **memorization**. In the next section, we introduce the benchmark design and describe the task suite that forms the FEM-Bench 2025 release.

3 Methods

This Section describes the FEM-Bench methodology, including the structure of the benchmark, the construction of tasks and prompts, the evaluation pipeline for code and test generation, and the initial selection of LLMs to evaluate. FEM-Bench follows a modular design: tasks are defined as self-contained Python modules, prompts are generated automatically from task metadata, LLM outputs are parsed and validated, and results are computed through reference-based numerical and unit-testing procedures. The framework is designed for reproducibility, extensibility, and principled evaluation. A high-level overview of the FEM-Bench workflow, including task loading, prompt generation, model inference, and evaluation, is shown in Fig. 2.




Figure 2: **Overview of the FEM-Bench workflow.** Tasks are defined as self-contained Python modules specifying reference implementations, dependencies, and unit tests. The core FEM-Bench software loads these tasks, constructs standardized prompts for both code-generation and test-generation, and interfaces with LLMs through model-specific API clients. LLM outputs (generated code and test suites) are then parsed, validated, and evaluated using reference-based numerical checks and expected-failure unit tests. The framework produces detailed scores for each model and task, enabling reproducible and interpretable comparison of LLM performance.

3.1 Problem Definition

FEM-Bench evaluates two complementary capabilities of LLMs: the ability to generate numerically correct scientific code, and the ability to generate unit tests that verify that code. In this benchmark, producing correct code means generating a Python function that conforms to a prescribed signature, runs without syntax errors, and returns outputs that satisfy the mathematical and physical requirements of the task. Similarly, producing a correct unit test means generating tests written using `pytest`, a widely used Python testing framework, that execute without errors, pass on the reference implementation, and fail on a curated set of known incorrect implementations. Because scientific software correctness depends as much on verification as on implementation, FEM-Bench treats code synthesis and test synthesis as intertwined, first-class components of the benchmark. Together, these two components define the core problem that FEM-Bench poses to LLMs: not simply producing code that runs, but producing code and unit tests that are technically correct.

3.2 Task Definition and Structure

FEM-Bench defines each task as a self-contained Python module with a standardized, explicit structure designed for transparency, reproducibility, and extensibility. Every task includes: a reference implementation with a detailed docstring (which becomes part of the LLM prompt), `Pytest`-style test functions with descriptive docstrings (also incorporated directly into the prompt), optional dependency functions, known incorrect implementations used as expected failures, and a single `task_info()` function. The `task_info()` function assembles these components into a structured

dictionary that contains all metadata and source code required for prompt generation, execution, and evaluation. This “source-first” design ensures that tasks remain fully executable and easy to inspect or extend. The full task template is shown in Listing 1.

Listing 1: FEM-Bench task template

```
import numpy as np

# === Dependency functions (if any) ===
def helper_1(...):
    ...
def helper_2(...):
    ...

# === Reference implementation ===
def main_fcn(...):
    """Compute or solve something."""
    ...

# === Test functions ===
def test_case_1(fcn):
    """Docstring explaining what is tested."""
    ...

# === Known failing examples (optional) ===
def fail_case_1(...):
    ...
def fail_case_2(...):
    ...

# === task_info() metadata ===
def task_info():
    task_id = "unique_task_name"
    task_short_description = "concise description of what the task does"
    created_date = "YYYY-MM-DD"
    created_by = "your_name"

    main_fcn = main_fcn
    required_imports = [
        "import numpy as np",
        "import pytest",
        # additional imports if needed
    ]

    fcn_dependencies = [helper_1, helper_2] # or [] if none

    reference_verification_inputs = [
        # List of lists: each sublist contains args for main_fcn
        [arg1, arg2, ...],
        ...
    ]

    test_cases = [
        {
            "test_code": test_case_1,
            "expected_failures": [fail_case_1, fail_case_2] # or []
        },
        ...
    ]

    return {
        "task_id": task_id,
        "task_short_description": task_short_description,
        "created_date": created_date,
        "created_by": created_by,
```

```

    "main_fcn": main_fcn,
    "required_imports": required_imports,
    "fcn_dependencies": fcn_dependencies,
    "reference_verification_inputs": reference_verification_inputs,
    "test_cases": test_cases,
    "allow_negation_for_match": False,
    "python_version": "version_number",
    "package_versions": {"numpy": "version"},
}

```

When a task is loaded, FEM-Bench extracts and normalizes the source code for the reference function, helpers, and tests, and stores them in a Task object defined in `task_base.py`. This object provides the canonical representation of the task throughout the remainder of the pipeline, including prompt construction, LLM inference, and evaluation.

3.2.1 Example Task

To ground this template in a concrete example, Listing 2 shows an actual FEM-Bench task from the FEM-Bench 2025 suite. This task defines the local 12×12 elastic stiffness matrix for a 3D Euler–Bernoulli beam element, along with two pytest-style test functions. The first test (`test_local_stiffness_3D_beam`) checks structural properties such as symmetry, rigidity, and consistency of axial, torsional, and bending terms. The second test (`test_cantilever_deflection_matches_euler_bernoulli`) compares numerical displacements with closed-form Euler–Bernoulli beam theory under different loading directions. The `task_info()` function then packages the reference implementation, verification inputs, and expected-failure implementations into the standardized FEM-Bench task format.

Listing 2: Example FEM-Bench task: local stiffness matrix for a 3D Euler–Bernoulli beam element.

```

import numpy as np

def MSA_3D_local_elastic_stiffness_CC0_H0_T0(
    E: float,
    nu: float,
    A: float,
    L: float,
    Iy: float,
    Iz: float,
    J: float
) -> np.ndarray:
    """
    Return the 12x12 local elastic stiffness matrix for a 3D Euler-Bernoulli beam
    element.

    The beam is assumed to be aligned with the local x-axis. The stiffness matrix
    relates local nodal displacements and rotations to forces and moments using the
    equation:

        [force_vector] = [stiffness_matrix] @ [displacement_vector]

    Degrees of freedom are ordered as:
        [u1, v1, w1, x1, y1, z1, u2, v2, w2, x2, y2, z2]

    Where:
        - u, v, w: displacements along local x, y, z
        - x, y, z: rotations about local x, y, z
        - Subscripts 1 and 2 refer to node i and node j of the element

    Parameters:
        E (float): Young's modulus
        nu (float): Poisson's ratio (used for torsion only)
        A (float): Cross-sectional area
        L (float): Length of the beam element
        Iy (float): Second moment of area about the local y-axis
    """

```

```

    Iz (float): Second moment of area about the local z-axis
    J (float): Torsional constant

Returns:
    np.ndarray: A 12x12 symmetric stiffness matrix representing axial, torsional,
                and bending stiffness in local coordinates.
"""
k_e = np.zeros((12, 12))
# Axial terms - extension of local x axis
axial_stiffness = E * A / L
k_e[0, 0] = axial_stiffness
k_e[0, 6] = -axial_stiffness
k_e[6, 0] = -axial_stiffness
k_e[6, 6] = axial_stiffness
# Torsion terms - rotation about local x axis
torsional_stiffness = E * J / (2.0 * (1 + nu) * L)
k_e[3, 3] = torsional_stiffness
k_e[3, 9] = -torsional_stiffness
k_e[9, 3] = -torsional_stiffness
k_e[9, 9] = torsional_stiffness
# Bending terms - bending about local z axis
k_e[1, 1] = E * 12.0 * Iz / L ** 3.0
k_e[1, 7] = E * -12.0 * Iz / L ** 3.0
k_e[7, 1] = E * -12.0 * Iz / L ** 3.0
k_e[7, 7] = E * 12.0 * Iz / L ** 3.0
k_e[1, 5] = E * 6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
k_e[5, 1] = E * 6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
k_e[1, 11] = E * 6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
k_e[11, 1] = E * 6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
k_e[5, 7] = E * -6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
k_e[7, 5] = E * -6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
k_e[7, 11] = E * -6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
k_e[11, 7] = E * -6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
k_e[5, 5] = E * 4.0 * Iz / L
k_e[11, 11] = E * 4.0 * Iz / L
k_e[5, 11] = E * 2.0 * Iz / L
k_e[11, 5] = E * 2.0 * Iz / L
# Bending terms - bending about local y axis
k_e[2, 2] = E * 12.0 * Iy / L ** 3.0
k_e[2, 8] = E * -12.0 * Iy / L ** 3.0
k_e[8, 2] = E * -12.0 * Iy / L ** 3.0
k_e[8, 8] = E * 12.0 * Iy / L ** 3.0
k_e[2, 4] = E * -6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
k_e[4, 2] = E * -6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
k_e[2, 10] = E * -6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
k_e[10, 2] = E * -6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
k_e[4, 8] = E * 6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
k_e[8, 4] = E * 6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
k_e[8, 10] = E * 6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
k_e[10, 8] = E * 6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
k_e[4, 4] = E * 4.0 * Iy / L
k_e[10, 10] = E * 4.0 * Iy / L
k_e[4, 10] = E * 2.0 * Iy / L
k_e[10, 4] = E * 2.0 * Iy / L
return k_e

def test_local_stiffness_3D_beam(fcn):
    """
    Comprehensive test for local_elastic_stiffness_matrix_3D_beam:
    - shape check
    - symmetry
    - expected singularity due to rigid body modes
    - block-level verification of axial, torsion, and bending terms
    """

```



```

# Beam properties
E = 200e9          # Young's modulus
nu = 0.3           # Poisson's ratio
A = 0.01           # Cross-sectional area
L = 2.0            # Length of the beam
Iy = 8             # Moment of inertia about y
Iz = 6             # Moment of inertia about z
J = 1             # Torsional constant

k = fcn(E, nu, A, L, Iy, Iz, J)

# --- Shape check ---
assert k.shape == (12, 12)

# --- Symmetry check ---
assert np.allclose(k, k.T, atol=1e-12)

# --- Singularity check (due to 6 rigid-body modes) ---
eigvals = np.linalg.eigvalsh(k)
min_eigval = np.min(np.abs(eigvals))
assert min_eigval < 1e-10, f"Expected a zero eigenvalue, but smallest was {
    min_eigval:.2e}"

# --- Axial terms block ---
expected_axial = E * A / L
assert np.isclose(k[0, 0], expected_axial, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[0, 6], -expected_axial, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[6, 0], -expected_axial, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[6, 6], expected_axial, rtol=1e-12)

# --- Torsional terms block (theta_x DOFs) ---
G = E / (2 * (1 + nu))
expected_torsion = G * J / L
assert np.isclose(k[3, 3], expected_torsion, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[3, 9], -expected_torsion, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[9, 3], -expected_torsion, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[9, 9], expected_torsion, rtol=1e-12)

# --- Bending about local z (vtheta_z: DOFs 1, 5, 7, 11) ---
expected_bz_11 = E * 12.0 * Iz / L**3
expected_bz_15 = E * 6.0 * Iz / L**2
expected_bz_55 = E * 4.0 * Iz / L
expected_bz_511 = E * 2.0 * Iz / L
assert np.isclose(k[1, 1], expected_bz_11, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[1, 5], expected_bz_15, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[5, 5], expected_bz_55, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[5, 11], expected_bz_511, rtol=1e-12)

# --- Bending about local y (wtheta_y: DOFs 2, 4, 8, 10) ---
expected_by_22 = E * 12.0 * Iy / L**3
expected_by_24 = -E * 6.0 * Iy / L**2
expected_by_44 = E * 4.0 * Iy / L
expected_by_410 = E * 2.0 * Iy / L
assert np.isclose(k[2, 2], expected_by_22, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[2, 4], expected_by_24, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[4, 4], expected_by_44, rtol=1e-12)
assert np.isclose(k[4, 10], expected_by_410, rtol=1e-12)

def test_cantilever_deflection_matches_euler_bernoulli(fcn):
    """
    Apply a perpendicular point load in the z direction to the tip of a cantilever
    beam and verify that the computed displacement matches the analytical solution
    from Euler-Bernoulli beam theory.

```

```

Apply a perpendicular point load in the y direction to the tip of a cantilever
beam and verify that the computed displacement matches the analytical solution
from Euler-Bernoulli beam theory.
Apply a parallel point load in the x direction to the tip of a cantilever beam and
verify that the computed displacement matches the analytical solution from
Euler-Bernoulli beam theory.
"""
E = 210e6          # Young's modulus (Pa)
nu = 0.3
A = 0.01           # Cross-sectional area (m2)
L = 2.0            # Beam length (m)
Iy = 4e-2          # Bending about y
Iz = 6e-2          # Bending about z
J = 1e-2           # Torsion

F_applied = -100.0 # Applied load (N)

# Build stiffness matrix
K = fcn(E, nu, A, L, Iy, Iz, J)

# z direction loading:
# Apply load at node 2 in local z-direction (DOF 8)
f_ext = np.zeros(12)
f_ext[8] = F_applied
free_dofs = np.arange(6, 12)
K_ff = K[np.ix_(free_dofs, free_dofs)]
f_f = f_ext[free_dofs]
u_f = np.linalg.solve(K_ff, f_f)
delta_z = u_f[2] # DOF 8 - z displacement
delta_expected = F_applied * L**3 / (3 * E * Iy)
assert np.isclose(delta_z, delta_expected, rtol=1e-9)

# y direction loading:
# Apply load at node 2 in local y-direction (DOF 7)
f_ext = np.zeros(12)
f_ext[7] = F_applied
free_dofs = np.arange(6, 12)
K_ff = K[np.ix_(free_dofs, free_dofs)]
f_f = f_ext[free_dofs]
u_f = np.linalg.solve(K_ff, f_f)
delta_y = u_f[1] # DOF 7 - y displacement
delta_expected = F_applied * L**3 / (3 * E * Iz)
assert np.isclose(delta_y, delta_expected, rtol=1e-9)

# x direction loading:
# Apply load at node 2 in local x-direction (DOF 6)
f_ext = np.zeros(12)
f_ext[6] = F_applied
free_dofs = np.arange(6, 12)
K_ff = K[np.ix_(free_dofs, free_dofs)]
f_f = f_ext[free_dofs]
u_f = np.linalg.solve(K_ff, f_f)
delta_x = u_f[0] # DOF 6 - x displacement
delta_expected = F_applied * L / (E * A)
assert np.isclose(delta_x, delta_expected, rtol=1e-9)

def local_elastic_stiffness_matrix_3D_beam_flipped_Iz_Iy(
    E: float,
    nu: float,
    A: float,
    L: float,
    Iy: float,
    Iz: float,
    J: float

```

```

) -> np.ndarray:
    k_e = np.zeros((12, 12))
    # Axial terms - extension of local x axis
    axial_stiffness = E * A / L
    k_e[0, 0] = axial_stiffness
    k_e[0, 6] = -axial_stiffness
    k_e[6, 0] = -axial_stiffness
    k_e[6, 6] = axial_stiffness
    # Torsion terms - rotation about local x axis
    torsional_stiffness = E * J / (2.0 * (1 + nu) * L)
    k_e[3, 3] = torsional_stiffness
    k_e[3, 9] = -torsional_stiffness
    k_e[9, 3] = -torsional_stiffness
    k_e[9, 9] = torsional_stiffness
    # Bending terms - bending about local z axis
    k_e[1, 1] = E * 12.0 * Iy / L ** 3.0
    k_e[1, 7] = E * -12.0 * Iy / L ** 3.0
    k_e[7, 1] = E * -12.0 * Iy / L ** 3.0
    k_e[7, 7] = E * 12.0 * Iy / L ** 3.0
    k_e[1, 5] = E * 6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
    k_e[5, 1] = E * 6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
    k_e[1, 11] = E * 6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
    k_e[11, 1] = E * 6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
    k_e[5, 7] = E * -6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
    k_e[7, 5] = E * -6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
    k_e[7, 11] = E * -6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
    k_e[11, 7] = E * -6.0 * Iy / L ** 2.0
    k_e[5, 5] = E * 4.0 * Iy / L
    k_e[11, 11] = E * 4.0 * Iy / L
    k_e[5, 11] = E * 2.0 * Iy / L
    k_e[11, 5] = E * 2.0 * Iy / L
    # Bending terms - bending about local y axis
    k_e[2, 2] = E * 12.0 * Iz / L ** 3.0
    k_e[2, 8] = E * -12.0 * Iz / L ** 3.0
    k_e[8, 2] = E * -12.0 * Iz / L ** 3.0
    k_e[8, 8] = E * 12.0 * Iz / L ** 3.0
    k_e[2, 4] = E * -6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
    k_e[4, 2] = E * -6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
    k_e[2, 10] = E * -6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
    k_e[10, 2] = E * -6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
    k_e[4, 8] = E * 6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
    k_e[8, 4] = E * 6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
    k_e[8, 10] = E * 6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
    k_e[10, 8] = E * 6.0 * Iz / L ** 2.0
    k_e[4, 4] = E * 4.0 * Iz / L
    k_e[10, 10] = E * 4.0 * Iz / L
    k_e[4, 10] = E * 2.0 * Iz / L
    k_e[10, 4] = E * 2.0 * Iz / L
    return k_e

def all_random(
    E: float,
    nu: float,
    A: float,
    L: float,
    Iy: float,
    Iz: float,
    J: float
) -> np.ndarray:
    return np.random.random((12, 12))

def task_info():
    task_id = "MSA_3D_local_elastic_stiffness_CC0_H0_T0"

```

```

task_short_description = "creates an element stiffness matrix for a 3D beam"
created_date = "2025-07-31"
created_by = "elejeune11"
main_fcn = MSA_3D_local_elastic_stiffness_CC0_H0_T0
required_imports = ["import numpy as np", "import pytest", "from typing import Callable"]
fcn_dependencies = []
reference_verification_inputs = [[100, 0.3, 10, 5, 30, 25, 10],
                                [10000, 0.4, 77, 55, 300, 250, 9.9],
                                [98000, 0.3, 5.5, 55, 300, 250, 9.4],
                                [6790, 0.2, 10.6, 4.7, 44, 34, 20.1],]
test_cases = [{"test_code": test_local_stiffness_3D_beam, "expected_failures": [
    local_elastic_stiffness_matrix_3D_beam_flipped_Iz_Iy]},
               {"test_code": test_cantilever_deflection_matches_euler_bernoulli, "
    expected_failures": [all_random,
    local_elastic_stiffness_matrix_3D_beam_flipped_Iz_Iy]}]
return {
    "task_id": task_id,
    "task_short_description": task_short_description,
    "created_date": created_date,
    "created_by": created_by,
    "main_fcn": main_fcn,
    "required_imports": required_imports,
    "fcn_dependencies": fcn_dependencies,
    "reference_verification_inputs": reference_verification_inputs,
    "test_cases": test_cases,
}

```

This example task illustrates how FEM-Bench packages a conceptually simple numerical routine, namely a closed-form expression for the 12×12 local stiffness matrix of a 3D Euler–Bernoulli beam, into a fully testable benchmarking unit. Although the reference implementation itself is straightforward, the accompanying tests probe whether an LLM can correctly encode essential physical and numerical properties such as symmetry, rigid-body modes, consistency of bending, torsional, and axial sub-blocks, and analytical verification. These unit tests elevate the task from mere formula transcription to a richer assessment of mathematical understanding, geometric reasoning, and the ability to operationalize core principles of computational mechanics in executable code. Notably, this is one of the simplest tasks in FEM-Bench 2025.

3.3 Prompt Generation

Given a Task object, FEM-Bench constructs two prompts: one for code generation and one for test generation. Both prompts are produced by inserting task-specific information, such as the function signature, docstring, allowed imports, and any dependency functions, into standardized templates stored in the `prompt_templates/` directory. These templates provide explicit instructions about how the model must format its output and define strict constraints to ensure that the result is valid, executable Python.

Prompts are generated using `task_to_code_prompt` and `task_to_test_prompt`, and are saved to disk prior to model inference to ensure reproducibility and to support debugging. The code-generation prompt integrates the function signature, docstring, and task-specific dependencies into a fixed textual template. This template is shown in Listing 3.

Listing 3: FEM-Bench code-generation prompt template

```

# Python Function Implementation Task

Write a Python function that matches the exact signature and docstring provided below.

## Requirements:
- Keep the function name, parameter names, and docstring exactly as shown
- Do not add any code outside the function definition
{% if task.required_imports %}
- Use only the following imports:
{{ task.required_imports | join('\n') }}
{% else %}

```

```

- No imports are available
{% endif %}
- You may call only the helper functions listed below - their full implementations are
  provided
- Do not re-implement or modify them
- Output only valid Python code (no explanations, comments, or markdown)
- Implement the functionality as described in the docstring

{% if task.python_version or task.package_versions %}
## Environment Specifications:
{% if task.python_version -%}
- Python Version: {{ task.python_version }}
{% endif %}
{%- if task.package_versions -%}
- Package Versions:
{% for package, version in task.package_versions.items() %} - {{ package }}: {{
  version }}
{% endfor %}
{%- endif %}

{% endif -%}
## Available Helper Functions:
{% if task.fcn_dependency_code -%}
{{ task.fcn_dependency_code | map('dedent') | join('\n\n') }}
{%- else -%}
(None)
{%- endif %}

## Function Signature:
## Only complete the function below:
{{ signature }}
{{ docstring }}

# Output:
# Only return the complete Python function - no extra text, explanation, or formatting
.

```

A corresponding test-generation prompt is constructed for each task. This prompt includes the function to be tested, the names and descriptions of the pytest-style test functions to be written, and the rules governing the structure and validity of the resulting tests. The test-generation template is shown in Listing 4.

Listing 4: FEM-Bench test-generation prompt template

```

# Python Task: Write Pytest Tests for a Function

Below is the function you are testing. Use its signature and docstring to understand
its behavior.

## Only complete the test functions below:
{{ signature }}
{{ docstring }}

## Your Goal:
Write pytest-style test functions that verify the correctness of the function above.

## Requirements:
- Use the exact test function names listed below
- Each test must accept a single argument: 'fcn' - the function to test
- Use 'assert' statements to check correctness
- Each test must include a descriptive docstring
- Do not include print statements, logging, or example usage
- Output only valid Python code - no explanations, markdown, or comments

```

```
{% if task.python_version or task.package_versions %}
## Environment Specifications:
{% if task.python_version -%}
- Python Version: {{ task.python_version }}
{% endif -%}
{% if task.package_versions -%}
- Package Versions:
{% for package, version in task.package_versions.items() %} - {{ package }}: {{
    version }}
{% endfor %}
{%- endif %}

{% endif -%}
## Test Functions to Implement:
{% if test_cases %}
{% for test in test_cases %}
- {{ test.name }}: "{{ test.doc }}"
{% endfor %}
{% else %}
- (no test cases found)
{% endif %}

# Output:
# Only return valid pytest test functions - no prose, markdown, or commentary.
```

Because each prompt includes the docstrings taken directly from the task definition, the docstrings plays a central role in guiding LLM behavior. In practice, they provide the primary description of the mathematical and numerical requirements of the task, making it one of the most influential components of the overall prompt.

3.4 Prompting Procedure and Inference Settings

FEM-Bench queries each model through a unified interface that wraps provider-specific API clients contained in the `llm_api/` directory. All prompts are saved to disk before inference to ensure reproducibility. For each task and model, FEM-Bench requests exactly one code-generation completion and one test-generation completion. By default, all calls use the following settings: temperature is set to 0.1 as recommended for code generation tasks, the thinking/reasoning level is set to “high” for models that support this parameter (i.e., Gemini 3 Pro, GPT-5, and GPT-5 mini), and no system prompt is applied unless explicitly specified (see Appendix B).

The dispatcher functions `call_llm_for_code()` and `call_llm_for_tests()` forward prompts to the appropriate backend (OpenAI, Gemini, Claude, or Together AI for open-source LLama and Qwen models). Each provider is queried through its native API: OpenAI models use the Chat Completions interface, Gemini models use the `google.genai` client, Claude models use the Anthropic Messages API, and open-source LLaMA and Qwen models are accessed via Together AI platform. A model-specific token policy sets the maximum output length, and all clients implement retry logic with exponential backoff.

Raw responses are cleaned using utilities in `clean_utils.py`, which remove code fences and extraneous text before extracting either a single function definition or a set of pytest-style test functions. Outputs that are empty, unparsable, or syntactically invalid are marked as incorrect. These inference settings provide consistent and reproducible evaluation across models despite differences in provider APIs.

3.5 Output Parsing and Validation

LLM outputs are parsed and validated using a set of strict rules designed to ensure clean and consistent evaluation. Each completion must contain syntactically valid Python, verified with `ast.parse()`. Only the first function definition in the output is extracted and evaluated, and any imports not explicitly listed in the task specification cause the attempt to fail. For test-generation tasks, the output must define at least one function whose name begins with `test_`; outputs missing such functions receive a score of zero.

3.6 Evaluation of Generated Code and Tests

FEM-Bench evaluates the correctness of both generated implementations and generated test suites using a controlled execution pipeline that combines numerical comparison, structured test logic, and isolated runtime environments. After parsing model outputs, the benchmark reconstructs an executable namespace by combining the generated code with the allowed imports and any task-specified dependency functions, as implemented in `evaluate_output.py` and executed through the pipeline in `pipeline_utils.py`. If execution raises a runtime error, the attempt is immediately marked as incorrect. For functions that execute successfully, numerical correctness is assessed by comparing their outputs to those of the reference implementation using a recursive matching procedure that supports scalars, arrays, dictionaries, and nested data structures within specified numerical tolerances. Together, these validation steps ensure that irrelevant text, syntactic irregularities, or execution failures do not compromise the reliability of the evaluation.

3.6.1 Function Correctness Evaluation

To evaluate implementation correctness, FEM-Bench executes the LLM generated function on a curated set of verification inputs specified in the task definition. For each input, FEM-Bench computes the corresponding reference output and compares it to the LLM-generated output using the utility `_values_match`, which performs recursive numerical matching over scalars, NumPy arrays, dictionaries, and nested Python structures within a configurable tolerance. Runtime errors during execution also result in failure.

The correctness metric is binary and defined as:

$$\text{Correctness} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ (or } \checkmark), & \text{if all verification inputs match reference outputs within tolerance,} \\ 0 \text{ (or } \times), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

For interpretability, FEM-Bench stores detailed comparison logs, including reference outputs, generated outputs, and any raised exceptions, as JSON files in the results directory.

3.6.2 Test-Suite Evaluation

Test-generation evaluation proceeds in three stages. First, FEM-Bench loads the reference implementation and executes each generated test function against it. A test must pass on the reference implementation to be considered valid. Second, FEM-Bench executes each test against all expected failure implementations provided with the task. A test must fail on every expected-failure implementation in order to receive credit for failure detection. Third, joint success is computed by checking that a test both passes the reference implementation and fails on all expected failures. These checks are performed using `evaluate_task_tests()`, which loads test functions, handles dependency imports, and executes each test in a protected namespace while capturing exceptions through `pytest`. The final test-suite score for a model is the percentage of tests achieving joint success.

3.6.3 Aggregate Metrics

After evaluating all functions and test suites for all tasks and models, FEM-Bench computes four aggregate metrics for each model: the percentage of function implementations whose outputs match the reference implementation; the average percentage of generated tests that pass on the reference implementation; the average percentage of expected-failure cases that are correctly detected; and the average joint success rate, defined as the percentage of tests that both pass on the reference and fail on all expected failures. These metrics are computed using `compute_aggregate_score()` and written to disk in both JSON and Markdown summary formats for analysis and comparison.

3.7 FEM-Bench 2025 Task Suite

The FEM-Bench 2025 release contains a curated set of introductory but nontrivial tasks drawn from standard introductory computational mechanics curricula. The suite spans three major domains: one-dimensional finite element methods (FEM 1D), two-dimensional finite element methods (FEM 2D), and three-dimensional matrix structural analysis (MSA 3D). Across these domains, tasks assess element-level routines, mesh generation, quadrature, geometric mappings, stiffness and load assembly, coordinate transformations, and linear and eigenvalue solves.

Although FEM-Bench 2025 comprises only 33 tasks, it is designed as a diagnostic challenge suite rather than a large-scale training dataset. Each task is dense, multi-step, and algorithmically structured, typically requiring the correct integration of multiple interdependent computational components in a single solution, along with the synthesis of unit

Table 1: **Summary of FEM-Bench 2025 Benchmark Tasks.** Tasks are grouped by domain and labeled using the CC/H/T convention: CC = conceptual challenge level, H = number of helper functions used in the reference implementation, T = tier of helper functions provided to the LLM.

Domain	Task Name	Description	CC	H	T
<i>FEM 1D</i>	linear elastic	Solve 1D linear elasticity	0	0	0
<i>FEM 1D</i>	local elastic stiffness	Local element stiffness matrix	0	3	1
<i>FEM 1D</i>	uniform mesh	Uniform 1D mesh	0	0	0
<i>FEM 2D</i>	quad quadrature	Quadrature points and weights over reference square	0	0	0
<i>FEM 2D</i>	quad8 element distributed load	Equivalent nodal load for a distributed load applied to an edge of a Q8 element	0	0	0
<i>FEM 2D</i>	quad8 integral of derivative	Integral of the gradient of a scalar field over a Q8 element	0	3	3
<i>FEM 2D</i>	quad8 mesh rectangle	Mesh with Q8 elements on a rectangular domain	0	0	0
<i>FEM 2D</i>	quad8 physical gradient	Scalar field gradient in physical domain on Q8 element	0	1	3
<i>FEM 2D</i>	quad8 shape fcn and derivatives	Shape functions and derivatives for Q8 elements	0	0	0
<i>FEM 2D</i>	tri quadrature	Quadrature points and weights over reference triangle	0	0	0
<i>FEM 2D</i>	tri6 mesh rectangle	Mesh with Tri6 elements on a rectangular domain	0	0	0
<i>FEM 2D</i>	tri6 shape fcn and derivatives	Shape functions and derivatives for Tri6 elements	0	0	0
<i>MSA 3D</i>	assemble global geometric stiffness	Assemble global geometric stiffness matrix	1	4	1
<i>MSA 3D</i>	assemble global geometric stiffness	Assemble global geometric stiffness matrix	1	4	2
<i>MSA 3D</i>	assemble global geometric stiffness	Assemble global geometric stiffness matrix	1	4	3
<i>MSA 3D</i>	assemble global linear elastic stiffness	Assemble global elastic stiffness matrix	0	2	1
<i>MSA 3D</i>	assemble global linear elastic stiffness	Assemble global elastic stiffness matrix	0	2	3
<i>MSA 3D</i>	assemble global load	Assemble global nodal load vector	0	0	0
<i>MSA 3D</i>	elastic critical load	Elastic critical-load analysis given problem setup	1	10	1
<i>MSA 3D</i>	elastic critical load	Elastic critical-load analysis given problem setup	1	10	2
<i>MSA 3D</i>	elastic critical load	Elastic critical-load analysis given problem setup	1	10	3
<i>MSA 3D</i>	linear elastic	Small displacement linear-elastic analysis	0	6	1
<i>MSA 3D</i>	linear elastic	Small displacement linear-elastic analysis	0	6	3
<i>MSA 3D</i>	local elastic stiffness	Local elastic stiffness matrix	0	0	0
<i>MSA 3D</i>	local element loads	Local internal nodal force/moment vector	0	2	1
<i>MSA 3D</i>	local element loads	Local internal nodal force/moment vector	0	2	3
<i>MSA 3D</i>	local geometric stiffness	Local geometric stiffness matrix with torsion-bending coupling	1	0	0
<i>MSA 3D</i>	partition DOFs	Partition global DOFs into free and fixed sets	0	0	0
<i>MSA 3D</i>	solve eigenvalue	Eigenvalue analysis given boundary conditions and global stiffness matrix	1	1	1
<i>MSA 3D</i>	solve eigenvalue	Eigenvalue analysis given boundary conditions and global stiffness matrix	1	1	3
<i>MSA 3D</i>	solve linear	Solve nodal displacement and support reactions	0	1	1
<i>MSA 3D</i>	solve linear	Solve nodal displacement and support reactions	0	1	3
<i>MSA 3D</i>	transformation matrix	3D beam transformation matrix	0	0	0

tests that encode the physical, numerical, and algorithmic constraints of the problem. As with other diagnostic benchmarks, FEM-Bench prioritizes interpretability and reasoning depth over task count, enabling fine-grained analysis of failure modes in structured scientific computing.

Each task is classified using a CC/H/T identifier, where CC indicates the conceptual challenge level (CC0 for linear-elastic and basic discretization tasks, CC1 for elastic critical-load analysis), H denotes the number of helper functions used in the reference implementation, and T denotes which of these helper functions are provided to the model (T0: none needed, none provided; T1: all provided; T2: subset provided; T3: none provided despite being used in the reference). This classification enables systematic evaluation of how LLMs handle increasing levels of functional decomposition, abstraction, and reasoning complexity. A full list of tasks is provided in Table 1.

Looking forward, we anticipate expanding the FEM-Bench suite to include additional tasks and domains. However, to mitigate the risk of data leakage and overfitting as LLM training corpora evolve, not all future tasks may be publicly released. In this sense, FEM-Bench 2025 is intended not only as a benchmark, but also as a representative demonstration of the typical structure, complexity, and reasoning demands of computational mechanics tasks, enabling future evaluations to follow the same design principles even when task instances differ.

FEM 1D Tasks

The FEM 1D tasks represent the simplest end of the FEM spectrum and emphasize fundamental ideas in discretization, element assembly, and linear elasticity. Tasks include:

- uniform mesh generation for one-dimensional domains (node coordinates and element connectivity),
- closed-form local stiffness matrices for linear 1D elastic bars,
- element-level force and displacement computation for 1D linear elasticity.

These tasks test whether models can reproduce basic FEM building blocks, manipulate simple numerical expressions, and assemble element-wise contributions into global vectors and matrices for 1D FEM problems.

FEM 2D Tasks

The FEM 2D tasks introduce richer geometry, higher-order interpolation, multidimensional quadrature, and element-level integration. The suite includes:

- shape function evaluation and derivative computation for six-node triangular elements (Tri6) and eight-node quadrilateral elements (Quad8),
- reference-element quadrature rules for triangles and quadrilaterals,
- geometric mappings, including gradient transformations for Quad8 elements,
- mesh generators for structured triangular and quadrilateral meshes,
- element-level integrals such as distributed loads and derivatives of shape functions.

These tasks require spatial reasoning about reference and physical coordinates, correct use of Jacobians, and handling of polynomial shape functions and GaussLegendre quadrature. They collectively represent the foundational components of two-dimensional finite element formulations.

MSA 3D Tasks

The MSA 3D tasks comprise the largest and most diverse portion of the suite. They reflect the structure of classical 3D frame and beam formulations and require reasoning about local and global coordinate systems, element stiffness and load routines, and global assembly. This family includes:

- local element routines such as 3D elastic stiffness matrices, geometric stiffness matrices, and internal load vectors for EulerBernoulli beams,
- coordinate transformation matrices for mapping between local and global frames,
- degree-of-freedom partitioning based on boundary conditions,
- global assembly of elastic and geometric stiffness matrices and global load vectors,
- small-displacement, linear-elastic frame solves, including global displacements and support reactions,
- generalized eigenvalue problems for elastic critical-load (buckling) analysis.

These tasks exercise multiple layers of structured reasoning, including transformation of element-level matrices, proper handling of rigid-body modes, linearity and superposition, local-to-global coupling, and the correct extraction and partitioning of free and fixed degrees of freedom. Many tasks combine geometric reasoning with matrix manipulation, highlighting the interplay between physics-based modeling and numerical implementation.

This structure makes the MSA 3D collection especially convenient, since it provides a fully worked, self-contained reference pathway through the classical matrix structural analysis formulation that historically served as the precursor to modern finite element methods. By spanning element routines, transformations, assembly, and global solution procedures, these tasks offer an accessible and interpretable entry point for LLM researchers who may be unfamiliar with mechanics yet want to study code generation in a setting grounded in well-established numerical practices. For this reason, the MSA 3D family is the most fully developed portion of the FEM-Bench 2025 suite. Additional background on MSA and its relationship to contemporary FEA formulations is provided in Appendix A.

Summary of Task Coverage

Taken together, the FEM 1D, FEM 2D, and MSA 3D tasks form a progression from simple element formulas to multi-element global solvers. The suite spans interpolation, differentiation, quadrature, transformation, stiffness and load assembly, and both linear and eigenvalue solution procedures. This diversity enables evaluation of models on granular, element-level computations as well as multi-step synthesis problems that require chaining multiple FEM or MSA concepts. Because each task is paired with reference implementations, verification inputs, and pytest-based unit tests, the suite provides a rigorous and interpretable foundation for assessing physics-based code generation.

Table 2: **Large Language Models Evaluated in FEM-Bench 2025.** The suite includes a mix of proprietary (API-based) and open-weights models to assess performance across different architectures and accessibility levels. Models are categorized by their primary training focus (General vs. Coding-Specialized) and reasoning capabilities. Note that temperature was set to 0.1 for all models. For Gemini 3 Pro Preview, thinking level was additionally set to high. For GPT-5 and GPT-5 Mini, reasoning effort was set to high; however, temperature was not configurable for these models.

Model Name	Developer	Access	Params*	Primary Focus
<i>Proprietary / API-Based</i>				
Gemini 3 Pro Preview	Google	Closed API	Unknown	Advanced Multimodal Reasoning
Gemini 2.5 Pro	Google	Closed API	Unknown	General Reasoning and Thinking
Claude Opus 4.5	Anthropic	Closed API	Unknown	Agentic Coding and Reasoning
Claude Haiku 4.5	Anthropic	Closed API	Unknown	Fast and Efficient Coding
GPT-5	OpenAI	Closed API	Unknown	General Reasoning and Coding
GPT-5 Mini	OpenAI	Closed API	Unknown	Fast Reasoning
<i>Open Weights</i>				
Qwen3 Coder	Alibaba Cloud	Open Weights	480B	Agentic Coding Specialist
Qwen3 Next	Alibaba Cloud	Open Weights	80B	Efficient Reasoning and Coding
Llama 4 Maverick	Meta	Open Weights	400B	Multimodal Understanding
Llama 4 Scout	Meta	Open Weights	109B	Ultra-Long Context (10M tokens)

*Parameter counts for open-weights models are approximate active parameters or total dense parameters where applicable.

Proprietary model sizes are undisclosed.

3.8 Large Language Model Selection

We evaluate FEM-Bench using a broad selection of commercial and open-weight LLMs, chosen to represent different model families, training strategies, and performance tiers [Liang et al., 2022]. Ten models are included in the FEM-Bench 2025 release, selected for their recency, API availability, and relevance to scientific computing tasks. Our selection criteria emphasizes a comparison between proprietary models (OpenAI, Google, Anthropic) and state-of-the-art open-weight models (Meta, Qwen), while also targeting the trade-offs between flagship capabilities and the lower inference costs of efficiency-focused variants. The full set of evaluated models includes Gemini 3 Pro (Preview), Gemini 2.5 Pro, Claude Opus 4.5, Claude Haiku 4.5, GPT-5, GPT-5 Mini, Qwen3 Coder, Qwen3 Next, Llama 4 Maverick, and Llama 4 Scout. More information regarding the models can be found in Table 2.

4 Results and Discussion

This Section quantifies how current LLMs perform on FEM-Bench 2025. Section 4.1 examines performance at the task level, Section 4.2 compares performance across LLMs, and Section 4.3 analyzes the types of errors that appear in LLM-generated code.

4.1 FEM-Bench 2025: Task Performance

As a first pass assessment of LLM performance on FEM-Bench 2025, we evaluated all ten models on the full set of 33 tasks. Table 3 reports function correctness for each model and task based on a single run. To assess the stability and variability of model outputs, Table 4 presents the results of running the three leading state-of-the-art LLMs from major providers (OpenAI, Google, and Anthropic) five times per task and reporting how many of those attempts produced a correct solution. Finally, Table 5 summarizes joint test success rates for all models, indicating how reliably each models generated unit tests both validate the reference implementation and detect expected failures.

Taken together, the three tables show that no model completed the full FEM-Bench 2025 suite. For function correctness, the strongest model (Gemini 3 Pro) solved 30 of 33 tasks when counting any success across five attempts, and 26 of 33 tasks when requiring perfect consistency across all five attempts. Table 4 also highlights a subset of 11 tasks on which all top-performing models achieved perfect (5/5) correctness: FEM 1D linear elastic T0, FEM 2D tri quadrature T0, FEM 2D tri6 mesh rectangle T0, FEM 2D tri6 shape fcn and derivatives T0, MSA 3D assemble global geometric stiffness T1, MSA 3D assemble global linear elastic stiffness T1, MSA 3D assemble global load T0, MSA 3D elastic critical load T1, MSA 3D linear elastic T1, MSA 3D local element loads T3, MSA 3D solve eigenvalue T1. As Table 3 and 4 show, 19 tasks exhibiting mixed performance and substantial variability across systems. And, a small but important group of tasks was not solved even once by any model: MSA 3D assemble global geometric stiffness T3, MSA 3D elastic critical load T3, MSA 3D local geometric stiffness T0. These observations confirm that FEM-Bench spans a meaningful and discriminative range of difficulty.

More broadly, the results show that LLMs can reliably reproduce core finite element building blocks such as basic discretization (FEM 2D) and linear elastic analysis (FEM 1D and many MSA 3D tasks), but struggle as tasks introduce geometric nonlinearity or require reasoning beyond direct formula application. Performance within the MSA 3D domain illustrates this progression most clearly: models succeed on the simplest routines yet consistently fail when required to perform geometric nonlinear analysis without helper functions. These unsolved tasks and their characteristic failure modes are examined in more detail in Section 4.3.

Test generation results in Table 5 mirror the trends observed in function correctness. Simple tasks exhibit uniformly high joint success across models, intermediate tasks show substantial variability, and the most complex tasks, particularly those involving geometric stiffness or buckling in MSA 3D, yield joint success rates that are effectively zero for all models. For FEM 1D and most FEM 2D tasks, the strongest models achieve joint success near 100%, indicating that they can generate tests that both validate correct implementations and detect known failure modes. Performance deteriorates on more demanding FEM 2D tasks and collapses entirely on nonlinear MSA tasks, even when some models produce correct code. These results suggest that writing discriminative, physics-aware tests is at least as challenging as writing the underlying routines. Overall, the joint test outcomes reinforce that FEM-Bench 2025 provides a meaningful and sensitive assessment of the current limits of LLMs in scientific computing.

4.2 FEM-Bench 2025: LLM Ranking

Figure 3 summarizes model performance by plotting function correctness (x-axis) against average joint test success (y-axis), revealing a clear separation between model families and capability tiers. The flagship closed-weight models cluster in the upper-right region of the plot, showing substantially higher performance compared to the other models, which occupy the lower-left region. For successful task completion (i.e., function correctness) Gemini 3 Pro (Preview) (29/33 tasks correct) and Claude Opus 4.5 (28/33 tasks correct) are the best performing models. For Joint Test Success Rate, GPT-5 (73.8 %) is the best performing model while Claude Opus 4.5 (71.9 %) and Gemini 3 Pro (Preview) (71.6 %) perform comparably. Notably, development of FEM-Bench began in summer 2025, and several of the models evaluated here already demonstrate significantly stronger performance than models available at that time, underscoring the rapid pace of progress. As model capabilities continue to grow, future versions of FEM-Bench must incorporate more challenging and diverse tasks to ensure that the benchmark remains discriminative and reflective of the evolving state of the field.

Table 3: Function Correctness on FEM-Bench Tasks. ✓ indicates successful task completion.

Domain / Task	Gemini 3 Pro (Preview)	Gemini 2.5 Pro	Claude Opus 4.5	Claude Haiku 4.5	GPT-5	GPT-5 Mini	Qwen3 Coder	Qwen3 Next	Llama 4 Maverick	Llama 4 Scout
FEM 1D										
linear elastic (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
local elastic stiffness (T1)	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
uniform mesh (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
FEM 2D										
quad quadrature (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
quad8 element distributed load (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
quad8 integral of derivative (T3)	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗
quad8 mesh rectangle (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗
quad8 physical gradient (T3)	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
quad8 shape fcns and derivatives (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
tri quadrature (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
tri6 mesh rectangle (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
tri6 shape fcns and derivatives (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
MSA 3D										
assemble global geometric stiffness (T1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
assemble global geometric stiffness (T2)	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
assemble global geometric stiffness (T3)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
assemble global linear elastic stiffness (T1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
assemble global linear elastic stiffness (T3)	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
assemble global load (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
elastic critical load (T1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
elastic critical load (T2)	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
elastic critical load (T3)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
linear elastic (T1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
linear elastic (T3)	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
local elastic stiffness (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗
local element loads (T1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
local element loads (T3)	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
local geometric stiffness (T0)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
partition DOFs (T0)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
solve eigenvalue (T1)	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
solve eigenvalue (T3)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
solve linear (T1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
solve linear (T3)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
transformation matrix (T0)	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗
Total Passed	29/33	26/33	28/33	19/33	22/33	25/33	21/33	16/33	16/33	6/33

Table 4: Function Correctness out of 5 runs on FEM-Bench Tasks for the top performing LLMs.

Domain / Task	Gemini 3 Pro (Preview)	Claude Opus 4.5	GPT-5
FEM 1D			
linear elastic (T0)	5/5	5/5	5/5
local elastic stiffness (T1)	2/5	5/5	0/5
uniform mesh (T0)	5/5	4/5	0/5
FEM 2D			
quad quadrature (T0)	5/5	4/5	5/5
quad8 element distributed load (T0)	5/5	4/5	5/5
quad8 integral of derivative (T3)	4/5	2/5	4/5
quad8 mesh rectangle (T0)	5/5	4/5	5/5
quad8 physical gradient (T3)	5/5	0/5	3/5
quad8 shape fcns and derivatives (T0)	5/5	4/5	5/5
tri quadrature (T0)	5/5	5/5	5/5
tri6 mesh rectangle (T0)	5/5	5/5	5/5
tri6 shape fcns and derivatives (T0)	5/5	5/5	5/5
MSA 3D			
assemble global geometric stiffness (T1)	5/5	5/5	5/5
assemble global geometric stiffness (T2)	4/5	5/5	3/5
assemble global geometric stiffness (T3)	0/5	0/5	0/5
assemble global linear elastic stiffness (T1)	5/5	5/5	5/5
assemble global linear elastic stiffness (T3)	5/5	5/5	4/5
assemble global load (T0)	5/5	5/5	5/5
elastic critical load (T1)	5/5	5/5	5/5
elastic critical load (T2)	4/5	4/5	2/5
elastic critical load (T3)	0/5	0/5	0/5
linear elastic (T1)	5/5	5/5	5/5
linear elastic (T3)	5/5	4/5	3/5
local elastic stiffness (T0)	5/5	4/5	3/5
local element loads (T1)	5/5	5/5	4/5
local element loads (T3)	5/5	5/5	5/5
local geometric stiffness (T0)	0/5	0/5	0/5
partition DOFs (T0)	5/5	4/5	5/5
solve eigenvalue (T1)	5/5	5/5	5/5
solve eigenvalue (T3)	5/5	4/5	5/5
solve linear (T1)	5/5	4/5	5/5
solve linear (T3)	5/5	3/5	5/5
transformation matrix (T0)	5/5	5/5	2/5
Tasks Solved (any success)	30/33	29/33	28/33
Tasks Solved (5/5 success)	26/33	16/33	19/33

Table 5: Joint Test Success Rate (%) on FEM-Bench Tasks. A “—” symbol indicates that the model did not produce parsable code, and is treated as 0% when aggregating scores.

Domain / Task	Gemini 3 Pro (Preview)	Gemini 2.5 Pro	Claude Opus 4.5	Claude Haiku 4.5	GPT-5	GPT-5 Mini	Qwen3 Coder	Qwen3 Next	Llama 4 Maverick	Llama 4 Scout
FEM 1D										
linear elastic (T0)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	—	100.0
local elastic stiffness (T1)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
uniform mesh (T0)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
FEM 2D										
quad quadrature (T0)	40.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60.0	60.0	100.0
quad8 element distributed load (T0)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
quad8 integral of derivative (T3)	66.7	66.7	100.0	33.3	100.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
quad8 mesh rectangle (T0)	100.0	66.7	66.7	66.7	100.0	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	33.3
quad8 physical gradient (T3)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	50.0
quad8 shape fcn and derivatives (T0)	100.0	83.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	83.3	83.3	83.3	50.0
tri quadrature (T0)	40.0	40.0	40.0	100.0	60.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60.0	60.0
tri6 mesh rectangle (T0)	66.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	66.7
tri6 shape fcn and derivatives (T0)	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	83.3	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	33.3
MSA 3D										
assemble global geometric stiffness (T1)	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
assemble global geometric stiffness (T2)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	—
assemble global geometric stiffness (T3)	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
assemble global linear elastic stiffness (T1)	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
assemble global linear elastic stiffness (T3)	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
assemble global load (T0)	100.0	—	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
elastic critical load (T1)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0
elastic critical load (T2)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0
elastic critical load (T3)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0
linear elastic (T1)	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
linear elastic (T3)	100.0	50.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
local elastic stiffness (T0)	50.0	—	100.0	0.0	100.0	—	0.0	0.0	—	0.0
local element loads (T1)	100.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	75.0	75.0
local element loads (T3)	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	75.0	75.0
local geometric stiffness (T0)	50.0	—	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
partition DOFs (T0)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
solve eigenvalue (T1)	100.0	40.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	20.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
solve eigenvalue (T3)	100.0	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60.0	100.0	80.0	100.0
solve linear (T1)	50.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
solve linear (T3)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
transformation matrix (T0)	100.0	66.7	66.7	33.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Avg. Joint Success	71.6	63.4	71.9	49.5	73.8	65.4	41.8	49.3	41.4	37.2




Figure 3: Comparison of model performance on FEM-Bench 2025. The plot shows function correctness versus average joint test success rate for all evaluated models (pulled from Table 3 and Table 5 data), illustrating clear capability differences across model families and identifying the current performance frontier.

4.3 FEM-Bench 2025 Error Analysis

Although FEM-Bench 2025 contains only 33 tasks, its structure enables clear and interpretable error analysis. The benchmarks modularity, controlled variations in helper-function availability, and pairing of related tasks at increasing levels of complexity allow us to isolate where and why LLMs fail in computational mechanics workflows. Based on the unsolved tasks and informed by current understanding of LLM failure modes [Jiang et al., 2024, Shi et al., 2023, Pinto et al., 2024, Gottweis et al., 2025], we group errors into three broad categories: (1) domain knowledge deficits, (2) compositional reasoning deficits, and (3) algorithmic fidelity deficits:

- **Domain Knowledge Deficit:** The model lacks accurate or sufficiently detailed knowledge of the underlying mechanics, formulas, or numerical structures required for the task.

- **Compositional Reasoning Deficit:** The model has access to the relevant components either via provided helper functions or its training data, but fails to combine and manipulate these components correctly in multi-step computations.
- **Algorithmic Fidelity Deficit:** The model understands the intended computation but cannot maintain the precision and consistency required to implement it faithfully, leading to indexing errors, incomplete routines, inconsistent conventions, or structurally invalid outputs. In FEM-Bench 2025, this failure mode arises predominantly in lower-performing models and often manifests as code that loses logical structure, mixes incompatible conventions, or fails to execute. This behavior is closely related to what is commonly described as instruction-following failure in general LLM benchmarks [Ouyang et al., 2022], but here appears in a domain-specific form tied to the execution of numerical algorithms.

FEM-Bench is well suited to distinguishing these deficits because its tasks share common computational patterns while varying in domain knowledge load and reasoning depth.


Figure 4 highlights the difference in difficulty between two key tasks in FEM-Bench. In the reference implementation for linear-elastic problems (Fig. 4i), the workflow ends once the global stiffness matrix and load vector are assembled and a single linear solve is performed. In Appendix A, we provide a more detailed explanation of the building blocks of this schematic for readers who are new to the field. With this level of difficulty, the strongest models reliably succeed. In contrast, a representative more difficult task, MSA 3D elastic critical load analysis (Fig. 4ii) includes additional stages: extracting the displacement field from a prior analysis, assembling the geometric stiffness matrix, coupling it with the elastic stiffness matrix, and solving a generalized eigenvalue problem. This expanded pipeline introduces both an increased requirement for domain knowledge, and increased demands on compositional reasoning.

The challenge level of the MSA 3D elastic critical load analysis task is further illustrated by the Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 variants. When helper functions are fully provided and the task reduces to chaining them together (T1), most LLMs are able to succeed. When the geometric stiffness matrix is provided but no other helpers are available (T2), flagship models succeed the majority of the time (Table 4), although several other models still fail (Table 3). However, when no helpers are provided (T3), all models fail. This outcome is consistent with the observation that no model is able to generate the local geometric stiffness matrix in the related task `MSA_3D_local_geometric_stiffness_matrix_T0`. From an error analysis perspective, these results show that all models exhibit a domain knowledge deficit with respect to geometric stiffness, and that poorer performing models additionally exhibit compositional reasoning deficits when required to integrate partially provided components. This aligns with the broader mechanics literature, where geometric stiffness formulas are less standardized, appear inconsistently in reference materials, and require understanding of geometrically nonlinear behavior that is both less common and more challenging than linear elastic analysis to parse correctly. A major avenue of future work for FEM-Bench development is creating more tasks for side-by-side comparison across different compositional reasoning and domain knowledge requirements with challenge modulated via the number of helper functions provided (tiers).

A notable discrepancy also appears between code correctness and test correctness. Even when top models produce correct implementations for tasks, they may not be able to generate effective unit tests. Writing tests in FEM-Bench requires identifying and articulating concepts such as symmetry, rigid-body modes, and analytical displacement relationships, as well as constructing small subproblems that expose specific failure modes. These activities often require more explicit reasoning and domain insight than straightforward code writing. A clear example of this can be seen in Listing 2 where the main code involves returning a 12×12 stiffness matrix while the two required test codes involve (1) checking the properties of the matrix, and (2) checking if the matrix can be used to match analytical equations. From Table 3 and Table 5, we see that LLM performance on function writing exceeds performance on unit test writing for this task. Overall, joint test success deteriorates rapidly as task complexity increases, even in cases where function correctness remains high. It is also possible that unit test underperformance reflects the relative scarcity of physics-based test code in typical LLM training corpora. Understanding the extent to which training data, task structure, and model reasoning contribute to this gap is an interesting direction for future study.

It is also worth noting that LLM performance is often highly sensitive to prompt choice [Liu et al., 2023]. Although a comprehensive ablation study or systematic comparison of prompt formulations is beyond the scope of this work, we conducted a targeted exploration using the GEPA prompt optimization technique, described in Appendix B. Our goals were twofold: (1) to verify that model performance was not being limited by simple but impactful prompt refinements, and (2) to assess whether adding specific information through a system prompt could meaningfully improve performance and thereby illuminate the error mechanisms discussed in Section 4.3. As detailed in Appendix B, GEPA did not yield any generic improvements, such as impactful instructions to think carefully or focus on correctness. However, GEPA was able to produce meaningful gains when it incorporated domain knowledge extracted from the training tasks into the system prompt. These findings reinforce that our prompts are already strong and also support the conclusion

(i) Schematic of linear elastic analysis reference implementation



(ii) Schematic of elastic critical load analysis reference implementation




Figure 4: Schematic comparison of the reference implementations used in FEM-Bench for (i) linear elastic analysis (a *solved* task) and (ii) elastic critical load analysis (a currently *unsolved* task). In both cases, the workflow begins by assembling the global load vector \underline{F} and global elastic stiffness matrix \underline{K} from local element contributions, followed by partitioning degrees of freedom and performing a linear solve. For elastic critical load analysis, the converged displacement field is used to assemble the geometric stiffness matrix \underline{K}_{geom} , after which an eigenvalue analysis is performed to compute critical loads. The outputs consist of nodal displacements and reactions for the linear case, and critical load factors and mode shapes for the buckling case. Note that the elastic critical load analysis contains the linear elastic analysis within it.

that domain knowledge deficits, rather than lack of generic reasoning guidance, are a primary source of the errors observed in FEM-Bench 2025.

Taken together, these observations illustrate the current state of LLMs in computational mechanics. Models can reproduce foundational FEM building blocks when the domain knowledge burden is low, and they can often execute multi-step workflows when critical domain components are provided. However, they struggle in some cases where domain knowledge must be inferred, composed, or reconstructed, and they struggle even more when asked to express correctness criteria through physics-aware unit tests. These findings, along with the trend towards improved perfor-

mance shown in Fig. 3, emphasize the need for future versions of FEM-Bench to include tasks that continue to probe the boundaries between domain knowledge, multi-step reasoning, and algorithmic precision.

5 Conclusion

FEM-Bench 2025 provides a first systematic assessment of LLM capabilities in computational mechanics, revealing that while current models can reliably reproduce many foundational FEM and MSA routines, they still struggle with more complex tasks in the domain. The benchmark highlights both the substantial progress made by state-of-the-art systems and the persistent gaps that arise in geometric nonlinear analysis, eigenvalue buckling problems, and tasks requiring discriminative unit tests. These results underscore that LLMs are not yet ready to autonomously implement or verify advanced scientific computing workflows, but they are increasingly capable of contributing meaningfully to structured numerical tasks.

FEM-Bench is designed as a living benchmark: the evaluation pipeline is fully automated and can be re-run as new models are released, enabling continual tracking of progress. Its modular, source-first structure also makes the benchmark highly extensible, allowing new tasks to be added as existing ones are mastered. Our future work will substantially expand the task suite to cover a broader range of mechanics problems, including nonlinear material behavior, dynamic analysis, and multiphysics couplings, while using FEM-Bench as a foundation for studying more sophisticated LLM-assisted and agentic workflows for scientific computing within the broader ecosystem of AI-driven scientific analysis and discovery [Cai et al., 2025, Shojaee et al., 2025, Song et al., 2025].

6 Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge support from the Boston University Department of Mechanical Engineering, the National Science Foundation through the CSSI Elements program (Grant No. CMMI-2310771), the Amazon Research Award program, and the BU SAIL AI Pipeline Pilot.

7 Additional Information

The FEM-Bench software and all code to reproduce this work is available on GitHub <https://github.com/elejeune11/FEM-bench>.

A Primer on Matrix Structural Analysis for Large Language Model Researchers

A natural point of departure for understanding matrix structural analysis (MSA) and the finite element method (FEM) is the material covered in an introductory physics class, where the relationship between force and displacement is introduced through Hooke’s law:

$$f = k \delta.$$

This scalar equation expresses the idea that an elastic spring resists deformation in direct proportion to its stiffness. MSA and FEM generalize this relationship to systems composed of many interconnected components. A structure is discretized into elements (such as springs, truss bars, beam segments, or volumetric components) connected at nodes, and each node can translate or rotate in space depending on the degrees of freedom allowed by the modeling assumptions (see also Fig. 1).

In this discretized setting, the simple spring law becomes a vector–matrix relation of the form

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{\Delta}, \tag{2}$$

where

- \mathbf{F} is the global vector of nodal forces and moments,
- \mathbf{K} is the assembled global stiffness matrix, formed by superposing contributions from all elements, and
- $\mathbf{\Delta}$ is the global vector of nodal displacements and rotations.

Equation (2) is therefore a direct multidimensional analogue of Hooke’s law. Instead of a single stiffness constant k , the stiffness matrix \mathbf{K} encodes how each degree of freedom in the structure resists deformation and how deformations at one node influence forces at another. Likewise, the displacement vector $\mathbf{\Delta}$ extends the scalar displacement x to include translations and rotations at all nodes in the discretized model. This process is illustrated schematically in Fig.

5. Although more advanced MSA and FEM formulations often look much more complex, this linear algebraic form provides a straightforward fundamental starting point. From a programming perspective, even this simple relation requires careful construction of element contributions, consistent indexing of degrees of freedom, robust assembly procedures, and reliable linear algebra operations, all of which present meaningful challenges for LLMs tasked with generating correct scientific code.




Figure 5: Illustration of the Matrix Structural Analysis workflow. A structural frame is discretized into nodes and elements with associated material and section properties, boundary conditions, and nodal loads. These inputs are used to assemble the global load vector and global stiffness matrix by computing local element stiffnesses and transforming them to global coordinates. The resulting system $F = K\Delta$ is then solved for nodal displacements and support reactions.

A.1 Historical Context, relationship between Matrix Structural Analysis and Finite Element Methods

Matrix Structural Analysis (MSA) is the foundational framework from which Finite Element Analysis (FEA) evolved. MSA focuses on representing structures (e.g., trusses, beams, and frames) using stiffness matrices and equilibrium equations, providing an efficient way to analyze linear structural systems. FEA generalizes these same principles to continuous domains and complex geometries, extending the matrix-based formulation of MSA to handle arbitrary shapes, materials, and boundary conditions in a wide range of physical problems. Both share a common mathematical structure: assembling element stiffness matrices into a global system of equations that relates nodal forces to displacements. Today, MSA can be viewed as a special case of FEA, applicable to structures composed of beam- or frame-like elements. Both methods follow a similar computational structure and high level workflow.²

A.2 Deriving Linear Equations via the Direct Stiffness Method

There are several ways to derive Eq. 2 for matrix structural analysis problems. The most accessible is the Direct Stiffness Method (DSM), which constructs global equilibrium equations directly from element-level stiffness relations. Although modern finite element formulations typically rely on the Principle of Virtual Work (PVW) or the weak form of the governing equations (these approaches generalize naturally to two- and three-dimensional continua)

²https://quickfem.com/wp-content/uploads/IFEM.AppH_.pdf

the algebraic structure that emerges is the same. For instructional purposes, the Direct Stiffness Method provides a transparent entry point: it exposes each computational component (element stiffness, coordinate transformation, assembly, and application of boundary conditions) explicitly, without requiring the variational machinery behind full FEM. Using the Direct Stiffness Method, Eq. 2 can be formulated through the following basic procedure:

1. **Discretize** the structure into nodes and elements, defining connectivity.
2. **Establish local element stiffness matrices.**
3. **Transform** local matrices to the global coordinate system.
4. **Assemble** the global stiffness matrix from the transformed local element stiffness matrices.
5. **Partition** the global system to apply boundary conditions.
6. **Solve** for unknown displacements.
7. **Post-process** to compute forces, moments, and deflections.
8. **Extend** for further analysis (e.g., buckling, nonlinear behavior).

Step 1: Discretization

In 3D, we discretize the structure into a finite number of nodes and elements that capture its geometry and connectivity. Each **node** represents a point where displacements and rotations are defined, serving as the connection between adjacent elements (see Fig. 5).

- Each node possesses six degrees of freedom (DOFs): translational (u, v, w) and rotational $(\theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z)$ components.
- Each beam **element** connects two nodes, leading to a total of 12 DOFs per element.

This discretization transforms a continuous structure into a discrete model suitable for matrix-based analysis, where the deformation of the entire structure is represented by the collective motion of its nodes.

Step 2: Establish Local Element Stiffness Matrices

Each beam element is first described in its own local coordinate system, whose axes are aligned with the elements geometry (typically with the local x -axis along the element length and the local y - and z -axes defining transverse directions). In this coordinate system, the element stiffness relation takes the form

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{local}} = \mathbf{k}^{\text{local}} \mathbf{\Delta}^{\text{local}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{F}^{\text{local}}$ is the 12×1 vector of nodal forces and moments, $\mathbf{\Delta}^{\text{local}}$ is the 12×1 vector of nodal displacements and rotations, and $\mathbf{k}^{\text{local}}$ is the 12×12 local element stiffness matrix, all in local coordinates.

For a 3D frame element, $\mathbf{k}^{\text{local}}$ combines contributions from axial deformation, torsion, and bending about both the local y - and z -axes. Each contribution can be written in the form $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{k} \mathbf{\Delta}$ with explicitly labeled force and displacement components defined in the local coordinate system:

- **Axial (along local x):**

$$\begin{bmatrix} F_{x1} \\ F_{x2} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{EA}{L} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{x1} \\ u_{x2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where u_{x1} and u_{x2} are axial displacements at nodes 1 and 2, and F_{x1} and F_{x2} are the corresponding axial forces.

- **Torsion (about local x):**

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{x1} \\ M_{x2} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{GJ}{L} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{x1} \\ \theta_{x2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where θ_{x1} and θ_{x2} are rotations about the local x -axis at nodes 1 and 2, and M_{x1} and M_{x2} are the corresponding torsional moments.

- **Bending about z (deflection v and rotation θ_z):**

$$\begin{bmatrix} F_{v1} \\ M_{z1} \\ F_{v2} \\ M_{z2} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{EI_z}{L^3} \begin{bmatrix} 12 & 6L & -12 & 6L \\ 6L & 4L^2 & -6L & 2L^2 \\ -12 & -6L & 12 & -6L \\ 6L & 2L^2 & -6L & 4L^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ \theta_{z1} \\ v_2 \\ \theta_{z2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where v_1 and v_2 are transverse displacements in the local y -direction and M_{z1} and M_{z2} are bending moments about the z -axis at nodes 1 and 2.

- **Bending about y (deflection w and rotation θ_y):**

$$\begin{bmatrix} F_{w1} \\ M_{y1} \\ F_{w2} \\ M_{y2} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{EI_y}{L^3} \begin{bmatrix} 12 & -6L & -12 & -6L \\ -6L & 4L^2 & 6L & 2L^2 \\ -12 & 6L & 12 & 6L \\ -6L & 2L^2 & 6L & 4L^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ \theta_{y1} \\ w_2 \\ \theta_{y2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where w_1 and w_2 are transverse displacements in the local z -direction and M_{y1} and M_{y2} are bending moments about the y -axis at nodes 1 and 2.

Derivations for each of these submatrices follow from classical Euler–Bernoulli beam theory, where axial, torsional, and bending deformations are expressed in terms of the elements material and geometric properties. By assembling these submatrices along the diagonal, we obtain the full 12×12 local stiffness matrix \mathbf{k} that captures both material properties (E, G) and geometric properties (A, I_y, I_z, J, L). This local matrix serves as the foundation for the coordinate transformation to the global system in Step 3, and ultimately for assembling the contributions of many elements into a single global system of equilibrium equations.

Step 3: Transform Local Matrices to the Global Coordinate System

Each element stiffness matrix is first defined in its local coordinate system ($\mathbf{F}^{\text{local}}, \mathbf{\Delta}^{\text{local}}$), where the x' -axis aligns with the elements longitudinal axis. To express the element behavior in the global coordinate system ($\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{\Delta}$), we apply a coordinate transformation using the orthogonal transformation matrix $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, constructed from the elements direction cosines. The transformation relates local and global displacement and force vectors as:

$$\mathbf{\Delta}^{\text{local}} = \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Delta}, \quad \mathbf{F}^{\text{local}} = \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{F}. \quad (4)$$

Substituting into the local stiffness relation $\mathbf{F}^{\text{local}} = \mathbf{k}^{\text{local}} \mathbf{\Delta}^{\text{local}}$ gives the global form:

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^T \mathbf{k}^{\text{local}} \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Delta}, \quad (5)$$

so that the global element stiffness matrix is:

$$\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^T \mathbf{k}^{\text{local}} \mathbf{\Gamma}. \quad (6)$$

The matrix $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ depends on the element orientation, with direction cosines derived from the elements local and global axes. For 3D frames, $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is block-diagonal, containing four identical 3×3 rotation submatrices based on these cosines.

Step 4: Assemble Global Stiffness Matrix

After transforming each element stiffness matrix to the global coordinate system, all element contributions are assembled into the global stiffness matrix \mathbf{K} . Assembly is performed by mapping each element's local degrees of freedom (DOFs) to the corresponding entries in the global stiffness matrix using the element's DOF index list. For each element elem , the global DOF indices are stored in a `dof_map` array (e.g., a list of length 12 for a 3D beam), and the local stiffness matrix `k_elem` is accumulated into the global matrix `K` using standard row–column indexing:

$$\mathbf{K}[\text{dof_map}, \text{dof_map}] += \mathbf{k_elem}. \quad (7)$$

This operation superposes the element's contribution onto the appropriate global DOF locations, consistent with the direct stiffness method and modern finite element assembly procedures.

This process is repeated for all elements, resulting in the global equilibrium relation:

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{\Delta}. \quad (8)$$

The assembled \mathbf{K} is symmetric and sparse, with nonzero entries only at DOF pairs that belong to the same or adjacent connected elements.

Step 5: Partition the Global System to Apply Boundary Conditions

To incorporate boundary conditions, the global equilibrium system is partitioned into free and constrained degrees of freedom (DOFs):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{ff} & \mathbf{K}_{fc} \\ \mathbf{K}_{cf} & \mathbf{K}_{cc} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Delta}_f \\ \mathbf{\Delta}_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_f \\ \mathbf{F}_c \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Prescribed displacements (e.g., fixed or pinned supports) are enforced by setting Δ_c to known values (often 0), and the reduced system

$$\mathbf{K}_{ff}\Delta_f = \mathbf{F}_f - \mathbf{K}_{fc}\Delta_c \quad (10)$$

is solved for the unknown free displacements. This partitioning cleanly separates supported and unconstrained DOFs for efficient solution and reaction recovery.

Step 6: Solve for Unknown Displacements

With boundary conditions applied, the reduced equilibrium system

$$\mathbf{K}_{ff}\Delta_f = \mathbf{F}_f - \mathbf{K}_{fc}\Delta_c \quad (11)$$

is solved for the unknown nodal displacements Δ_f using numerical linear algebra techniques (e.g., Gaussian elimination or sparse matrix solvers). Once Δ_f is obtained, the reactions at constrained DOFs are recovered from:

$$\mathbf{F}_c = \mathbf{K}_{cf}\Delta_f + \mathbf{K}_{cc}\Delta_c. \quad (12)$$

This step yields the complete displacement field and reaction forces for the structure.

Step 7: Post-process to Compute Forces, Moments, and Deflections

After obtaining nodal displacements, internal element forces and moments are recovered using the local stiffness relation:

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{element}}^{\text{local}} = \mathbf{k}_{\text{element}}^{\text{local}}\Delta_{\text{element}}^{\text{local}}, \quad (13)$$

where $\Delta_{\text{element}}^{\text{local}} = \mathbf{T}\Delta_{\text{element}}$ are the element deformations expressed in the local coordinate system. From these quantities, one can compute axial forces, shear forces, bending moments, and torsion along each element, as well as visualize the deflected shape of the structure. These results are typically presented graphically to assess structural performance and verify design requirements.

A.3 Elastic Critical Load Analysis

Elastic critical load analysis determines the maximum load a structure can sustain before experiencing elastic buckling, assuming the material remains within its elastic limit. Buckling is characterized by a sudden lateral deformation under compressive loading and is governed by the eigenvalue problem:

$$[\mathbf{K}_{\text{elastic}} + \lambda\mathbf{K}_{\text{geometric}}]\Delta = \mathbf{0}, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{K}_{\text{elastic}}$ is the elastic stiffness matrix, $\mathbf{K}_{\text{geometric}}$ is the geometric stiffness matrix computed with respect to a reference load P_{ref} , λ is the load factor (eigenvalue), and Δ is the buckling mode shape (eigenvector). The smallest eigenvalue λ_{cr} corresponds to the elastic critical load, $P_{\text{cr}} = \lambda_{\text{cr}}P_{\text{ref}}$, and its associated eigenvector defines the buckled configuration.

The geometric stiffness matrix $\mathbf{K}_{\text{geometric}}$ captures the influence of axial forces on lateral displacements through both global ($P\Delta$) and local ($P\delta$) effects. Its derivation involves applying the principle of virtual work with nonlinear strain terms and incorporating axial, flexural, and torsional contributions. A full derivation of $\mathbf{K}_{\text{geometric}}$ can be found in standard Matrix Structural Analysis (MSA) textbooks, where expressions for the axial, flexural, and torsional geometric stiffness components are developed in closed form [McGuire et al., 2000].

A.4 Numerical Challenges

In Matrix Structural Analysis (MSA), numerical challenges become especially evident when solving the generalized eigenvalue problem for elastic critical load analysis. Small numerical errors can strongly influence the computed eigenvalues and corresponding buckling modes. Finite precision arithmetic introduces rounding and truncation errors that accumulate during matrix assembly and factorization, while ill-conditioned stiffness matrices amplify these errors. The condition number $\kappa(\mathbf{K})$ serves as a key indicator of numerical sensitivity: as κ increases, significant digits are lost in both displacement and eigenvalue computations. Discretization adds further complexity although refining the mesh or using higher-order shape functions improves the approximation of the true (sinusoidal) buckling shape, it also increases $\kappa(\mathbf{K})$, making the eigenvalue problem more sensitive to floating-point precision. As a result, accurate computation of critical loads requires balancing discretization quality and numerical stability, often necessitating the use of robust linear algebra routines for large or ill-conditioned systems. Though the benchmark does not touch on this area extensively, it is a rich direction for further development in that understanding these errors often requires sophisticated reasoning and expertise across multiple domains.

A.5 Additional Pedagogical Resources

For readers interested in more general derivations of Matrix Structural Analysis, the Principle of Virtual Work (PVW) provides a powerful and elegant framework from which the element stiffness relations and global equilibrium equations can be derived. PVW also offers a direct bridge to finite element formulations, where the same variational principles are applied to continuous domains to obtain weak forms, interpolation functions, and numerical integration rules.

Similar PVW-based derivations for the finite element method can be found in standard FEM texts, where beam, truss, solid, and shell elements are introduced as specific discretizations of the governing partial differential equations. These derivations highlight the shared mathematical structure between MSA and FEM while also illustrating how FEM extends to more complex geometries and physics.

Key references on Matrix Structural Analysis include classical works such as McGuire, Gallagher, and Ziemians Matrix Structural Analysis, which provides a clear introduction to beam and frame formulations [McGuire et al., 2000]. For finite element methods, foundational texts include (but are certainly not limited to, see for example additional references in Sections 1 and 2) Zienkiewicz and Taylors The Finite Element Method [Zienkiewicz and Taylor, 2005], Bathes Finite Element Procedures [Bathe, 1996], and Hughes The Finite Element Method [Hughes, 2003]. These resources offer both theoretical background and practical insights that complement the material presented in FEM-Bench.

B Preliminary work on prompt optimization via GEPA

While LLMs achieve strong performance across a wide range of applications due to their broad, general-purpose pretraining [Brown et al., 2020], attaining high performance in a specific domain often benefits from an additional post-training optimization step [Brown et al., 2020]. Post-training optimization is typically accomplished either by fine-tuning model weights or by improving the input prompts. Fine-tuning methods such as Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) [Shao et al., 2024], which was originally introduced in DeepSeekMath to enhance mathematical reasoning in LLMs, can be effective but often require a large number of model rollouts [Agrawal et al., 2025]. Alternatively, using higher-quality prompts, including those augmented with few-shot examples, has proven highly effective for downstream applications [Brown et al., 2020, Zhou et al., 2022]. This process of crafting prompts that elicit the desired model behavior is known as prompt engineering [Zhou et al., 2022]. To automate this process, a variety of prompt optimization methods have been developed. For example, MIPROv2 [Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024] uses Bayesian optimization to align instructions with examples in the prompt. Other approaches, such as EvoPrompt [Guo et al., 2023] and GEPA [Agrawal et al., 2025], rely on evolutionary algorithms that treat natural language phrases as gene sequences in order to evolve improved prompts.

In our exploration of prompt optimization, we focus on the GEPA algorithm. GEPA (Genetic-Pareto) is a prompt optimizer that combines evolutionary search with natural-language feedback generated by a reflective LLM to iteratively refine candidate prompts [Agrawal et al., 2025]. Within the context of FEM-Bench, GEPA performs multi-objective optimization across tasks using a Pareto frontier, making it well suited for adapting LLMs in a sample-efficient manner on small datasets. Here, we investigate whether a GEPA-optimized system prompt can improve LLM performance on the FEM-Bench 2025 task suite. Our objectives are twofold: (1) to ensure we are not inadvertently limiting model performance by overlooking simple but impactful prompt improvements (for example, “think carefully” or “focus on correctness”), and (2) to examine what additional information, when provided through the system prompt, meaningfully improves performance and whether this sheds light on the error mechanisms discussed in Section 4.3.

Because FEM-Bench 2025 only consists of 33 tasks and GEPA requires access to sample tasks for training, we restrict our exploration to one specific and limited scenario. Specifically, we trained the GEPA optimizer on all tasks, except Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 variants of the MSA_3D_elastic_critical_load task which is the most complex task in FEM-bench 2025 suite encompassing all other tasks in MSA_3D domain. As presented in Table 3, the versions of this task without helper functions provided (T3 for no helper functions, T2 for only local geometric stiffness matrix provided) are two of the most challenging tasks for the tested models.

Our protocol is as follows. We used the GEPA optimizer implemented in the DSPy [Khattab et al., 2024, 2022] framework, with the system-aware merge strategy which merges the prompts in the pool that have a complementary strategy [Agrawal et al., 2025], a minibatch size of 3 and all other parameters set to their defaults. The 30 tasks used for prompt optimization (all tasks except the 3 held out tasks) were split with 70% of tasks in the training set and a 30% of the tasks in the validation set. With this split, the task involving construction of the local geometric stiffness matrix was included in the training set. In our implementation, we use the prompt generated by the FEM-bench 2025 as presented in Listing 3 for the coding task as the input to the optimizer, and the reflection stage uses the respective reference function implemented in the task to give feedback to the reflecting LLM. Here we only tested

gemini-3-pro-preview and gpt-5 as the reflection model using the default reasoning effort parameter across three GEPA optimization budgets: “light”, “medium”, and “heavy”.

Table 6 shows that system prompts produced under the “heavy” optimization budget enabled both models to solve all three tiers of the task. The resulting prompts are provided in Listings 6 and 7. In contrast, the “light” and “medium” optimization budgets applied to gemini-3-pro-preview yielded no consistent improvement over the baseline (no system prompt). Under these settings, GEPA consistently collapsed to overly generic prompts, shown in Listing 5, which offered no task-specific guidance, particularly regarding construction of the local geometric stiffness matrix, a component already identified as challenging in Table 3. A similar pattern occurred for GPT-5 under the “light” budget, which also failed to solve Tier 3. However, unlike gemini-3-pro-preview, GPT-5 benefited from both the “medium” and “heavy” budgets and successfully completed Tier 3 in both cases. Overall, these results suggest that GEPA did not yield any broadly applicable, domain-agnostic prompt improvements, and that meaningful gains arose only when the optimized prompts incorporated substantial domain-specific knowledge.

Table 6: Function correctness out of 5 runs on MSA_3D_elastic_critical_load task

MSA_3D_elastic_critical_load	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Gemini 3 pro preview			
No system prompt	5/5	4/5	0/5
Light (416 iterations)	5/5	5/5	0/5
Medium (735 iterations)	5/5	4/5	0/5
Heavy (1098 iterations)	5/5	5/5	5/5
GPT-5			
No system prompt	5/5	2/5	0/5
Light (416 iterations)	5/5	3/5	3/5
Medium (735 iterations)	5/5	5/5	5/5
Heavy (1098 iterations)	5/5	3/5	5/5

Listing 5: GEPA optimized system prompt with “light” budget using gemini-3-pro-preview

Solve the problem and provide the answer in the correct format.

Listing 6: GEPA optimized system prompt with “heavy” budget using gemini-3-pro-preview

You are an expert Python programmer specialized in Computational Structural Mechanics and Matrix Structural Analysis (MSA). Your task is to implement specific Python functions for 3D beam element analysis, exactly matching the provided function signatures and docstrings.

Follow these strict guidelines and domain-specific technical details:

1. Output Format

--Code Only:-- Return *only* the valid Python function definition. Do not include markdown blocks (‘python ... ‘), comments outside the code, explanations, or imports that are not requested.

--Self-Containment:-- If the function requires logic for transformation matrices, elastic stiffness, or load calculations, and those helper functions are *not* provided in the “Available Helper Functions” section, you must define them as private inner functions (e.g., ‘def _beam_transformation_matrix_3D(...)’) within the scope of the main function.

2. Domain Knowledge: Geometric Stiffness Matrix (\$k_g\$)

When implementing geometric stiffness (often named with ‘CC1’, ‘H0’, ‘T0’, ‘H4’, ‘T3’ suffixes), do not derive coefficients from general textbooks, as sign conventions vary. Use the following *specific* formulation for a 12x12 symmetric local geometric stiffness matrix.

Variables:

–‘L’: Length

–‘Fx2’: Axial force at node 2 (Tension +)


```

-‘Mx2’: Torque at node 2
-‘My1’, ‘My2’: Bending moments about local y-axis at nodes 1 and 2
-‘Mz1’, ‘Mz2’: Bending moments about local z-axis at nodes 1 and 2
-‘I_rho’: Polar moment of inertia ( $I_x$  or  $I_y$  depending on context, often  $I_y + I_z$ ).
-‘A’: Area

**Upper Triangle Coefficients (Indices 0-11):**
* ‘k[0, 6] = -Fx2 / L’
* ‘k[1, 3] = My1 / L’
* ‘k[1, 4] = Mx2 / L’
* ‘k[1, 5] = Fx2 / 10.0’
* ‘k[1, 7] = -6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)’
* ‘k[1, 9] = My2 / L’
* ‘k[1, 10] = -Mx2 / L’
* ‘k[1, 11] = Fx2 / 10.0’
* ‘k[2, 3] = Mz1 / L’
* ‘k[2, 4] = -Fx2 / 10.0’
* ‘k[2, 5] = Mx2 / L’
* ‘k[2, 8] = -6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)’
* ‘k[2, 9] = Mz2 / L’
* ‘k[2, 10] = -Fx2 / 10.0’
* ‘k[2, 11] = -Mx2 / L’
* ‘k[3, 4] = -(2.0 * Mz1 - Mz2) / 6.0’
* ‘k[3, 5] = (2.0 * My1 - My2) / 6.0’
* ‘k[3, 7] = -My1 / L’
* ‘k[3, 8] = -Mz1 / L’
* ‘k[3, 9] = -Fx2 * I_rho / (A * L)’ (Wagner term)
* ‘k[3, 10] = -(Mz1 + Mz2) / 6.0’
* ‘k[3, 11] = (My1 + My2) / 6.0’
* ‘k[4, 7] = -Mx2 / L’
* ‘k[4, 8] = Fx2 / 10.0’
* ‘k[4, 9] = -(Mz1 + Mz2) / 6.0’
* ‘k[4, 10] = -Fx2 * L / 30.0’
* ‘k[4, 11] = Mx2 / 2.0’
* ‘k[5, 7] = -Fx2 / 10.0’
* ‘k[5, 8] = -Mx2 / L’
* ‘k[5, 9] = (My1 + My2) / 6.0’
* ‘k[5, 10] = -Mx2 / 2.0’
* ‘k[5, 11] = -Fx2 * L / 30.0’
* ‘k[7, 9] = -My2 / L’
* ‘k[7, 10] = Mx2 / L’
* ‘k[7, 11] = -Fx2 / 10.0’
* ‘k[8, 9] = -Mz2 / L’
* ‘k[8, 10] = Fx2 / 10.0’
* ‘k[8, 11] = Mx2 / L’
* ‘k[9, 10] = (Mz1 - 2.0 * Mz2) / 6.0’
* ‘k[9, 11] = -(My1 - 2.0 * My2) / 6.0’

**Diagonal Terms:**
* ‘k[0, 0] = k[6, 6] = Fx2 / L’
* ‘k[1, 1] = k[7, 7] = k[2, 2] = k[8, 8] = 6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)’
* ‘k[3, 3] = k[9, 9] = Fx2 * I_rho / (A * L)’
* ‘k[4, 4] = k[5, 5] = k[10, 10] = k[11, 11] = 2.0 * Fx2 * L / 15.0’

**Construction:**
Initialize with zeros, apply upper triangle terms, add transpose (to symmetrize), then apply diagonal
terms (since diagonal terms were not set in the upper triangle step).

### 3. Implementation Strategy for Assembly Tasks
If asked to assemble a global geometric stiffness matrix (‘assemble_global_geometric_stiffness...’):
1. **Iterate** through elements.
2. **Calculate Geometry:** Compute Length (‘L’) and the Transformation Matrix (‘Gamma’). If no
reference vector (‘local_z’) is provided, default to Global Z, unless the beam is vertical
(parallel to Z), then use Global Y.
3. **Calculate Internal Forces:**

```

```

    * Extract global displacements for the element nodes.
    * Transform to local displacements:  $u_{\text{local}} = \Gamma \cdot u_{\text{global}}$ .
    * Calculate **local elastic stiffness** ( $k_e$ ).
    * Compute local forces:  $f_{\text{local}} = k_e \cdot u_{\text{local}}$ .
    * Extract 'Fx2' (index 6), 'Mx2' (index 9), 'My1', 'Mz1', 'My2', 'Mz2' (indices 4, 5, 10, 11) from
       $f_{\text{local}}$ .
4. **Compute Geometric Stiffness:** Pass these forces into the local geometric stiffness logic ( $k_g$ )
   defined in Section 2.
5. **Globalize and Assemble:**  $K_{\{g, \text{global}\}} = \Gamma^T \cdot k_g \cdot \Gamma$ . Add to the global system matrix.

### 4. Constants & Helper Logic
- **Elastic Stiffness ( $k_e$ ):**
  - Axial:  $EA/L$  at indices (0,0), etc.
  - Torsion:  $GJ/L$  at (3,3), etc.
  - Bending:  $12EI/L^3$ ,  $6EI/L^2$ ,  $4EI/L$ ,  $2EI/L$ .
- **Transformation Matrix ( $\Gamma$ ):**
  - Use direction cosines.
  -  $\Gamma$  is a 12x12 block diagonal matrix composed of four 3x3 rotation matrices.

```

Listing 7: GEPA optimized system prompt with “heavy” budget using gpt-5

You will receive Python function implementation tasks with strict formatting and domain-specific requirements. Follow these instructions precisely to ensure your solution is accepted.

General rules for all tasks

- Output only valid Python code containing the single function requested. Do not include any explanations, comments, assertions, prints, or markdown.
- Keep the function name, signature (including type hints), and docstring exactly as provided. Do not alter spacing, order, or wording inside the docstring.
- Do not add any code outside the function body.
- Use only the imports explicitly listed in the task prompt. Do not import anything else. If imports are allowed, place them inside the function unless told otherwise.
- Use only the helper functions explicitly provided in the prompt. Do not re-implement or modify them unless the prompt explicitly states that helper functions are unavailable. If no helpers are available, implement all needed logic inside the single function.

Coordinate systems, DOF ordering, and transformations (3D beam/frame tasks)

- Local element DOF ordering is always:

[u1, v1, w1, $\theta x1$, $\theta y1$, $\theta z1$, u2, v2, w2, $\theta x2$, $\theta y2$, $\theta z2$]
- Internal force vector (local) uses the same order mapped to force/moment resultants:

[Fx_i, Fy_i, Fz_i, Mx_i, My_i, Mz_i, Fx_j, Fy_j, Fz_j, Mx_j, My_j, Mz_j]
- The 12x12 transformation matrix Γ relates local and global systems via:

 $K_{\text{global}} = \Gamma^T @ K_{\text{local}} @ \Gamma$

Therefore:
 - Displacements transform to local with $u_{\text{local}} = \Gamma @ u_{\text{global}}$
 - Forces transform to local with $f_{\text{local}} = \Gamma^T @ f_{\text{global}}$
- The 12x12 Γ is composed of four repeated 3x3 direction cosine blocks along the diagonal, built from a right-handed orthonormal triad (ex, ey, ez) where:
 - ex is the unit vector along the element axis from node i to node j
 - ey = normalize(cross(ref_vec, ex))
 - ez = cross(ex, ey)
 - If ref_vec (local_z) is not provided: use global z unless ex is nearly parallel to global z, then use global y.
 - Validate ref_vec when provided: shape (3,), unit length, and not parallel to ex.
 - A zero-length element must raise an error in the transformation routine.

Local elastic stiffness of a 3D Euler-Bernoulli beam (when helpers are not provided)

- Use the standard 12x12 formulation with axial, torsional, and bending about local y and z:
 - Axial: EA/L coupling u1-u2
 - Torsion: GJ/L coupling $\theta x1$ - $\theta x2$ with $G = E/(2(1+\nu))$
 - Bending about z (affects v and θz) uses $E \cdot I_z$
 - Bending about y (affects w and θy) uses $E \cdot I_y$
- A canonical implementation (matching typical helpers) is:

```

k = np.zeros((12, 12))
EA_L = E * A / L
GJ_L = E * J / (2.0 * (1.0 + nu) * L)
EIz_L = E * Iz
EIy_L = E * Iy
# axial
k[0, 0] = k[6, 6] = EA_L
k[0, 6] = k[6, 0] = -EA_L
# torsion
k[3, 3] = k[9, 9] = GJ_L
k[3, 9] = k[9, 3] = -GJ_L
# bending about z (local ydisplacements & rotations about z)
k[1, 1] = k[7, 7] = 12.0 * EIz_L / L**3
k[1, 7] = k[7, 1] = -12.0 * EIz_L / L**3
k[1, 5] = k[5, 1] = k[1, 11] = k[11, 1] = 6.0 * EIz_L / L**2
k[5, 7] = k[7, 5] = k[7, 11] = k[11, 7] = -6.0 * EIz_L / L**2
k[5, 5] = k[11, 11] = 4.0 * EIz_L / L
k[5, 11] = k[11, 5] = 2.0 * EIz_L / L
# bending about y (local zdisplacements & rotations about y)
k[2, 2] = k[8, 8] = 12.0 * EIy_L / L**3
k[2, 8] = k[8, 2] = -12.0 * EIy_L / L**3
k[2, 4] = k[4, 2] = k[2, 10] = k[10, 2] = -6.0 * EIy_L / L**2
k[4, 8] = k[8, 4] = k[8, 10] = k[10, 8] = 6.0 * EIy_L / L**2
k[4, 4] = k[10, 10] = 4.0 * EIy_L / L
k[4, 10] = k[10, 4] = 2.0 * EIy_L / L

```

Computing internal element end forces (local)

-Given global element displacements u_dofs_global of length 12 and geometry:

- 1) Build Γ with the transformation routine.
- 2) Compute element length $L = ||x_j - x_i||$.
- 3) Build the local elastic stiffness k_e_local as above or via provided helper.
- 4) Transform displacements to local: $u_local = \Gamma @ u_dofs_global$.
- 5) Internal end forces (local) are $load_local = k_e_local @ u_local$.

Local geometric stiffness matrix with torsionbending coupling (12×12)

-For the function `MSA_3D_local_geometric_stiffness_CC1_H0_T0`, you must construct the full consistent local geometric (initial-stress) stiffness with coupling between axial force $Fx2$, torsion $Mx2$, and end bending moments $My1$, $Mz1$, $My2$, $Mz2$, including polar inertia coupling via I_rho and A . Use exactly this formulation:

```

k_g = np.zeros((12, 12))
# upper triangle off diagonal terms
k_g[0, 6] = -Fx2 / L
k_g[1, 3] = My1 / L
k_g[1, 4] = Mx2 / L
k_g[1, 5] = Fx2 / 10.0
k_g[1, 7] = -6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)
k_g[1, 9] = My2 / L
k_g[1, 10] = -Mx2 / L
k_g[1, 11] = Fx2 / 10.0
k_g[2, 3] = Mz1 / L
k_g[2, 4] = -Fx2 / 10.0
k_g[2, 5] = Mx2 / L
k_g[2, 8] = -6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)
k_g[2, 9] = Mz2 / L
k_g[2, 10] = -Fx2 / 10.0
k_g[2, 11] = -Mx2 / L
k_g[3, 4] = -1.0 * (2.0 * Mz1 - Mz2) / 6.0
k_g[3, 5] = (2.0 * My1 - My2) / 6.0
k_g[3, 7] = -My1 / L
k_g[3, 8] = -Mz1 / L
k_g[3, 9] = -Fx2 * I_rho / (A * L)
k_g[3, 10] = -1.0 * (Mz1 + Mz2) / 6.0
k_g[3, 11] = (My1 + My2) / 6.0

```

```

k_g[4, 7] = -Mx2 / L
k_g[4, 8] = Fx2 / 10.0
k_g[4, 9] = -1.0 * (Mz1 + Mz2) / 6.0
k_g[4, 10] = -Fx2 * L / 30.0
k_g[4, 11] = Mx2 / 2.0
k_g[5, 7] = -Fx2 / 10.0
k_g[5, 8] = -Mx2 / L
k_g[5, 9] = (My1 + My2) / 6.0
k_g[5, 10] = -Mx2 / 2.0
k_g[5, 11] = -Fx2 * L / 30.0
k_g[7, 9] = -My2 / L
k_g[7, 10] = Mx2 / L
k_g[7, 11] = -Fx2 / 10.0
k_g[8, 9] = -Mz2 / L
k_g[8, 10] = Fx2 / 10.0
k_g[8, 11] = Mx2 / L
k_g[9, 10] = (Mz1 - 2.0 * Mz2) / 6.0
k_g[9, 11] = -1.0 * (My1 - 2.0 * My2) / 6.0
# add in the symmetric lower triangle
k_g = k_g + k_g.transpose()
# add diagonal terms
k_g[0, 0] = Fx2 / L
k_g[1, 1] = 6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)
k_g[2, 2] = 6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)
k_g[3, 3] = Fx2 * I_rho / (A * L)
k_g[4, 4] = 2.0 * Fx2 * L / 15.0
k_g[5, 5] = 2.0 * Fx2 * L / 15.0
k_g[6, 6] = Fx2 / L
k_g[7, 7] = 6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)
k_g[8, 8] = 6.0 * Fx2 / (5.0 * L)
k_g[9, 9] = Fx2 * I_rho / (A * L)
k_g[10, 10] = 2.0 * Fx2 * L / 15.0
k_g[11, 11] = 2.0 * Fx2 * L / 15.0

```

Global geometric stiffness assembly (when required)

-Global DOFs per node are 6, ordered $[u_x, u_y, u_z, \theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z]$.

-For each element:

- 1) Determine node indices n_i, n_j and their coordinates.
- 2) Build Γ and element length L .
- 3) Extract the elements global displacement subvector u_e (12×1).
- 4) Transform to local: $d_{loc} = \Gamma @ u_e$.
- 5) Compute local elastic stiffness k_{el} (as above or via helper).
- 6) Compute internal local end forces: $f_{loc} = k_{el} @ d_{loc}$.
- 7) Extract geometric parameters from f_{loc} for k_g^{local} construction:


```

Fx2 = f_loc[6]
Mx2 = f_loc[9]
My1 = f_loc[4]
Mz1 = f_loc[5]
My2 = f_loc[10]
Mz2 = f_loc[11]

```
- 8) Build k_g^{local} using the exact 12×12 formulation above.
- 9) Transform to global: $k_g^{global} = \Gamma.T @ k_g^{local} @ \Gamma$.
- 10) Assemble into the global matrix K at the elements DOF indices.

-After assembly, you may enforce symmetry via $K = 0.5 * (K + K.T)$ to counter minor numerical asymmetries.

Common pitfalls to avoid

- Do not use $\Gamma.T$ to transform displacements; the correct is $u_{local} = \Gamma @ u_{global}$.
- Respect the exact DOF ordering and index mapping when extracting forces and moments.
- Do not omit torsionbending and momentdisplacement/rotation coupling terms in geometric stiffness; use the full matrix provided above when requested.
- Do not add extra imports or code outside the function.
- Ensure no extraneous output (no prints, comments, or markdown).

When in doubt, strictly follow the formulas and conventions above; these reflect the expected answers for these tasks.

Inspection of the code produced by LLMs for Tier 3 of the MSA_3D_elastic_critical_load task shows that the models consistently struggled to construct the local geometric stiffness matrix, a core requirement of the problem. The contrast between their success on Tier 2 and failure on Tier 3 reinforces this observation. A similar limitation appears in the GEPA-optimized prompts, which ultimately needed to provide the geometric stiffness matrix explicitly for the models to succeed. Taken together, these results indicate that even when LLMs can handle broader tasks with ease, they are unable to solve specialized and technically intricate problems without access to essential domain knowledge. In this particular case, the models were not able to recall or derive the local geometric stiffness matrix on the fly, but once that information was supplied through tools or system context they became capable of solving substantially more complex challenges.

While the current system prompt is effective for completing the hardest task in the FEM-Bench 2025 suite, it is unlikely to generalize to areas of FEM or MSA that fall outside the present scope, such as elasto-plasticity or dynamic analysis. Achieving broad generalizability across these domains may require fundamental advances in an LLMs ability to synthesize information from multiple sources and reason over heterogeneous technical inputs. This is precisely where AI agents equipped with multiple external tools may become valuable. Looking ahead, we anticipate that integrating capabilities such as symbolic reasoning, automated code execution, and authoritative retrieval will be essential for enabling LLMs to move beyond prior accessible domain knowledge for solving FEM related tasks.

References

- Anton Bakhtin, Laurens van der Maaten, Justin Johnson, Laura Gustafson, and Ross Girshick. Phyre: A new benchmark for physical reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Yi Wang, Jiafei Duan, Dieter Fox, and Siddhartha Srinivasa. Newton: Are large language models capable of physical reasoning? In *Findings of the association for computational linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 9743–9758, 2023.
- Hao Cui, Zahra Shamsi, Gowoon Cheon, Xuejian Ma, Shutong Li, Maria Tikhonovskaya, Peter Norgaard, Nayanara Mudur, Martyna Plomecka, Paul Raccuglia, et al. Curie: Evaluating llms on multitask scientific long context understanding and reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.13517*, 2025.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021a.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code. 2021a.
- Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. Swbench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06770*, 2023.
- Elliot Glazer, Ege Erdil, Tamay Besiroglu, Diego Chicharro, Evan Chen, Alex Gunning, Caroline Falkman Olsson, Jean-Stanislas Denain, Anson Ho, Emily de Oliveira Santos, et al. Frontiermath: A benchmark for evaluating advanced mathematical reasoning in ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04872*, 2024.
- Minyang Tian, Luyu Gao, Shizhuo Zhang, Xinan Chen, Cunwei Fan, Xuefei Guo, Roland Haas, Pan Ji, Kittithat Krongchon, Yao Li, et al. Scicode: A research coding benchmark curated by scientists. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:30624–30650, 2024.
- Qile Jiang, Zhiwei Gao, and George Em Karniadakis. Deepseek vs. chatgpt vs. claude: A comparative study for scientific computing and scientific machine learning tasks. *Theoretical and Applied Mechanics Letters*, 15(3): 100583, 2025.
- Weicheng Huang, Xiaonan Huang, Carmel Majidi, and M Khalid Jawed. Dynamic simulation of articulated soft robots. *Nature communications*, 11(1):2233, 2020.

- Steven A Niederer, Michael S Sacks, Mark Girolami, and Karen Willcox. Scaling digital twins from the artisanal to the industrial. Nature Computational Science, 1(5):313–320, 2021.
- Gokhan Danabasoglu, J-F Lamarque, J Bacmeister, DA Bailey, AK DuVivier, Jim Edwards, LK Emmons, John Fiasullo, R Garcia, Andrew Gettelman, et al. The community earth system model version 2 (cesm2). Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 12(2):e2019MS001916, 2020.
- Cameron Talischi, Glaucio H Paulino, Anderson Pereira, and Ivan FM Menezes. Polytop: a matlab implementation of a general topology optimization framework using unstructured polygonal finite element meshes. Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization, 45(3):329–357, 2012.
- Roger D Peng. Reproducible research in computational science. Science, 334(6060):1226–1227, 2011.
- William L Oberkampf and Christopher J Roy. Verification and validation in scientific computing. Cambridge university press, 2010.
- Daniel Arndt, Wolfgang Bangerth, Maximilian Bergbauer, Marco Feder, Marc Fehling, Johannes Heinz, Timo Heister, Luca Heltai, Martin Kronbichler, Matthias Maier, et al. The deal. ii library, version 9.5. Journal of Numerical Mathematics, 31(3):231–246, 2023.
- Martin Alnæs, Jan Blechta, Johan Hake, August Johansson, Benjamin Kehlet, Anders Logg, Chris Richardson, Johannes Ring, Marie E Rognes, and Garth N Wells. The fenics project version 1.5. Archive of numerical software, 3(100), 2015.
- Richard Courant et al. Variational methods for the solution of problems of equilibrium and vibrations. Lecture notes in pure and applied mathematics, pages 1–1, 1994.
- M Jon Turner, Ray W Clough, Harold C Martin, and LJ Topp. Stiffness and deflection analysis of complex structures. journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, 23(9):805–823, 1956.
- OC Zienkiewicz and Richard Lawrence Taylor. The finite element patch test revisited a computer test for convergence, validation and error estimates. Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering, 149(1-4):223–254, 1997.
- Thomas JR Hughes. The finite element method: linear static and dynamic finite element analysis. Courier Corporation, 2003.
- Krishna Garikipati. The finite element method for problems in physics. Coursera [MOOC], 2015. URL <https://www.coursera.org/learn/finite-element-method>.
- Mostafa Faghih Shojaei, Rahul Gulati, Benjamin A Jaspersen, Shangshang Wang, Simone Cimolato, Dangli Cao, Willie Neiswanger, and Krishna Garikipati. Ai-university: An llm-based platform for instructional alignment to scientific classrooms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08846, 2025.
- Farhad Kamarei, Bo Zeng, John E Dolbow, and Oscar Lopez-Pamies. Nine circles of elastic brittle fracture: A series of challenge problems to assess fracture models. Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 448:118449, 2026.
- Barna Szabó and Ivo Babuška. Finite element analysis: Method, verification and validation. 2021.
- Ted Belytschko, Wing Kam Liu, Brian Moran, and Khalil Elkhodary. Nonlinear finite elements for continua and structures. John wiley & sons, 2014.
- Morton E Gurtin, Eliot Fried, and Lallit Anand. The mechanics and thermodynamics of continua. Cambridge university press, 2010.
- Hans Petter Langtangen. Computational partial differential equations: numerical methods and diffpack programming, volume 2. Springer Berlin, 2003.
- William McGuire, Richard H Gallagher, and Ronald D Ziemian. Matrix structural analysis. 2000.
- John H Argyris, Sydney Kelsey, et al. Energy theorems and structural analysis, volume 60. Springer, 1960.
- Robert D Cook et al. Concepts and applications of finite element analysis. John wiley & sons, 2007.
- Carlos A Felippa. Introduction to finite element methods. 2004.
- Gilbert Strang, George J Fix, et al. An analysis of the finite element method, volume 212. Prentice-hall, 1973.
- William H Press. Numerical recipes 3rd edition: The art of scientific computing. Cambridge university press, 2007.
- Klaus Jurgan Bathe. Finite element procedures, 1996.
- J Austin Cottrell, Thomas JR Hughes, and Yuri Bazilevs. Isogeometric analysis: toward integration of CAD and FEA. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- Nicholas J Higham. Accuracy and stability of numerical algorithms. SIAM, 2002.

- Gerhard A Holzapfel. Nonlinear solid mechanics: a continuum approach for engineering science, 2002.
- Richard H Macneal and Robert L Harder. A proposed standard set of problems to test finite element accuracy. Finite elements in analysis and design, 1(1):3–20, 1985.
- Patrick J Roache. Verification and validation in computational science and engineering, volume 895. Hermosa Albuquerque, NM, 1998.
- Paul Ammann and Jeff Offutt. Introduction to software testing. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- James D Foley. Computer graphics: principles and practice, volume 12110. Addison-Wesley Professional, 1996.
- Lloyd N Trefethen and David Bau. Numerical linear algebra. SIAM, 2022.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, and Charles Sutton. Program synthesis with large language models, 2021b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07732>.
- Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik R Narasimhan. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VTF8yNQM66>.
- Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Scott Wen tau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. Ds-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation. ArXiv, abs/2211.11501, 2022.
- Erfan Hamdi and Emma Lejeune. Towards robust surrogate models: Benchmarking machine learning approaches to expediting phase field simulations of brittle fracture. Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 449:118526, 2026.
- Emma Lejeune. Mechanical mnist: A benchmark dataset for mechanical metamodels. Extreme Mechanics Letters, 36:100659, 2020.
- Joel Shor, Erik Strand, and Cory Y. McLean. Nucleobench: A large-scale benchmark of neural nucleic acid design algorithms. bioRxiv, 2025. doi:10.1101/2025.06.20.660785. URL <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2025/08/26/2025.06.20.660785>. Presented at the ICML 2025 GenBio Workshop.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. NeurIPS, 2021.
- Iman Mirzadeh, Keivan Alizadeh, Hooman Shahrokhi, Oncel Tuzel, Samy Bengio, and Mehrdad Farajtabar. Gsm-symbolic: Understanding the limitations of mathematical reasoning in large language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.05229>.
- Nayantara Mudur, Hao Cui, Subhashini Venugopalan, Paul Raccuglia, Michael Brenner, and Peter Christian Norgaard. Feabench: Evaluating language models on real world physics reasoning ability. 2024.
- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, et al. Holistic evaluation of language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110, 2022.
- Bowen Jiang, Yangxinyu Xie, Zhuoqun Hao, Xiaomeng Wang, Tanwi Mallick, Weijie J Su, Camillo Jose Taylor, and Dan Roth. A peek into token bias: Large language models are not yet genuine reasoners. In Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 4722–4756, 2024.
- Freda Shi, Xinyun Chen, Kanishka Misra, Nathan Scales, David Dohan, Ed H Chi, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Large language models can be easily distracted by irrelevant context. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 31210–31227. PMLR, 2023.

- Gustavo Pinto, Cleidson De Souza, João Batista Neto, Alberto Souza, Tarcísio Gotto, and Edward Monteiro. Lessons from building stackspot ai: A contextualized ai coding assistant. In *Proceedings of the 46th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice*, pages 408–417, 2024.
- Juraj Gottweis, Wei-Hung Weng, Alexander Daryin, Tao Tu, Anil Palepu, Petar Sirkovic, Artiom Myaskovsky, Felix Weissenberger, Keran Rong, Ryutaro Tanno, et al. Towards an ai co-scientist. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18864*, 2025.
- 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.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM computing surveys*, 55(9):1–35, 2023.
- Hengxing Cai, Xiaochen Cai, Junhan Chang, Sihang Li, Lin Yao, Wang Changxin, Zhifeng Gao, Hongshuai Wang, Li Yongge, Mujie Lin, et al. Sciassess: Benchmarking llm proficiency in scientific literature analysis. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2025*, pages 2335–2357, 2025.
- Parshin Shojaee, Ngoc-Hieu Nguyen, Kazem Meidani, Amir Barati Farimani, Khoa D Doan, and Chandan K Reddy. Llm-srbench: A new benchmark for scientific equation discovery with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10415*, 2025.
- Zhangde Song, Jieyu Lu, Yuanqi Du, Botao Yu, Thomas M Pruyn, Yue Huang, Kehan Guo, Xiuzhe Luo, Yuanhao Qu, Yi Qu, et al. Evaluating large language models in scientific discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.15567*, 2025.
- Olgierd C Zienkiewicz and Robert Leroy Taylor. *The finite element method set*. Elsevier, 2005.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Yang Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- Lakshya A Agrawal, Shangyin Tan, Dilara Soylu, Noah Ziemis, Rishi Khare, Krista Opsahl-Ong, Arnav Singhvi, Herumb Shandilya, Michael J Ryan, Meng Jiang, et al. Gepa: Reflective prompt evolution can outperform reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.19457*, 2025.
- Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwen Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. In *The eleventh international conference on learning representations*, 2022.
- Krista Opsahl-Ong, Michael J Ryan, Josh Purtell, David Broman, Christopher Potts, Matei Zaharia, and Omar Khattab. Optimizing instructions and demonstrations for multi-stage language model programs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11695*, 2024.
- Qingyan Guo, Rui Wang, Junliang Guo, Bei Li, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Guoqing Liu, Jiang Bian, and Yujiu Yang. Connecting large language models with evolutionary algorithms yields powerful prompt optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08532*, 2023.
- Omar Khattab, Arnav Singhvi, Paridhi Maheshwari, Zhiyuan Zhang, Keshav Santhanam, Sri Vardhamanan, Saiful Haq, Ashutosh Sharma, Thomas T. Joshi, Hanna Moazam, Heather Miller, Matei Zaharia, and Christopher Potts. Dspy: Compiling declarative language model calls into self-improving pipelines. 2024.
- Omar Khattab, Keshav Santhanam, Xiang Lisa Li, David Hall, Percy Liang, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. Demonstrate-search-predict: Composing retrieval and language models for knowledge-intensive NLP. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14024*, 2022.