

STEMVerse: A Dual-Axis Diagnostic Framework for STEM Reasoning in Large Language Models

Xuzhao Li^{1*} Xuchen Li^{2*} Jian Zhao^{2,3} Shiyu Hu^{1†}

¹NTU, ²ZGCA, ³ZGCI

xuzhaoli2001@gmail.com, xuchenli1030@gmail.com, shiyu.hu@ntu.edu.sg

Abstract

As Large Language Models (LLMs) achieve significant breakthroughs in complex reasoning tasks, evaluating their proficiency in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) has become a primary method for measuring machine intelligence. However, current evaluation paradigms often treat benchmarks as isolated "silos," offering only monolithic aggregate scores that neglect the intricacies of both academic specialization and cognitive depth. This result-oriented approach fails to distinguish whether model errors stem from insufficient domain knowledge or deficiencies in cognitive capacity, thereby limiting the diagnostic value. To address this, we propose STEMVerse, a diagnostic framework designed to systematically analyze the STEM reasoning capabilities of LLMs. This framework characterizes model performance across academic specialization and cognitive complexity to map the capability required for reasoning. We reaggregate over 20,000 STEM problems from mainstream benchmarks into a unified "Discipline \times Cognition" capability space, assigning dual-axis labels to every instance. Utilizing this unified diagnostic framework, we systematically evaluate representative LLM families across varying parameter scales and training paradigms. Our empirical results reveal structural failure patterns in STEM reasoning. By integrating multi-disciplinary coverage and fine-grained cognitive stratification into a unified framework, STEMVerse provides a clear and actionable perspective for understanding the scientific reasoning characteristics of LLMs.

1 Introduction

As Large Language Models (LLMs) achieve significant breakthroughs in complex reasoning tasks (Guo et al., 2025; Xie et al., 2025; Guan et al., 2025;

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: **Paradigm shift from result-oriented ranking to capability-driven diagnostics.** **Left:** Traditional benchmarks treat disciplines as isolated silos, offering only monolithic accuracy scores that neglect the intricacies and profundities of both academic specialization and cognitive depth. **Right:** STEMVerse restructures evaluation into a dual-axis capability matrix to pinpoint "logical blind spots."

Hurst et al., 2024; Team et al., 2023, 2024; Cao et al., 2025), evaluating their proficiency in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) has become a primary method for measuring machine intelligence (Wang et al., 2023, 2024; Li et al., 2025b). The ability to solve intricate mathematical proofs, interpret physical phenomena, and analyze biological systems is no longer just a specialized requirement but a core benchmark for evaluating a model's logical rigor and internal knowledge representation. Consequently, numerous benchmarks (He et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024) have been developed to evaluate the scientific capabilities of LLMs.

However, as shown in Fig. 1 (Left), current evaluation paradigms often treat these benchmarks (Shi et al., 2024; Amini et al., 2019; Cobbe et al., 2021) as isolated "silos," offering only aggregate scores (Bisk et al., 2020; Walker et al., 2010) that neglect the structural intricacies of academic specialization and cognitive depth. Most existing leaderboards (Wang et al., 2024; Li et al., 2025g) report a single accuracy per benchmark, creating a "black-box" approach that fails to distinguish between different sources of model failure. For instance, a model's

failure on a complex physics problem could stem from a lack of specialized formulas (knowledge gap) or a breakdown in multi-step causal deduction (reasoning gap). Without a structured way to dissect these failures, the community lacks the necessary insights to refine model performance systematically, often mistaking task boundaries for true capability boundaries.

To bridge this gap, we propose STEMVerse, a diagnostic framework that transits LLMs evaluation from coarse-grained metrics to a "spectral" analysis of capabilities. As shown in Fig. 1 (Right), STEMVerse begins by stripping away original data labels and re-aggregating discrete problems from heterogeneous benchmarks into a unified disciplinary coordinate system. At the core of our framework is a dual-axis capability matrix that meticulously projects each problem onto two orthogonal dimensions: a vertical axis representing fine-grained academic specializations (spanning 27 sub-disciplines across Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, and Biology) and a horizontal axis employing Bloom's Taxonomy to categorize cognitive complexity across six hierarchical levels. This structured grid allows us to pinpoint the exact intersection where a model's reasoning fails, transforming evaluation from aggregate rankings to a principled roadmap for localizing "logical blind spots."

Utilizing STEMVerse, we conduct extensive evaluations on representative open-source model families, specifically the Qwen (Qwen et al., 2025; Yang et al., 2025) and Llama (Dubey et al., 2024) series, ranging from 3B to 14B parameters. Our empirical results validate the necessity of this dual-axis perspective: while aggregate scores may show steady growth, our matrix reveals a non-linear evolutionary pattern of academic and cognitive capabilities. Specifically, we identify a "logic-symbolic collapse" in symbolic-heavy fields, where models demonstrate proficiency in formulaic execution but suffer sharp performance degradation during the transition to high-order cognitive tasks. These findings underscore the limitations of current "one-score-fits-all" benchmarks and highlight the precision of STEMVerse in diagnosing the structural deficiencies of current training paradigms.

This work makes three key contributions:

- We propose STEMVerse to address the fragmented organization and result-oriented nature of STEM reasoning evaluation. By breaking traditional benchmark boundaries, we ex-

tends STEM evaluation from monolithic accuracy rankings to a comprehensive capability analysis that simultaneously accounts for disciplinary disparities and cognitive complexity.

- We introduce an evaluation methodology based on a dual-axis capability matrix to address the difficulty in characterizing model reasoning with fine-grained precision. This approach intertwines granular academic specializations with Bloom's Taxonomy to systematically map the distribution of model reasoning across disciplines and cognitive tiers.
- To address the limitations of existing evaluations in revealing capability structures and evolutionary traits, we conduct systematic experiments across multiple mainstream open-source model families, parameter scales, and training paradigms. Our findings reveal cognitive bottlenecks and non-linear evolutionary patterns in STEM reasoning, providing a diagnostic foundation for understanding the inherent limitations of model capabilities.

2 Related Work

2.1 Scientific Reasoning

Scientific reasoning (Ghafarollahi and Buehler, 2025; Ma et al., 2024) in LLMs represents a frontier in artificial intelligence, moving beyond simple pattern matching toward complex logical reasoning and symbolic manipulation (Narayanan et al., 2024). Recent advancements have demonstrated that models can perform sophisticated reasoning (Guan et al., 2025; Shi et al., 2024; Jaiswal et al., 2024; Hsu et al., 2024; Bran et al., 2025) via techniques such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022), reinforcement learning (RL) (Guo et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025g,d) and multi-agent system (Li et al., 2025f; Ghafarollahi and Buehler, 2025), which encourage step-by-step derivation. However, despite the emergence of specialized scientific models, research suggests that LLMs still struggle with multi-step causal chains and domain-specific constraints in STEM disciplines (Li et al., 2025h; Díaz et al., 2023). Current studies (Ahn et al., 2024) focus primarily on enhancing these capabilities through fine-tuning on high-quality technical corpora or integrating external tools like calculators and code interpreters.




Figure 2: **Overview of the STEMVerse.** STEMVerse restructures traditional STEM benchmarks into a dual-axis capability matrix, mapping academic specializations against Bloom’s cognitive taxonomy to provide a granular, “spectral” characterization of model reasoning.

2.2 STEM Evaluation

As models evolve, the demand for robust evaluation frameworks has led to the development of numerous STEM-oriented benchmarks (He et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2024). Traditional benchmarks often categorize problems by broad subjects or rely on multiple-choice formats to track state-of-the-art performance (Wang et al., 2024; Rein et al., 2024; Du et al., 2025). While these benchmarks (Bisk et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2023; Amini et al., 2019) provide a macroscopic view of model progress, they frequently treat different benchmarks as isolated silos, offering monolithic aggregate scores (Walker et al., 2010; Cobbe et al., 2021; Li et al., 2025e). Such a “black-box” evaluation paradigm obscures the specific reasons for model failure, making it difficult to distinguish whether a model lacks specialized domain knowledge or the underlying cognitive flexibility required for scientific tasks.

2.3 Cognitive Taxonomy

To address the lack of granularity in performance metrics, researchers have begun exploring cognitive psychology (Huber and Niklaus, 2025) and educational theories (Li et al., 2025a; ?) to assess machine intelligence. Among these, Bloom’s Taxonomy has served as a foundational framework in pedagogy for classifying learning objectives into hierarchical levels of complexity (Bhambri et al., 2025). Early attempts (Ma et al., 2025) have been made to utilize such taxonomies to evaluate common-sense

reasoning or linguistic tasks (Hatalis et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025c). However, a dual-axis framework integrating fine-grained specializations and hierarchical cognitive tiers remains largely unexplored in STEM. By adopting this structural approach, we aim to provide a more “spectral” and diagnostic characterization of how scientific reasoning scales with model capacity.

3 STEMVerse

3.1 Overview

The STEMVerse transits LLMs evaluation from coarse-grained performance metrics to fine-grained academic specialization (Liu et al., 2025) and cognitive diagnostics (Huber and Niklaus, 2025), enabling a “spectral” analysis of model capabilities as illustrated in Fig. 2. The process begins with cross-benchmark data re-aggregation, where we break the silos of existing STEM benchmarks by stripping away original data labels and treating the collected problems as a unified corpus. At the core of the framework is the dual-axis taxonomy mapping, where each problem is meticulously projected onto two orthogonal dimensions: the academic axis, covering fine-grained academic specializations, and the cognitive axis, which employs Bloom’s taxonomy to categorize tasks across six hierarchical levels. This mapping constructs a structured grid that allows us to pinpoint the exact intersection of discipline and cognitive complexity where a model’s reasoning fails. Ultimately, this diagnostic profiling transcends mere performance ranking to provide a

principled roadmap to systematically identifying and localizing "logical blind spots."

3.2 Cross-Benchmark Data Re-aggregation

Table 1: Statistics and Data Sources of STEMVerse. (Coll.: College level; HS: High School level; Conc.: Conceptual level)

Discipline	Volume	Data Sources
Mathematics	8,094	MATH500 (Hendrycks et al., 2021) MathQA (Amini et al., 2019) GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) AMC (He, 2024) AIME (2024, 2025) (Maxwell-Jia, 2024) Olympiad Benchmarks (He et al., 2024)
Physics	5,585	MMLU (Coll./HS/Conc.) (Wang et al., 2024) PIQA (Bisk et al., 2020) SciBench-Physics (Wang et al., 2023) GPQA-Physics (Rein et al., 2024) Super_GPQA-Physics (Du et al., 2025)
Chemistry	5,043	ChemBench (Walker et al., 2010) MMLU (Coll./HS) (Wang et al., 2024) GPQA-Chemistry (Rein et al., 2024) Super_GPQA-Chemistry (Du et al., 2025)
Biology	1,652	MMLU (Coll./HS) (Wang et al., 2024) GPQA-Biology (Rein et al., 2024) Super_GPQA-Biology (Du et al., 2025)
Total	20,374	

The construction of STEMVerse begins with cross-benchmark data re-aggregation, primarily aimed at resolving the fragmentation and isolation of existing STEM evaluation benchmarks. Traditional evaluations typically treat a single benchmark as the basic unit, reporting performance within closed data distributions, which often causes task boundaries to be mistaken for capability boundaries. In contrast, the evaluation unit of STEMVerse is explicitly defined as "academic sub-discipline \times cognitive complexity," requiring problems from disparate benchmarks to be realigned into a unified disciplinary coordinate system as a prerequisite for comparative analysis.

Based on this objective, we deconstruct and re-group problems from heterogeneous benchmarks into four core STEM pillars: Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, and Biology, further subdivided into specific sub-fields. This classification is designed to characterize model reasoning emphasis and capability disparities across scientific domains rather than merely sorting topics. By mapping scattered problems into a unified disciplinary structure, we effectively mitigate the "silo effect" of traditional benchmarks and enable the systematic alignment of reasoning performance.

Within each disciplinary pillar, the selection of problems follow a consistent principle of cover-

ing diverse levels of difficulty: (1) Foundational academic knowledge, which reflects curricula or standardized knowledge to assess basic domain mastery; (2) Reasoning-intensive tasks, which emphasize reasoning processes and problem analysis to evaluate domain-specific reasoning capabilities; and (3) Cognitive challenges, which include competition-level or research-grade problems used to evaluate the model's upper limits in complex scientific scenarios. The roles and distributions of various benchmarks within this structure are summarized in Tab. 1.

Through this cross-benchmark re-aggregation, STEMVerse establishes a robust foundation for subsequent dual-axis diagnostic analysis. This process ensures that evaluation is no longer confined to performance rankings within a single benchmark but can instead characterize performance variances across disciplines and reasoning tiers within a unified capability space, supporting fine-grained, structural analysis of LLM scientific reasoning.

3.3 Dual-Axis Capability Matrix

To support fine-grained diagnostic evaluation, STEMVerse introduces a dual-axis capability matrix that embeds each problem into two orthogonal dimensions: academic specialization and cognitive complexity. Unlike evaluations based solely on monolithic metrics or a single classification axis, the primary objective of this matrix is to explicitly distinguish between different sources of model failure. Specifically, it differentiates whether a performance decline stems from insufficient domain knowledge or a breakdown in high-order reasoning, thereby shifting the evaluative focus from aggregate rankings to structural capability analysis.

3.3.1 Academic Specializations

The vertical axis of the dual-axis matrix characterizes the degree of academic specialization involved in each problem. Along this dimension, STEMVerse further subdivides the four core natural science pillars into a comprehensive set of academic sub-disciplines ([Liu et al., 2025](#)), designed to assess the model's knowledge depth and reasoning emphasis across different scientific directions. Rather than serving as mere topical tags, this disciplinary classification is intended to characterize systemic capability variances that models may exhibit across different academic domains. By aligning problems with specific sub-disciplines and incorporating an "Others" category to ensure exhaustive coverage,

STEMVerse can determine whether performance bottlenecks stem from a lack of specialized knowledge in specific disciplinary directions. The complete disciplinary hierarchy and sub-discipline definitions are summarized in Tab. 2.

Table 2: **Taxonomy of Academic Sub-disciplines.**

Core Pillar	Sub-disciplines
Mathematics	Analysis; Statistics and Operations Research; Algebra and Geometry; Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems; Computational Mathematics; Interdisciplinary Mathematics.
Physics	Relativity; Astrophysics; Thermodynamics and Statistical Physics; Electrodynamics; Quantum Mechanics; Classical Mechanics; Fluid Mechanics.
Chemistry	Physical Chemistry; Inorganic Chemistry; Organic Chemistry; Analytical Chemistry; Chemical Engineering and Technology; Theoretical and Computational Chemistry.
Biology	Molecular Biology and Biotechnology; Genetics and Bioinformatics; Immunology; Physiology and Integrative Biology; Neuroscience and Psychology; Ecology; Biophysics and Biochemistry; Cell Biology.

3.3.2 Cognitive Complexity

The horizontal axis of the dual-axis matrix characterizes the cognitive complexity required to solve a given problem. Drawing upon Bloom’s Taxonomy (Huber and Niklaus, 2025), we categorize problems into six hierarchical cognitive levels, ranging from foundational knowledge retrieval and comprehension to high-order cognitive activities involving synthesis, evaluation, and creative reasoning. This dimension is designed to characterize performance variances across reasoning depths, rather than merely assessing the mastery of knowledge.

By intersecting the academic specialization dimension with the cognitive complexity dimension, STEMVerse maps the distribution of model reasoning behaviors within a unified capability space, forming a structured capability spectrum. This dual-axis diagnostic approach ensures that evaluation transcends aggregate accuracy; it enables a precise distinction between failures rooted in insufficient domain knowledge and those caused by a breakdown in high-order reasoning chains, thereby providing a clear diagnostic lens for subsequent experimental analysis.

3.4 Annotation and Human Review

To translate the raw data into our dual-axis matrix, we implement a hybrid annotation pipeline that leverages the efficiency of LLMs alongside the rigorous precision of human experts. This process ensures that each problem is assigned an accurate disciplinary and cognitive label.




Figure 3: **Distribution of academic specializations.** The composition of fine-grained academic specializations across Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, and Biology, ensures a balanced and comprehensive coverage of the STEM knowledge landscape.




Figure 4: **Distribution of cognitive levels across disciplines.** The stacked bar chart shows the percentage of problems categorized under each level of Bloom’s Taxonomy for Biology, Physics, Mathematics, and Chemistry, highlighting the benchmark’s focus on high-order reasoning evaluation.

3.4.1 AI-Assisted Annotation

We employ GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024) as our primary annotator to categorize the re-aggregated benchmarks. By utilizing carefully system prompts (see Appendix A), the model analyzes each question and its corresponding answer to determine: (1) the specific academic specialization from our pre-defined taxonomy, and (2) the appropriate Bloom’s cognitive Level. This automated phase establishes a consistent baseline for our capability matrix.

3.4.2 Expert Manual Review and Validation

To ensure the scientific reliability of the automated labeling, we introduced a rigorous expert manual




Figure 5: Performance across academic specializations. These radar charts visualize the accuracy of the Qwen and Llama families across fine-grained specializations in Math, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry, illustrating the performance variances. For detailed results, please refer to Appendix C.1.

audit process. We randomly sampled 10% of the problems from each discipline for manual review, conducted by Master’s and PhD students with the relevant academic backgrounds. The audit focused on evaluating: (1) whether the assigned academic sub-disciplines accurately reflect the core knowledge content of the problems; and (2) whether the annotated Bloom’s cognitive levels reasonably characterize the cognitive complexity required for problem-solving. For samples where discrepancies occur, a second verification is conducted by an additional expert to minimize subjective bias.

This hybrid approach effectively mitigates the “black-box” risks associated with automatic labeling by combining the scalability of GPT-4o with the nuanced judgment of domain experts. The reliability of this process is quantified through Inter-Annotator Agreement (IAA) scores. Across the four core disciplines, the IAA scores range from 0.87 to 0.92. Ultimately, this rigorous validation produces a reliable, high-fidelity benchmark that serves as a solid foundation for the subsequent evaluation and diagnostic analysis of various LLMs.

3.5 Statistics

The STEMVerse comprises a diverse corpus of 20,374 high-quality problems across four foundational disciplines. The benchmark is strategically distributed with Mathematics (39.7%) and Physics (27.4%) forming the core analytical pillars, while Chemistry (24.8%) and Biology (8.1%) provide specialized domain-specific challenges.

To ensure the diagnostic utility of the framework, we provide a detailed statistical analysis of the benchmark across the proposed dual-axis capability matrix. The disciplinary distribution within each pillar, illustrated in Fig. 3, is comprehensive and covers both fundamental and specialized topics. The distribution of Bloom’s cognitive levels,

as detailed in Fig. 4, reveals the depth of reasoning required by the STEMVerse, where Analyze and Apply constitute the most significant proportions across all disciplines.

4 Experiment

4.1 Baselines

To systematically analyze the evolutionary characteristics of LLMs in STEM reasoning and to support capability comparisons within our dual-axis diagnostic framework, we selected a representative set of open-source models from the Qwen (Qwen et al., 2025; Yang et al., 2025) and Llama (Dubey et al., 2024) families as evaluation baselines. The core consideration for model selection was not a simple performance ranking, but rather achieving coverage across diverse parameter scales and training paradigms. This allows us to observe how model capabilities shift as disciplinary depth and cognitive complexity progressively increase. Specifically, the selected models include both base models and instruction-tuned models to distinguish the distinct roles of capacity expansion versus alignment training in STEM reasoning. Furthermore, the selection spans a wide range of parameter scales, from 3B to 14B, to characterize the evolutionary behavior of capabilities as model size scales. By evaluating these models within the same dual-axis capability space, we can perform a unified comparison of capability distributions across different model families and scale configurations, establishing a consistent reference foundation for subsequent analysis.

4.2 Evaluation Protocol

The evaluation protocol is aligned with the dual-axis capability matrix, aiming to project performance onto a unified space of academic specialization and cognitive complexity. Departing from




Figure 6: **Fine-grained performance diagnostics across the Dual-Axis Capability Matrix.** The matrix maps model accuracy across academic specializations and hierarchical cognitive tiers. Bubbles represent individual models from the Qwen and Llama families, categorized by parameter scale and alignment stage.

the traditional approach of reporting only aggregate scores, we calculate model performance across each academic sub-discipline and Bloom’s cognitive tier, capturing fine-grained diagnostic signals.

Regarding the reasoning setup, we adopt a few-shot prompting strategy consistent with Mega-Science (Fan et al., 2025) to minimize the impact of prompting disparities on cross-model comparability. The primary evaluation metric is Accuracy, used to measure the problem-solving success rate within specific disciplinary and cognitive dimensions. It is important to emphasize that this accuracy is not intended as a standalone ranking criterion, but rather as a localized observable within the dual-axis capability matrix. By aggregating these localized accuracy results across the entire dual-axis matrix, we construct the capability spectrum of each model. This allows for a systematic analysis of reasoning patterns across different architectures and parameter scales across various disciplines and cognitive complexity.

5 Main Results and Analysis

5.1 Disciplinary Specializations

Across the fine-grained academic specializations, different models exhibit a clear performance hierarchy (Fig. 5). Qwen3-14B-Instruct maintains a dom-

inant position in the vast majority of disciplines, achieving a 32.5% accuracy in Analytical Chemistry and 58.3% in Neuroscience and Psychology. In contrast, the Llama3.2-3B series shows significant numerical fluctuations, particularly in biology, where its accuracy in Classical Mechanics (16.7%) is substantially lower than in Genetics & Bioinformatics (27.0%). Furthermore, no model below 14B parameters managed to surpass the 38.0% accuracy threshold in Physical Chemistry.

These results reveal a "siloed knowledge" effect in smaller models. The cross-family performance inversion, where Qwen2.5-7B (25.1%) outperforms the larger Llama3.1-8B (21.39%) in Inorganic Chemistry, suggests that data composition during pre-training is a more reliable predictor of STEM success than raw parameter count. Qwen’s performance indicates a higher density of high-quality scientific tokens, providing a more stable foundation for specialized sub-disciplines that remains resilient across different model scales.

5.2 Cognitive Complexity

Model performance does not follow a simple linear decline as Bloom’s Taxonomy levels ascend (Fig. 7). Performance consistently peaks at the Understand level, significantly outperforming other




Figure 7: **Performance across cognitive levels.** These radar charts illustrate model accuracy across the six Bloom’s Taxonomy tiers for Math, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry, highlighting a general performance decrease as tasks move from Remember to Create. For detailed results, please refer to Appendix C.2.

dimensions. However, a noticeable "performance dip" occurs upon entering the Apply stage for Biology, Physics, and Chemistry. Mathematics exhibits a unique trajectory: models maintain high proficiency in Apply tasks (e.g., Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct at 54.3%) but suffer a sharp collapse at the Analyze stage (dropping to 34.0%). In the highest-order Evaluate and Create dimensions, scores are extremely sparse, with Llama3.1-8B recording 0% in Physics for Create tasks.

This reveals a logic-symbolic collapse in symbolic-heavy fields. While models excel at formulaic execution (Apply), they fail during the transition to Analyze, where tasks shift from rule-following to the decomposition of multi-stage logical chains. This divergence identifies a structural gap: while domain-specific information is successfully internalized, its reliable deployment within cognitive frameworks remains inconsistent. Models appear to possess scientific facts but lack the structural reasoning integrity required to maintain coherence as cognitive complexity increases.

5.3 Scaling, Robustness and Training Effects

The relationship between parameter and performance is non-linear. In the Remember tier, the Qwen3 family exhibits a predictable, incremental scaling pattern (approx. +10% per scale jump), suggesting that increasing parameter density directly expands the model’s internal "scientific database." However, the Understand tier follows a non-linear threshold; for instance, scaling from 8B to 14B triggers a massive leap from 60% to 90%, whereas the jump from 4B to 8B yields negligible gains. This suggests that mastering relational scientific knowledge requires a minimum parameter size to synthesize disparate concepts into a coherent framework successfully.

Furthermore, we identify an "Instruction-Tuning Paradox": the Qwen3-14B Base model consistently outperforms its Instruct counterpart in specialized Mathematics sub-disciplines (66.7% vs 33.3% in Analysis). While Instruction Tuning (IT) enhances format adherence and controllability, it may inadvertently suppress the diverse internal reasoning paths activated during pre-training, leading to a degradation of complex logic. These findings suggest that current training paradigms achieve horizontal expansion (more facts) at the expense of vertical reasoning depth, highlighting a structural deficiency in how alignment affects high-order reasoning. We provide some cases in Appendix B.

6 Conclusion

We propose STEMVerse, a dual-axis diagnostic framework that unifies academic specialization with Bloom’s Taxonomy. By systematically characterizing the distribution of STEM reasoning capabilities, we overcome the limitations of traditional benchmarks that rely on monolithic accuracy to evaluate models. Experimental results demonstrate that while current mainstream LLMs perform reliably in knowledge retrieval and low-order cognitive tasks, they suffer from significant performance degradation at higher-order cognitive levels. This trend remains consistent across different disciplines and model scales, revealing a fundamental disconnect between the expansion of model capacity and the refinement of reasoning structures. Further analysis indicates that while alignment and instruction-tuning enhance controllability, they may inadvertently weaken a model’s symbolic reasoning and multi-step logical capabilities. This highlights a structural deficiency in existing training paradigms regarding high-order scientific reasoning.

Limitations

In this study, we primarily focus on the foundational pillars of STEM: Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, and Biology. We prioritize these subjects because they provide the most rigorous and formal logical frameworks necessary for evaluating high-order scientific reasoning. These disciplines possess well-defined symbolic systems and clear causal structures, which are essential for a principled diagnostic using Bloom’s Taxonomy. However, the current version of STEMVerse does not yet encompass more applied fields. Evaluating LLMs in these areas often requires assessing multimodal understanding or code-execution capabilities, which are beyond the current scope of our text-based reasoning matrix. We plan to extend our dual-axis framework to these applied STEM sectors in subsequent updates.

References

Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00157*.

Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. Mathqa: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, pages 2357–2367.

Siddhant Bhambri, Upasana Biswas, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2025. Do cognitively interpretable reasoning traces improve llm performance? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.16695*.

Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, and 1 others. 2020. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439.

Andres M Bran, Theo A Neukomm, Daniel P Armstrong, Zlatko Jončev, and Philippe Schwaller. 2025. Chemical reasoning in llms unlocks steerable synthesis planning and reaction mechanism elucidation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08537*.

Pengfei Cao, Tianyi Men, Wencan Liu, Jingwen Zhang, Xuzhao Li, Xixun Lin, Dianbo Sui, Yanan Cao, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2025. Large language models for planning: A comprehensive and systematic survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.19683*.

Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.

Carlos Díaz, Birgit Dorner, Heinrich Hussmann, and Jan-Willem Strijbos. 2023. Conceptual review on scientific reasoning and scientific thinking. *Current Psychology*, 42(6):4313–4325.

Xinrun Du, Yifan Yao, Kajjing Ma, Bingli Wang, Tianyu Zheng, King Zhu, Minghao Liu, Yiming Liang, Xiaolong Jin, Zhenlin Wei, and 1 others. 2025. Supergpqa: Scaling llm evaluation across 285 graduate disciplines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14739*.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, and 1 others. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2407.

Run-Ze Fan, Zengzhi Wang, and Pengfei Liu. 2025. Megascience: Pushing the frontiers of post-training datasets for science reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.16812*.

Alireza Ghafarollahi and Markus J Buehler. 2025. Scia-gents: automating scientific discovery through bioinspired multi-agent intelligent graph reasoning. *Advanced Materials*, 37(22):2413523.

Xinyu Guan, Li Lyra Zhang, Yifei Liu, Ning Shang, Youran Sun, Yi Zhu, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. 2025. rstar-math: Small llms can master math reasoning with self-evolved deep thinking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.04519*.

Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shitong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, and 1 others. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.

Kostas Hatalis, Despina Christou, and Vyshnavi Kondapalli. 2025. Review of case-based reasoning for llm agents: theoretical foundations, architectural components, and cognitive integration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.06943*.

Chaoqun He, Renjie Luo, Yuzhuo Bai, Shengding Hu, Zhen Thai, Junhao Shen, Jinyi Hu, Xu Han, Yujie Huang, Yuxiang Zhang, and 1 others. 2024. Olympiadbench: A challenging benchmark for promoting agi with olympiad-level bilingual multimodal scientific problems. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3828–3850.

Zhiwei He. 2024. Amc 2023 dataset.

Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*.

Chi-Yang Hsu, Kyle Cox, Jiawei Xu, Zhen Tan, Tianhua Zhai, Mengzhou Hu, Dexter Pratt, Tianlong Chen, Ziniu Hu, and Ying Ding. 2024. Thought graph: Generating thought process for biological reasoning. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024*, pages 537–540.

Zhen Huang, Zengzhi Wang, Shijie Xia, Xuefeng Li, Haoyang Zou, Ruijie Xu, Run-Ze Fan, Lyuman-shan Ye, Ethan Chern, Yixin Ye, and 1 others. 2024. Olympicarena: Benchmarking multi-discipline cognitive reasoning for superintelligent ai. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:19209–19253.

Thomas Huber and Christina Niklaus. 2025. Llms meet bloom’s taxonomy: A cognitive view on large language model evaluations. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5211–5246.

Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, and 1 others. 2024. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*.

Raj Jaiswal, Dhruv Jain, Harsh Parimal Popat, Avinash Anand, Abhishek Dharmadhikari, Atharva Marathe, and Rajiv Ratn Shah. 2024. Improving physics reasoning in large language models using mixture of refinement agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.00821*.

Chengzu Li, Wenshan Wu, Huanyu Zhang, Qingtao Li, Zeyu Gao, Yan Xia, José Hernández-Orallo, Ivan Vulić, and Furu Wei. 2025a. 11plus-bench: Demystifying multimodal llm spatial reasoning with cognitive-inspired analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20068*.

Qian Li, Xuchen Li, Zongyu Chang, Yuzheng Zhang, Cheng Ji, and Shangguang Wang. 2025b. Multi-modal knowledge retrieval-augmented iterative alignment for satellite commonsense conversation. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 8168–8176.

Xuchen Li, Xiaokun Feng, Shiyu Hu, Meiqi Wu, Dailing Zhang, Jing Zhang, and Kaiqi Huang. 2024. Dtllm-vlt: Diverse text generation for visual language tracking based on llm. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7283–7292.

Xuchen Li, Xuzhao Li, Jiahui Gao, Renjie Pi, Shiyu Hu, and Wentao Zhang. 2025c. Look less, reason more: Rollout-guided adaptive pixel-space reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.01681*.

Xuchen Li, Xuzhao Li, Shiyu Hu, and Kaiqi Huang. 2025d. Select less, reason more: Prioritizing evidence purity for video reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.15440*.

Xuchen Li, Xuzhao Li, Shiyu Hu, Kaiqi Huang, and Wentao Zhang. 2025e. Causalstep: A benchmark for explicit stepwise causal reasoning in videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.16878*.

Xuchen Li, Ruitao Wu, Xuanbo Liu, Xukai Wang, Jinbo Hu, Zhixin Bai, Bohan Zeng, Hao Liang, Leheng Chen, Mingrui Chen, and 1 others. 2025f. Sciagent: A unified multi-agent system for generalistic scientific reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.08151*.

Xuzhao Li, Xuchen Li, Shiyu Hu, Yongzhen Guo, and Wentao Zhang. 2025g. Verifybench: A systematic benchmark for evaluating reasoning verifiers across domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09884*.

Zhong-Zhi Li, Duzhen Zhang, Ming-Liang Zhang, Jiaxin Zhang, Zengyan Liu, Yuxuan Yao, Haotian Xu, Junhao Zheng, Pei-Jie Wang, Xiuyi Chen, and 1 others. 2025h. From system 1 to system 2: A survey of reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17419*.

Hongwei Liu, Junnan Liu, Shudong Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuqiang Li, Mao Su, Xiaohong Liu, Guangtao Zhai, Xinyu Fang, Qianhong Ma, and 1 others. 2025. Atlas: A high-difficulty, multidisciplinary benchmark for frontier scientific reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.14366*.

Xueqi Ma, Jun Wang, Yanbei Jiang, Sarah Monazam Erfani, Tongliang Liu, and James Bailey. 2025. Cognitive mirrors: Exploring the diverse functional roles of attention heads in llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.10978*.

Yubo Ma, Zhibin Gou, Junheng Hao, Ruochen Xu, Shuohang Wang, Liangming Pan, Yujiu Yang, Yixin Cao, Aixin Sun, Hany Awadalla, and 1 others. 2024. Sciagent: Tool-augmented language models for scientific reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11451*.

Maxwell-Jia. 2024. [Aime 2024 dataset](#).

Siddharth Narayanan, James D Braza, Ryan-Rhys Griffiths, Manu Ponnappati, Albert Bou, Jon Laurent, Ori Kabeli, Geemi Wellawatte, Sam Cox, Samuel G Rodrigues, and 1 others. 2024. Aviary: training language agents on challenging scientific tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.21154*.

Qwen, :, An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jingren Zhou, and 25 others. 2025. [Qwen2.5 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.15115.

David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R Bowman. 2024. Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.

Wenhao Shi, Zhiqiang Hu, Yi Bin, Junhua Liu, Yang Yang, See Kiong Ng, Lidong Bing, and Roy Ka-Wei Lee. 2024. Math-llava: Bootstrapping mathematical reasoning for multimodal large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 4663–4680.

Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, and 1 others. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.

Gemini Team, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent, Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, and 1 others. 2024. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*.

Theo Walker, Christopher M Grulke, Diane Pozefsky, and Alexander Tropsha. 2010. Chembench: a cheminformatics workbench. *Bioinformatics*, 26(23):3000–3001.

Xiaoxuan Wang, Ziniu Hu, Pan Lu, Yanqiao Zhu, Jieyu Zhang, Satyen Subramaniam, Arjun R Loomba, Shichang Zhang, Yizhou Sun, and Wei Wang. 2023. Scibench: Evaluating college-level scientific problem-solving abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10635*.

Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyan Jiang, and 1 others. 2024. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:95266–95290.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, and 1 others. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.

Tian Xie, Zitian Gao, Qingnan Ren, Haoming Luo, Yuqian Hong, Bryan Dai, Joey Zhou, Kai Qiu, Zhirong Wu, and Chong Luo. 2025. Logic-rl: Unleashing llm reasoning with rule-based reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14768*.

An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, and 1 others. 2025. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*.

Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. 2022. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. In *The eleventh international conference on learning representations*.

A Prompts

We present the prompts used for academic specializations labeling in prompt 1 and cognitive complexity labeling in prompt 2, which are partially derived from this paper (Huber and Niklaus, 2025).

B Cases

B.1 Instruction-Tuning Paradox

This case 1 exemplifies the Instruction-Tuning Paradox. While the solution 1 of Base model correctly identifies the link between environmental stressors and epigenetic modifications (Methylome analysis), the solution 2 of Instruct model is misled by its own "formatting-oriented" reasoning. It produces a highly structured but scientifically flawed justification for Option (A), prioritizing advanced-sounding terms (CRISPR, Single-cell) over the domain-specific relevance of the correct methodology. This highlights how alignment can inadvertently suppress the model's internal scientific integrity in favor of superficial articulacy.

B.2 Logic-Symbolic Collapse

As shown in case 2, it exemplifies the Logic-Symbolic Collapse within the domain of Theoretical and Computational Chemistry. While the model correctly retrieves the structural fact ($N = 60$), it fails the critical transition to symbolic application ($3N - 6$ for non-linear molecules) in solution 3. To rationalize its error, the model hallucinates a connection to the Einstein Model, a concept relevant to solid-state heat capacity but theoretically misapplied here. This "semantic patching" of a logical failure highlights a structural deficiency: the model possesses the relevant scientific tokens but lacks the rigorous connectivity required for valid theoretical modeling.

B.3 Knowledge-reasoning gap

The contrast between case 3 and case 4 provides a definitive empirical window into the structural reasoning limitations of current LLMs, specifically the decoupling of high-density knowledge retrieval from high-order cognitive coordination. In case 3 (Remember), Qwen3-14B-Base demonstrates a sophisticated "internal library" by accurately replicating the Liénard-Wiechert potentials, a task that requires high-fidelity recall of complex, research-grade symbolic sequences. This confirms that as parameter scales reach the 14B threshold, models

become exceptional repositories of specialized scientific facts. However, case 4 (Analyze) reveals a profound "cognitive short-circuit" that undermines this perceived expertise. The model's failure is not due to a knowledge gap, as its internal monologue explicitly and correctly identifies that general relativity is not a gauge theory while the other three forces are. Instead, the model suffers from a breakdown in structural reasoning integrity, where it fails to maintain the logical constraints of its own argument, ultimately selecting a final answer that contradicts its preceding evidence. This "knowledge-reasoning gap" validates the core necessity of the STEMVerse dual-axis framework: it proves that academic difficulty (case 3) is not synonymous with cognitive complexity (case 4). A model can behave like a specialist in terms of information density while simultaneously exhibiting the structural inconsistency of a novice in logical synthesis, highlighting that the path toward true machine intelligence in STEM requires more than just the cumulative expansion of scientific facts.

C Detailed Results

C.1 Academic Specializations

We provide a comprehensive breakdown of the experimental results to support our diagnostic analysis. We detail the subject categories for academic specializations in Tab. A1. Based on this classification, the first dimension of our evaluation focuses on the academic specialization axis, where the fine-grained accuracy results for sub-disciplines within Mathematics, Biology, Physics, and Chemistry are meticulously documented in Tab. A2, Tab. A3, Tab. A4 and Tab. A5, respectively.

C.2 Cognitive Complexity

The second dimension examines model performance through the lens of cognitive complexity as defined by our dual-axis framework. The accuracy scores mapped onto the six levels of Bloom's Taxonomy for the four core scientific pillars of Mathematics, Biology, Physics and Chemistry are provided in Tab. A6, Tab. A7, Tab. A8 and Tab. A9.

Together, these data collections constitute the full-dimensional capability matrix of STEMVerse, facilitating a localized and precise examination of where model reasoning maintains robustness or encounters structural bottlenecks.

Prompt 1: Prompt for Academic Specializations Labeling

You are a strict and deterministic text classifier.

Your task is to assign exactly one label to each input based on the predefined category-to-letter mapping below.

##Classification Categories

[label1] → A

[label2] → B

[label3] → C

[label4] → D

...

Others → Z

##Classification Rules

1. You must choose exactly one label from the list above.
2. You must not output any label that is not in the mapping.
3. If the text could belong to multiple categories, select the dominant or most relevant one.
4. If the input does not clearly belong to any scientific category, classify it as "Z" (Others).

##Consistency Requirements

- If the input is vague or ambiguous, you must infer the most likely meaning and classify accordingly. Never answer "unable to judge."
- Even if the boundaries between categories are close, you must still choose the single most appropriate category.

##Output Format Requirements

Your output must strictly be:

Label: X

where X is the assigned label.

Prompt 2: Prompt for Cognitive Complexity Labeling

Bloom's Taxonomy Task Classification Prompt

Your task is to classify items into Bloom's Taxonomy categories. **Strict Rules to Follow**:

1. You must select **one precise label** from the classification criteria list below.
2. You may NOT output any labels that are not included in the criteria.
3. If the item could fit multiple categories, choose the **primary/most relevant one** (based on the core mental process required).

Classification Criteria (with core descriptions and action verb examples):

1. **Remember**: Recall facts and basic concepts

Action verb examples: define, list, memorize, repeat, state

2. **Understand**: Explain ideas or concepts

Action verb examples: classify, describe, explain, identify, summarize, translate

3. **Apply**: Use information in new situations

Action verb examples: execute, solve, use, demonstrate, operate

4. **Analyze**: Draw connections among ideas

Action verb examples: differentiate, compare, contrast, examine, question, experiment

5. **Evaluate**: Justify a stand or decision

Action verb examples: appraise, defend, judge, support, critique, weigh

6. **Create**: Produce new or original work

Action verb examples: design, construct, develop, author, formulate, integrate

Critical Notes:

1. Difficulty ≠ Bloom's Level:

- Remember-level tasks can be hard (e.g., obscure knowledge); high-level tasks may feel easy to experts. Do NOT replace "low/high level" with "easy/hard".

2. Task Format ≠ Actual Cognitive Process:

- Multiple-choice questions can involve "Analyze/Evaluate"; open-ended questions may only require "Understand". Classify by the **mental process required to solve the task**.

Classify the following item into the corresponding Bloom's Taxonomy category:

Item to classify

Classification:

Case 1: Biology Case for Instruction-Tuning Paradox

Problem:

You have been given the task of determining the effects of chronic ionizing radiation and cyclic extreme temperature fluctuations on DNA. So you conduct a multifaceted experiment wherein one set of MCF 10A was exposed to ionizing radiation, another set was exposed to cyclic extreme temperature fluctuations and the third group was kept in a controlled environment with no exposure to either radiation or temperature variations. To comprehensively assess the impact of these exposures on the genome, you would employ the following combination of advanced molecular techniques:

What of the following is the right choice? Explain your answer.

- (A) Single-cell DNA sequencing and CRISPR screening
- (B) Proteomics and DNA barcoding
- (C) DNA ChIP-seq and mass spectrometry
- (D) DNA methylome analysis and NGS

Answer:

D

Solution 1: Solution for case 1 of Qwen2.5-7B-Base

The correct answer is (D) DNA methylome analysis and NGS.

DNA methylome analysis is a technique that can be used to study the changes in DNA methylation patterns in response to ionizing radiation and cyclic extreme temperature fluctuations. DNA methylation is an epigenetic modification that can affect gene expression and can be altered by environmental factors such as radiation and temperature.

NGS (Next-Generation Sequencing) is a high-throughput sequencing technology that can be used to sequence the entire genome of the cells in the three groups. This can provide a comprehensive view of the changes in the genome that occur in response to the exposures.

Proteomics and DNA barcoding are not relevant to the study of the effects of ionizing radiation and cyclic extreme temperature fluctuations on DNA. Single-cell DNA sequencing and CRISPR screening are also not relevant to this study.

Final Answer: The final answer is (D). I hope it is correct.

Solution 2: Solution for case 1 of Qwen2.5-7B-Base-Instruct

To comprehensively assess the impact of chronic ionizing radiation and cyclic extreme temperature fluctuations on the genome, the following combination of advanced molecular techniques would be most appropriate:

(A) Single-cell DNA sequencing and CRISPR screening

Single-cell DNA sequencing allows for the analysis of genetic material from individual cells, which is crucial for understanding the effects of radiation and temperature fluctuations on the genome at the cellular level. CRISPR screening can be used to identify specific genetic changes or mutations that may have occurred as a result of the exposures.

Final Answer: The final answer is (A). I hope it is correct.

You are right, but I would like to provide a more detailed explanation for each option to ensure a thorough understanding.

Let's analyze each option in detail:

Option (A): Single-cell DNA sequencing and CRISPR screening

- **Single-cell DNA sequencing**: This technique allows for the sequencing of DNA from individual cells, which is crucial for understanding the effects of radiation and temperature fluctuations on the genome at the cellular level. It can provide insights into the specific genetic changes or mutations that may have occurred.

- **CRISPR screening**: CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) screening can be used to identify specific genetic changes or mutations that may have occurred as a result of the exposures. This method involves using CRISPR-Cas9 to edit the genome and then screening for the presence of specific genetic changes.

Option (B): Proteomics and DNA barcoding

- **Proteomics**: This technique involves the study of proteins in a cell, which can provide insights into the functional changes in the cell due to the exposures. However, it does not directly assess the genetic changes in the DNA.

- **DNA barcoding**: This technique is used to identify and classify organisms based on genetic differences in a specific region of their DNA. It is not suitable for assessing the impact of chronic ionizing radiation and cyclic extreme temperature fluctuations on the genome.

Option (C): DNA ChIP-seq and mass spectrometry

- **DNA ChIP-seq**: This technique is used to identify the binding sites of transcription factors on the genome. It can provide insights into the changes in gene expression due to the exposures, but it does not directly assess the genetic changes in the DNA.

- **Mass spectrometry**: This technique is used to identify and quantify proteins in a sample. It is not suitable for assessing the impact of chronic ionizing radiation and cyclic extreme temperature fluctuations on the genome.

Option (D): DNA methylome analysis and NGS

- **DNA methylome analysis**: This technique involves the study of DNA methylation patterns, which can provide insights into the epigenetic changes in the genome due to the exposures. However, it does not directly assess the genetic changes in the DNA.

- **NGS (Next-Generation Sequencing)**: This technique is used for sequencing the entire genome or large portions of the genome. It can provide insights into the genetic changes in the DNA, but it is not as comprehensive as single-cell DNA sequencing.

Conclusion

The most comprehensive and appropriate combination of advanced molecular techniques for assessing the impact of chronic ionizing radiation and cyclic extreme temperature fluctuations on the genome is **Option (A): Single-cell DNA sequencing and CRISPR screening**. This combination allows for the detailed analysis of genetic changes at the cellular level and the identification of specific genetic changes or mutations that may have occurred.

Final Answer: The final answer is (A). I hope this detailed explanation is helpful.

Case 2: Chemistry Case for Logic-Symbolic Collapse

Problem:

What is the total number of normal vibrational modes for a C_{60} molecule?

What of the following is the right choice? Explain your answer.

(A) 174

(B) 175

(C) 180

(D) 60

Answer:

A

Solution 3: Solution for case 2 of Llama3.2-3B-Base

The correct answer is **(C) 180**. The total number of normal vibrational modes for a C₆₀ molecule is 180. Here's why:

Explanation:

- C₆₀ is a fullerenes, a class of molecules with a hollow, spherical shape.
- Fullerenes have a unique structure, with carbon atoms arranged in a pentagonal ring pattern.
- Each carbon atom is connected to three other carbon atoms, forming a hexagonal ring.
- The pentagonal rings are connected to each other in a way that creates a hollow sphere.
- The number of carbon atoms in a fullerene is always a multiple of 60.
- The total number of normal vibrational modes for a C₆₀ molecule is 180.
- This is because each carbon atom has three degrees of freedom (three normal modes of vibration), and there are 60 carbon atoms in the molecule.
- Therefore, the total number of normal vibrational modes for a C₆₀ molecule is 180.
- This is also known as the **Einstein model**.
- The Einstein model assumes that each atom has three degrees of freedom, and the number of degrees of freedom is equal to the number of atoms in the molecule.
- This model is used to calculate the number of normal vibrational modes for molecules with a regular structure, such as C₆₀.
- The Einstein model is a simplification, and in reality, the number of normal vibrational modes for a molecule is not always equal to the number of atoms in the molecule.
- For example, in a molecule with a more complex structure, such as a protein, the number of normal vibrational modes may be higher than the number of atoms in the molecule.
- However, the Einstein model is a useful approximation for molecules with a regular structure, such as C₆₀.
- The Einstein model is also used to calculate the number of normal vibrational modes for other fullerenes, such as C₇₀ and C₈₀.
- The total number of normal vibrational modes for a C₇₀ molecule is 210, and the total number of normal vibrational modes for a C₈₀ molecule is 240.
- These values are calculated using the Einstein model, which assumes that each atom has three degrees of freedom.
- The Einstein model is a useful approximation for molecules with a regular structure, such as fullerenes, but it is not always accurate for more complex molecules.
- In reality, the number of normal vibrational modes for a molecule is not always equal to the number of atoms in the molecule.
- However, the Einstein model is a useful starting point for calculating the number of normal vibrational modes for molecules with a regular structure, such as fullerenes.
- The Einstein model is also used to calculate the number of normal vibrational modes for other molecules with a regular structure, such as C₆₀, C₇₀, and C₈₀.
- The Einstein model is a useful approximation for molecules with a regular structure, but it is not always accurate for more complex molecules.
- In reality, the number of normal vibrational modes for a molecule is not always equal to the number of atoms in the molecule.
- However, the Einstein model is a useful starting point for calculating the number of normal vibrational modes for molecules with a regular structure, such as fullerenes.
- The Einstein model is also used to calculate the number of normal vibrational modes for other molecules with a regular structure, such as C₆₀, C₇₀, and C₈₀.
- The Einstein model is a useful approximation for molecules with a regular structure, but it is not always accurate for more complex molecules.
- In reality, the number of normal vibrational modes for a molecule is not always equal to the number of atoms in the molecule.
- However, the Einstein model is a useful starting point for calculating the number of normal vibrational modes for molecules with a regular structure, such as fullerenes.

Case 3: Remember Case

Problem:

Imagine a point charge q is moving with a trajectory $\vec{s}(t)$, where t is time, with respect to the origin. Let \vec{r} be the field point, where the field is observed, with respect to the origin of the same reference frame, and \vec{d} be the vector from the point where the electromagnetic field was generated at some earlier time t_r to the observation point \vec{r} . The velocity of the moving charge q at the field generating instant t_r is \vec{v} . What are the scalar potential (V) and vector potential (\vec{A}) at time t , satisfying $t > t_r$, and position \vec{r} ? In obtaining the expressions, use the notation of $c \rightarrow$ light speed in vacuum, $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow$ permittivity of free space and μ_0 is the permeability.

What of the following is the right choice? Explain your answer.

(A) $V(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r}, A(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{v^2}{c^2} V(\vec{r}, t)$

(B) $V(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r}, A(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{\vec{v}}{c^2} V(\vec{r}, t)$

(C) $V(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{qc}{4\pi\epsilon_0 (dc + \vec{d} \cdot \vec{v})}, A(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{\mu_0 qc \vec{v}}{4\pi (dc + \vec{d} \cdot \vec{v})}$

(D) $V(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{qc}{4\pi\epsilon_0 (dc - \vec{d} \cdot \vec{v})}, A(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{\mu_0 qc \vec{v}}{4\pi (dc - \vec{d} \cdot \vec{v})}$

Answer:

D

Solution 4: Solution for case 3 of Qwen3-14B-Base

The scalar potential (V) and vector potential (\vec{A}) for a moving point charge q can be derived using the Liénard-Wiechert potentials. The Liénard-Wiechert potentials are given by:

$$V(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\vec{d} \cdot \vec{v}}{cd}}$$

$$A(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{\mu_0 q \vec{v}}{4\pi} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\vec{d} \cdot \vec{v}}{cd}}$$

where r is the distance between the charge and the field point, d is the distance between the charge and the field point at the retarded time, and \vec{v} is the velocity of the charge at the retarded time.

Comparing the given options with the Liénard-Wiechert potentials, we can see that option (D) matches the correct expressions for the scalar potential (V) and vector potential (\vec{A}):

$$V(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{qc}{4\pi\epsilon_0 (dc - \vec{d} \cdot \vec{v})}$$

$$A(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{\mu_0 qc \vec{v}}{4\pi (dc - \vec{d} \cdot \vec{v})}$$

Final Answer: The final answer is (D). I hope it is correct.

Case 4: Analyze Case

Problem:

Which of the four fundamental forces present at nuclear scales can never be described by a pure gauge theory, to a healthy approximation?

What of the following is the right choice? Explain your answer.

- (A) Electromagnetic
- (B) Strong Nuclear
- (C) Gravitational
- (D) Weak Nuclear

Answer:

D

Solution 5: Solution for case 4 of Qwen3-14B-Base

A pure gauge theory is a type of field theory where the Lagrangian is invariant under local gauge transformations. In the context of the four fundamental forces, the electromagnetic, strong nuclear, and weak nuclear forces can be described by gauge theories. However, the gravitational force cannot be described by a pure gauge theory to a healthy approximation.

The electromagnetic force is described by Quantum Electrodynamics (QED), which is a gauge theory based on the $U(1)$ symmetry group. The strong nuclear force is described by Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), which is a gauge theory based on the $SU(3)$ symmetry group. The weak nuclear force is described by the electroweak theory, which is a gauge theory based on the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ symmetry group.

On the other hand, the gravitational force is described by General Relativity, which is not a gauge theory. General Relativity is based on the principle of equivalence and the curvature of spacetime, rather than a gauge symmetry. While there have been attempts to formulate a quantum theory of gravity, such as string theory and loop quantum gravity, these theories are not pure gauge theories.

Final Answer: The final answer is (C) Gravitational. I hope it is correct.

Table A1: Subject Categories for Academic Specializations

Category	Sub-field	Code
Math	Analysis	A
	Statistics and Operations Research	B
	Algebra and Geometry	C
	Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems	D
	Computational Mathematics	E
	Interdisciplinary Mathematics	F
	Others	Z
Biology	Molecular Biology and Biotechnology	A
	Genetics and Bioinformatics	B
	Immunology	C
	Physiology and Integrative Biology	D
	Neuroscience and Psychology	E
	Ecology	F
	Biophysics and Biochemistry	G
	Cell Biology	H
	Others	Z
Physics	Relativity	A
	Astrophysics	B
	Thermodynamics and Statistical Physics	C
	Electrodynamics	D
	Quantum Mechanics	E
	Classical Mechanics	F
	Fluid Mechanics	G
	Others	Z
Chemistry	Physical Chemistry	A
	Inorganic Chemistry	B
	Organic Chemistry	C
	Analytical Chemistry	D
	Chemical Engineering and Technology	E
	Theoretical and Computational Chemistry	F
	Others	Z

Table A2: Model Performance for Math Across Academic Specializations Dimensions.

Discipline	Model	A	B	C	D	E	F	Z
Math	Llama3.2-3B	0.0	11.83	8.74	9.24	6.34	0.0	19.18
	Llama3.2-3B-Instruct	33.33	44.98	30.79	36.51	32.39	0.0	42.2
	Qwen2.5-3B	66.67	33.35	37.67	36.22	43.66	0.0	49.33
	Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	66.67	59.44	50.94	51.91	55.63	100.0	58.44
	Qwen3-4B	66.67	59.94	48.42	53.52	44.37	100.0	59.09
	Qwen3-4B-Instruct	33.33	71.72	62.78	66.28	66.9	100.0	58.75
	Llama3.1-8B	33.33	28.88	20.38	21.85	21.13	0.0	35.12
	Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	33.33	48.71	36.34	41.94	30.99	0.0	50.71
	Qwen2.5-7B	66.67	58.55	46.51	50.44	45.07	0.0	58.4
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	33.33	49.01	40.25	49.41	38.03	100.0	51.66
	Qwen3-8B	66.67	65.95	55.09	59.09	59.15	100.0	62.29
	Qwen3-8B-Instruct	33.33	72.76	63.15	65.98	70.42	100.0	66.95
	Qwen2.5-14B	33.33	42.05	49.88	49.56	53.52	100.0	58.7
	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	33.33	49.85	38.62	42.23	39.44	100.0	65.96
	Qwen3-14B	66.67	61.23	52.06	54.99	56.34	100.0	61.51
	Qwen3-14B-Instruct	33.33	60.29	46.55	48.24	50.0	100.0	67.78

Table A3: Model Performance for Biology Across Academic Specializations Dimensions.

Discipline	Model	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Z
Biology	Llama3.2-3B	23.81	27.0	28.21	30.29	25.0	36.96	21.14	23.85	6.78
	Llama3.2-3B-Instruct	23.81	31.75	41.03	30.29	25.0	38.2	19.8	27.31	3.39
	Qwen2.5-3B	33.33	36.5	33.33	34.29	27.78	41.61	29.53	35.38	27.12
	Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	26.98	37.0	46.15	38.29	33.33	39.44	28.86	34.23	18.64
	Qwen3-4B	28.57	44.0	46.15	41.71	36.11	45.03	46.64	42.69	20.34
	Qwen3-4B-Instruct	36.51	44.25	33.33	41.14	25.0	43.79	37.58	42.69	10.17
	Llama3.1-8B	28.57	39.25	38.46	32.57	25.0	40.37	33.56	38.85	15.25
	Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	36.51	39.75	43.59	34.86	30.56	42.86	35.91	40.77	6.78
	Qwen2.5-7B	38.1	42.0	41.03	40.0	41.67	45.34	38.26	44.62	20.34
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	31.75	29.5	35.9	25.14	22.22	34.16	22.48	27.69	1.69
	Qwen3-8B	41.27	49.75	66.67	48.0	58.33	51.86	45.3	49.62	20.34
	Qwen3-8B-Instruct	44.44	47.75	53.85	54.29	38.89	51.86	48.66	50.0	30.51
	Qwen2.5-14B	41.27	40.5	48.72	47.43	41.67	47.52	39.6	46.15	18.64
	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	41.27	45.25	56.41	44.57	58.33	49.07	43.96	49.62	22.03
	Qwen3-14B	50.79	55.5	48.72	53.71	41.67	50.93	52.35	53.08	15.25
	Qwen3-14B-Instruct	53.97	55.0	61.54	50.86	58.33	53.73	51.34	55.77	20.34

Table A4: Model Performance for Physics Across Academic Specializations Dimensions.

Discipline	Model	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Z
Physics	Llama3.2-3B	22.08	17.0	15.48	15.21	15.22	16.69	13.45	70.35
	Llama3.2-3B-Instruct	36.36	21.0	12.13	16.48	15.02	15.13	13.74	77.3
	Qwen2.5-3B	35.06	18.0	16.32	18.4	16.21	18.73	13.74	77.77
	Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	28.57	22.58	9.92	15.27	12.65	17.11	11.44	77.41
	Qwen3-4B	20.78	13.0	11.58	13.21	13.83	15.61	11.99	78.09
	Qwen3-4B-Instruct	55.84	28.0	24.83	32.7	34.19	32.17	27.49	79.97
	Llama3.1-8B	31.17	16.0	17.99	19.95	19.76	20.29	18.13	80.23
	Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	46.75	24.0	20.08	22.95	21.94	22.93	17.54	81.28
	Qwen2.5-7B	31.17	27.0	15.06	18.85	17.59	20.65	16.67	78.61
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	28.57	28.0	10.46	16.03	13.64	18.85	11.7	78.97
	Qwen3-8B	48.05	30.0	20.22	28.87	24.7	24.85	23.98	83.89
	Qwen3-8B-Instruct	58.44	43.0	26.08	34.61	33.0	33.01	31.29	85.25
	Qwen2.5-14B	32.47	33.0	14.37	20.31	20.55	22.69	20.76	86.72
	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	41.56	31.0	15.06	20.95	23.12	21.13	17.84	87.5
	Qwen3-14B	51.95	39.0	28.45	36.61	33.99	32.41	32.46	82.64
	Qwen3-14B-Instruct	54.55	36.0	27.89	34.52	34.78	32.05	30.12	83.47

Table A5: Model Performance for Chemistry Across Academic Specializations Dimensions.

Discipline	Model	A	B	C	D	E	F	Z
Chemistry	Llama3.2-3B	11.76	16.47	10.77	9.82	4.26	14.57	42.79
	Llama3.2-3B-Instruct	21.57	15.9	15.08	13.21	10.64	19.21	45.64
	Qwen2.5-3B	25.49	18.21	16.0	17.53	14.89	19.87	47.57
	Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	20.59	16.47	21.54	14.65	18.09	17.88	43.39
	Qwen3-4B	37.25	27.46	19.69	27.43	34.04	33.77	53.73
	Qwen3-4B-Instruct	30.39	29.48	28.92	26.42	27.66	28.48	54.01
	Llama3.1-8B	21.57	21.39	19.69	18.46	14.89	21.19	48.63
	Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	23.53	22.25	20.92	16.43	15.96	17.88	51.2
	Qwen2.5-7B	33.33	25.14	21.54	20.07	22.34	23.18	50.39
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	33.33	24.57	22.77	19.73	18.09	28.48	50.98
	Qwen3-8B	32.35	24.28	21.85	25.74	22.34	24.5	54.85
	Qwen3-8B-Instruct	29.41	26.01	30.46	25.66	21.28	25.83	53.02
	Qwen2.5-14B	28.43	21.39	20.92	17.53	20.21	19.87	52.04
	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	29.41	27.17	30.46	23.29	24.47	25.83	46.59
	Qwen3-14B	40.2	32.95	34.77	32.18	30.85	27.81	58.26
	Qwen3-14B-Instruct	39.22	37.28	37.23	32.51	28.72	30.46	39.91

Table A6: Model Performance for Math Across Bloom's Cognitive Dimensions.

Discipline	Model	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Math	Llama3.2-3B	21.05	0.0	12.89	6.44	33.33	0.0
	Llama3.2-3B-Instruct	47.37	0.0	50.20	22.63	53.33	0.0
	Qwen2.5-3B	56.14	0.0	49.37	21.34	46.67	0.0
	Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	71.93	0.0	68.98	38.63	60.00	0.0
	Qwen3-4B	70.18	0.0	67.40	38.08	60.00	25.00
	Qwen3-4B-Instruct	85.96	0.0	78.77	53.08	73.33	25.00
	Llama3.1-8B	50.88	0.0	33.82	12.27	40.00	0.0
	Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	66.67	0.0	55.01	26.68	60.00	0.0
	Qwen2.5-7B	64.91	0.0	65.79	36.04	66.67	0.0
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	52.63	0.0	54.28	34.03	40.00	25.00
	Qwen3-8B	75.44	0.0	73.01	45.18	73.33	25.00
	Qwen3-8B-Instruct	80.70	0.0	79.40	53.81	80.00	25.00
	Qwen2.5-14B	77.19	0.0	59.29	32.74	40.00	0.0
	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	42.11	0.0	45.75	40.64	53.33	37.50
	Qwen3-14B	77.19	0.0	69.74	41.03	53.33	12.50
	Qwen3-14B-Instruct	78.95	0.0	63.51	39.47	60.00	0.0

Table A7: Model Performance for Biology Across Bloom's Cognitive Dimensions.

Discipline	Model	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Biology	Llama3.2-3B	17.38	47.22	8.91	33.74	66.67	0.0
	Llama3.2-3B-Instruct	15.73	44.44	13.86	38.0	61.11	0.0
	Qwen2.5-3B	26.16	63.89	16.83	41.26	72.22	100.0
	Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	25.99	58.33	12.87	41.59	66.67	100.0
	Qwen3-4B	31.95	63.89	23.76	50.78	66.67	0.0
	Qwen3-4B-Instruct	25.5	52.78	29.7	50.34	61.11	100.0
	Llama3.1-8B	26.66	66.67	20.79	42.49	61.11	0.0
	Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	26.16	55.56	17.82	46.75	66.67	100.0
	Qwen2.5-7B	28.81	66.67	25.74	49.78	66.67	100.0
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	10.1	38.89	2.97	40.58	72.22	100.0
	Qwen3-8B	35.76	69.44	27.72	57.62	83.33	100.0
	Qwen3-8B-Instruct	38.58	61.11	36.63	56.28	77.78	100.0
	Qwen2.5-14B	32.95	66.67	20.79	50.45	66.67	100.0
	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	36.42	55.56	29.7	53.25	72.22	100.0
	Qwen3-14B	39.24	66.67	35.64	60.43	66.67	100.0
	Qwen3-14B-Instruct	41.56	72.22	31.68	61.43	72.22	100.0

Table A8: Model Performance for Physics Across Bloom's Cognitive Dimensions.

Discipline	Model	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Physics	Llama3.2-3B	27.86	43.33	11.13	20.36	25.0	0.0
	Llama3.2-3B-Instruct	32.14	56.67	9.38	21.35	31.25	0.0
	Qwen2.5-3B	23.57	63.33	12.45	23.46	12.5	0.0
	Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	19.29	53.33	8.07	21.9	25.0	0.0
	Qwen3-4B	31.43	10.0	11.38	14.81	18.75	0.0
	Qwen3-4B-Instruct	39.29	86.67	25.93	36.09	43.75	0.0
	Llama3.1-8B	30.71	80.0	15.28	23.86	18.75	0.0
	Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	37.86	73.33	15.77	28.88	31.25	0.0
	Qwen2.5-7B	32.86	66.67	13.38	23.53	31.25	0.0
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	17.86	76.67	9.47	22.27	31.25	0.0
	Qwen3-8B	42.14	83.33	19.09	31.99	43.75	0.0
	Qwen3-8B-Instruct	45.71	90.0	27.64	37.34	43.75	0.0
	Qwen2.5-14B	30.71	73.33	14.75	26.31	31.25	0.0
	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	32.86	80.0	13.38	28.49	37.5	0.0
	Qwen3-14B	45.71	86.67	28.56	38.66	50.0	0.0
	Qwen3-14B-Instruct	52.86	83.33	26.27	38.93	56.25	0.0

Table A9: Model Performance for Chemistry Across Bloom's Cognitive Dimensions.

Discipline	Model	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Chemistry	Llama3.2-3B	16.36	38.46	6.68	13.91	20.0	0.0
	Llama3.2-3B-Instruct	15.15	53.85	8.37	19.36	30.0	0.0
	Qwen2.5-3B	23.64	61.54	14.66	18.8	60.0	0.0
	Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	26.06	76.92	10.77	19.64	50.0	0.0
	Qwen3-4B	30.3	69.23	24.93	28.29	40.0	0.0
	Qwen3-4B-Instruct	26.06	69.23	21.64	32.42	40.0	0.0
	Llama3.1-8B	24.85	46.15	13.36	22.56	60.0	0.0
	Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	26.06	46.15	13.86	21.05	30.0	0.0
	Qwen2.5-7B	38.18	69.23	14.96	25.09	50.0	0.0
	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	25.45	84.62	16.55	25.47	40.0	0.0
	Qwen3-8B	38.18	61.54	20.84	25.85	50.0	0.0
	Qwen3-8B-Instruct	37.58	69.23	21.44	27.91	70.0	0.0
	Qwen2.5-14B	35.15	46.15	14.96	20.77	30.0	0.0
	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	42.42	69.23	18.44	29.04	40.0	0.0
	Qwen3-14B	44.24	92.31	24.63	36.75	70.0	0.0
	Qwen3-14B-Instruct	49.09	92.31	26.62	37.22	60.0	0.0