
IR-Agent: Expert-Inspired LLM Agents for Structure Elucidation from Infrared Spectra

Heewoong Noh¹, Namkyeong Lee¹, Gyoung S. Na², Kibum Kim¹, Chanyoung Park^{1*}

¹ KAIST ² KRICT

{heewoongnoh,namkyeong96,rlqja1107,cy.park}@kaist.ac.kr
ngs0@kriict.re.kr

Abstract

Spectral analysis provides crucial clues for the elucidation of unknown materials. Among various techniques, infrared spectroscopy (IR) plays an important role in laboratory settings due to its high accessibility and low cost. However, existing approaches often fail to reflect expert analytical processes and lack flexibility in incorporating diverse types of chemical knowledge, which is essential in real-world analytical scenarios. In this paper, we propose IR-Agent, a novel multi-agent framework for molecular structure elucidation from IR spectra. The framework is designed to emulate expert-driven IR analysis procedures and is inherently extensible. Each agent specializes in a specific aspect of IR interpretation, and their complementary roles enable integrated reasoning, thereby improving the overall accuracy of structure elucidation. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate that IR-Agent not only improves baseline performance on experimental IR spectra but also shows strong adaptability to various forms of chemical information. The source code for IR-Agent is available at <https://github.com/HeewoongNoh/IR-Agent>.

1 Introduction

Spectral analysis provides critical clues for the elucidation of unknown materials [12, 24]. In particular, spectroscopic techniques such as Infrared Spectroscopy (IR), Mass Spectrometry (MS), and Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy (NMR) are widely used for elucidating molecular structures [24]. For example, IR reveals details about chemical bonds and substructures [9], MS offers molecular weight and fragmented molecular structures [22], and NMR provides in-depth structural information, including stereochemistry [24, 15]. Although IR spectroscopy lacks comprehensive chemical information such as molecular weight, stoichiometry, and stereochemical details compared to MS and NMR, it is frequently utilized in the initial phase of analysis due to its low cost, speed, and high accessibility in laboratory settings [6, 27]. Despite the ease and affordability of acquiring IR spectra, their interpretation remains a challenging and time-consuming task that requires extensive domain knowledge and expert experience [34, 14].

To automate IR spectra analysis, various machine learning (ML)-based approaches have been explored. Early ML approaches for IR spectra analysis primarily focus on identifying functional groups, achieving high predictive accuracy. Specifically, convolutional neural network (CNN) architectures are employed to classify functional groups from IR spectra [14, 36], and the M-order Markov property is utilized to construct IR spectrum graphs for tasks such as material class classification and functional group detection [30]. While functional group classification enables rapid and simple characterization of compounds, it remains insufficient for tasks such as material discovery or identification of unknown material, thereby underscoring the necessity of complete molecular structure elucidation.

*Corresponding Author.

More specifically, molecular structure elucidation requires more comprehensive molecular information such as atomic composition, bonding information, and the connectivity of substructures, making it a substantially more complex task compared to functional group classification[38]. As a result, only a few recent studies have explored early approaches, including predicting molecular structures as SMILES sequences by leveraging Transformer models with chemical formula information [1, 37], and exploring reinforcement learning methods that integrate both IR and NMR spectra [7]. Despite these early advances, these methods generally rely on fixed and predefined input formats, which restricts their flexibility in accommodating diverse types of chemical information.

However, in real-world analytical scenarios, IR spectra are often accompanied by various types of chemical information, necessitating approaches that are capable of integrating this additional information. For instance, information such as atom types inferred from synthesis pathways, the number of carbon atoms, or scaffolds (i.e., the molecular skeleton structure) may be provided. Therefore, previous methods pose a limitation in using real-world IR spectra analysis due to the limited flexibility, i.e., accommodating new types of chemical information typically requires redesigning and retraining the model [1, 14, 7]. To overcome this limitation, a framework capable of flexibly accepting various types of input is required.

Recently, by representing chemical information in a human language, Large Language Models (LLMs) have been effectively utilized in the field of biochemistry [20]. For instance, LLMs have been used to generate molecular structures in the string representation of molecules (i.e., SMILES) from text-based descriptions [8] and even modify molecular structures based on specified conditions [23, 26]. These successes highlight that an LLM-based framework is well-suited for building a more flexible and extensible IR spectrum-based structure elucidation system.

On the other hand, beyond the various types of chemical information, IR spectra analysis involves comprehensively integrating knowledge from diverse sources. Specifically, during the process, experts interpret IR absorption tables to infer local substructures and bonding patterns from peak positions [32, 16], and retrieve structurally similar molecules from spectral databases to provide global contextual clues [28]. Similar to expert workflows, a successful system should accurately perform each of these tasks—extracting critical information from multiple sources—and ultimately integrate the results in a coherent reasoning process to predict the molecular structure. However, it is widely known that relying on a single LLM to perform all sub-tasks simultaneously can result in suboptimal information extraction and may be inadequate for handling complex reasoning tasks [5, 33].

To this end, we propose **IR-Agent**, a novel LLM-based multi-agent framework specifically designed to emulate expert analytical processes and seamlessly incorporate various types of knowledge into the structure elucidation workflow based on IR spectra. Rather than relying on a single LLM to process all types of knowledge at once, our framework adopts modeling with specialized sub-agents tailored to each type of knowledge. More specifically, we design a multi-agent framework composed of the following: (1) a **Table Interpretation Expert** that performs table-guided absorption analysis to extract local structural information from the target IR spectrum; (2) a **Retriever Expert** that identifies similar spectra from spectra databases to provide global contextual structural information; and (3) a **Structure Elucidation Expert** that produces the final structure prediction by integrating the analyses from both expert agents, each contributing complementary information for complete structure elucidation. This integrative analysis within a multi-agent framework enables efficient molecular structure elucidation by extracting relevant information from each knowledge source and performing collaborative reasoning. A further appeal of **IR-Agent** is its flexibility: when new knowledge becomes available, the system does not need a complete redesign or retraining. Instead, it can be easily extended by incorporating the additional information through updated prompts to guide the agent’s reasoning process. Our main contributions in this study are as follows:

- We introduce **IR-Agent**, a novel multi-agent framework for molecular structure elucidation from infrared (IR) spectra. This framework models expert-driven IR spectrum analysis processes and is designed to be highly extensible.
- While each agent specializes in a specific aspect of IR spectrum analysis, their complementary roles enable an integrated analysis process, thereby improving molecular structure elucidation from IR spectrum.
- Through extensive experimentation, we show that our proposed framework not only improves baseline performance on experimental IR spectra but also exhibits strong adaptability to diverse types of chemical information.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to leverage the LLM agents framework for molecular structure elucidation from IR spectra.

2 Related Works

2.1 Machine Learning for IR Spectra Analysis

Recently, ML approaches have become game changers in the field of molecular science, where traditional research has heavily relied on theory, experimentation, and computer simulation, which is costly [17, 19, 18]. Among the approaches, analyzing IR spectra have demonstrated their capability to identify functional groups, extract structural features, and assist in molecular structure elucidation. Inspired by CNN architectures specifically designed to capture local features, CNNs have been successfully applied to functional group classification directly from IR spectra [14, 36]. In parallel, GNNs have been employed to construct IR spectrum graphs based on the M-order Markov property, enabling tasks such as material classification and functional group detection. Beyond functional group identification, recent efforts have extended ML approaches to full molecular structure elucidation from IR spectra. Among these, Transformer-based architectures are the most widely adopted, with prior work [1] transforming downsampled IR spectra into text format for use with standard Transformer models, and other studies [37] adopting patch-based self-attention mechanisms to better capture spectral patterns and local dependencies. Additionally, recent work explores reinforcement learning methods that leverage both IR and NMR spectra for structure elucidation [7], and more recent studies examines the use of LLMs with multi-modal spectral inputs, such as IR, MS, and NMR spectra, to perform structure elucidation tasks [10]. Unlike prior work, **IR-Agent** aims to incorporate expert analytical processes and adopts a multi-agent framework, which offers high architectural flexibility.

2.2 LLM Agents for Science

LLM agents have demonstrated strong capabilities across various scientific domains. For example, ChemCrow[4] employs an LLM agent to autonomously perform tasks typically conducted by chemists, using a range of external tools. Similarly, Coscientist[3] autonomously handles experimental design, planning, and execution of complex experiments by integrating internet search, code execution, and laboratory automation. Moreover, LLM agents have been applied to diverse fields such as materials science[39] and biomedical domain, including applications in drug discovery[13] and the design of biological experiments[31]. In addition, recent work has explored the use of multi-agent frameworks to effectively tackle drug discovery tasks[21, 25], highlighting the growing interest in collaborative LLM-based systems for complex scientific workflows. While LLM agents have not yet been applied to spectra-related tasks, their integration with external tools presents high potential for extensibility and effectiveness, as demonstrated in other scientific domains. This work aims to initiate exploration in this direction by positioning LLM agents as a viable solution for spectral analysis.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Problem setup

Task Description. Given an IR spectrum $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times L}$ as input, where L denotes the number of absorbance values corresponding to wavenumber positions (i.e., the length of the spectrum), **IR-Agent** predicts the raw SMILES representation of the corresponding molecule, a process known as molecular structure elucidation. We primarily assume an analysis setting in which only the IR spectrum is available for an unknown material, as this reflects a more practical and common scenario in early-stage compound elucidation, where additional information is often limited or unavailable. Since our framework is designed to flexibly accommodate scenarios where supplementary *chemical information*—such as atom types, the number of carbon atoms, or scaffold structures—is available, we also explore its applicability to more informed analytical settings (Section 4.4).

Tools. In this paper, we specifically design tools to support task-specific analysis as follows:

- *IR Peak Table Assigner* extracts the peaks from the spectrum and finds relevant substructures from the IR absorption table.




Figure 1: Overview of IR-Agent. (a) Overall framework. Given an unknown IR spectrum, IR-Agent first utilizes the IR Spectra Translator to generate candidate structures in SMILES format. The Table Interpretation (TI) Expert then extracts local structural information by referencing the IR absorption table through the IR Peak Table Assigner. In parallel, the Retriever (Ret) Expert obtains global structural features from similar spectra retrieved by the IR Spectra Retriever from a database. The Structure Elucidation (SE) Expert integrates the analyses from both experts to produce the final ranked list of predicted molecular structures. (b) Detailed view of the Table Interpretation (TI) Expert. (c) Detailed view of the Retriever (Ret) Expert.

- *IR Spectra Retriever* retrieves IR spectra from the IR Spectra Database that are similar to a given input spectrum.

External Knowledge. We also use external knowledge to support task-specific analysis as follows:

- *IR Absorption Table* summarizes the characteristic absorption frequencies associated with different molecular functional groups.
- The *IR Spectra Database* contains a variety of IR spectra along with their corresponding molecules in SMILES format.

Additional details on the tools and external knowledge are provided in the Appendix A.

3.2 IR Spectra Translator

To begin with, we introduce IR Spectra Translator, a Transformer-based model [35] that predicts a set of initial molecular structures in SMILES format from a target IR spectrum. In line with previous studies that employ Transformer architectures for IR spectra modeling [1, 37], we adopt this architecture for our IR Spectra Translator. Specifically, given the target IR spectrum \mathcal{X} , we obtain a set of SMILES candidates \mathcal{C} as follows:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{s_1, \dots, s_K\} = \text{Transformer}(\mathcal{X}), \quad (1)$$

where K denotes the number of SMILES candidates generated by the Translator using beam search decoding. Additional details on the IR Spectra Translator are provided in Appendix A.

4 Proposed Method: IR-Agent

In this section, we introduce IR-Agent, a multi-agent framework for molecular structure elucidation from IR spectra that mimics expert analytical processes through specialized expert agents. Our framework combines off-the-shelf LLMs with analytical tools to support an integrative analysis process. It is composed of the following expert agents: (1) the **Table Interpretation (TI) Expert**, which employs IR absorption table to identify substructures (Section 4.1); (2) the **Retriever (Ret)**

Expert, which extracts structural information from retrieved spectra (Section 4.2); and (3) the **Structure Elucidation (SE) Expert**, which provides a ranked list of SMILES based on the outputs from both the Retriever Experts and Table Interpretation Experts (Section 4.3). The overall framework is presented in Figure 1.

4.1 Table Interpretation (TI) Expert

The use of IR absorption tables is grounded in decades of experimental validation and theoretical development, offering reliable and interpretable structural insights. Importantly, this approach captures fine-grained localized structural features, such as substitution patterns, cis/trans isomerism, and conjugation, which makes it a crucial component in structure elucidation. However, effective utilization of these tables requires accurate identification of spectral peaks, which is challenging to an LLM agent because: (1) it may infer peak positions from spectral images, but only approximately and often without sufficient precision; and (2) it struggles to detect peaks directly from high-dimensional numerical absorbance data, which typically consists of thousands of values.

To address this limitation, the TI Expert agent employs the IR Peak Table Assigner tool, which extracts peaks from the spectrum by simply comparing the absorbance of neighboring wavenumbers. Then, TI Expert agent assigns corresponding substructures to each peak based on its wavenumber range, by referring to the IR absorption table. Specifically, given the task-specific prompt $\mathbf{P}_{\text{TI Expert}}$, the IR Absorption Table (\mathbf{T}), and IR Peak Table Assigner, the agent is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{TI Expert}} = \text{TI Expert}(\mathbf{P}_{\text{TI Expert}}, \text{IR Peak Table Assigner}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{T}), \mathcal{C}), \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{C} denotes the SMILES candidates generated by the IR spectra Translator. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{TI Expert}}$ includes the potential substructures that can be included in the SMILES string.

Despite its utility, table-based interpretation has inherent limitations, as IR spectra often contain noise and multiple substructures may exhibit absorption within the same wavenumber region, leading to ambiguity in peak assignment. To mitigate the possible misinterpretation, we design a prompt $\mathbf{P}_{\text{TI Expert}}$ that guides the agent to compare the output of the IR Peak Table Assigner with the SMILES candidates \mathcal{C} , identify shared substructures, and generate a confidence level along with a brief rationale for each identified substructure (e.g., substructure \rightarrow confidence \rightarrow brief rationale). By doing so, the agent enhances the reliability of the table-based interpretation for target spectra. Details of IR Peak Table Assigner, IR absorption table, the textual prompt are provided in Appendix E.

4.2 Retriever (Ret) Expert

Although the local structural information provided by the TI Expert is valuable, it is often insufficient to uniquely determine the complete molecular structure. This limitation arises because IR spectra offer vibrational information localized to specific functional groups or substructures, rather than providing a direct mapping to the full molecular structure [6, 9]. To overcome this limitation, we draw inspiration from the typical reasoning process of human experts, who frequently consult spectral databases to identify structurally similar reference compounds when analyzing unknown spectra [28]. Accordingly, we propose the Retriever (Ret) Expert agent, which leverages known molecular structures associated with similar IR spectra to provide global structural context, effectively linking local substructures to a more complete molecular structure.

Specifically, the Ret Expert agent utilizes the IR Spectra Retriever tool to identify spectra that are similar to the target IR spectrum. The IR Spectra Retriever adopts a simple yet effective approach: (1) it computes the cosine similarity between the target spectrum and all spectra in the database; (2) it then retrieves the top- N most similar spectra, each associated with its corresponding SMILES structure. The output of IR Spectra Retriever for the target spectrum(\mathcal{X}) is defined as follows:

$$\{\text{candi}_1 : \text{sim}_1, \dots, \text{candi}_N : \text{sim}_N\} = \text{IR Spectra Retriever}(\mathcal{X}), \quad (3)$$

where candi_i denotes the SMILES corresponding to the i -th retrieved spectrum, and sim_i denotes its cosine similarity to the target spectrum. Given task-specific prompt $\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ret Expert}}$ and the retrieval output, the agent is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{Ret Expert}} = \text{Ret Expert}(\mathbf{P}_{\text{Ret Expert}}, \text{IR Spectra Retriever}(\mathcal{X})). \quad (4)$$

The output of the Ret Expert, i.e., $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Ret Expert}}$, includes shared structural features among the top- N retrieved SMILES. Given the SMILES and the cosine similarity between the target spectrum and the

retrieved spectrum, the Ret Expert automatically identifies common substructures while assigning higher weight to spectra with increased similarity. These structural features provide global contextual clues that guide molecular structure reasoning. The complete prompt is provided in Appendix E.

4.3 Structure Elucidation (SE) Expert

Finally, the Structure Elucidation (SE) Expert conducts integrative structure reasoning based on both $\mathcal{A}_{\text{TI Expert}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Ret Expert}}$, as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{SE Expert}} = \text{SE Expert}(\mathbf{P}_{\text{SE Expert}}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{TI Expert}}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{Ret Expert}}, \mathcal{C}), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{\text{SE Expert}}$ includes a final ranked list of the top- K predicted molecular structures. By utilizing the information provided by both agents, the SE expert agent is able to perform a comprehensive reasoning process that integrates both local and global molecular structures. Moreover, structural features consistently identified by both agents can serve as reliable cues for the SE expert agent in molecular structure elucidation.

4.4 Incorporating Various Chemical Information into Agent Reasoning

In real-world analytical scenarios, IR spectra are often accompanied by various types of chemical information, necessitating approaches that are capable of integrating this additional information. As the IR-Agent framework is based on LLM agents, it is not constrained by fixed input formats as in conventional ML approaches, and can flexibly incorporate various chemical information in textual form. Specifically, rather than instantiating a separate agent for chemical information, we embed chemical information directly into the reasoning prompts of all the agents. Moreover, to avoid the complexity of prompt engineering, we simply append a concise sentence containing the relevant chemical information to the original prompt. This lightweight strategy reduces the cost of adding new agents and designing new prompts, while enabling each agent to perform its original task more effectively by leveraging chemical information during reasoning. Therefore, IR-Agent is applicable not only in scenarios where only IR spectral data is available, but also in cases where additional chemical information is provided, thereby enhancing the flexibility and applicability of the framework without requiring additional training or architectural modifications. We provide more details on the prompt that incorporates chemical information in the Appendix E.

4.5 Discussion: Multi-Agent Framework for Structure Elucidation

Our IR-Agent employs a multi-agent framework in which each LLM agent is assigned a distinct sub-task within the overall structure elucidation process. Rather than employing a single LLM to manage the entire reasoning pipeline, IR-Agent distributes the workload across specialized agents with each agent focusing on a specific type of analytical reasoning, and integrates their outputs to infer the final molecular structure. Each sub-task poses unique reasoning challenges: the TI Expert performs precise local pattern recognition and chemical knowledge grounding to interpret peak-substructure mappings; the Ret Expert needs to reason over spectral similarity and extract structurally meaningful global patterns from retrieved candidates; and the SE Expert is tasked with integrating these heterogeneous insights into a coherent molecular structure. When a single-agent model attempts to perform all these sub-tasks simultaneously, it often struggles to distinguish and prioritize relevant signals for each stage. For instance, local absorption features may be misinterpreted by global context, or retrieved candidates may not be properly utilized when misleading substructure signals are present. Additionally, the increased cognitive burden of handling diverse input information (e.g., tables interpretation by peak region, retrieved SMILES) within a single context window can result in incomplete reasoning, leading to degraded predictions. To evaluate the effectiveness of our multi-agent framework in addressing these issues, we conduct a comparative analysis against its single-agent counterpart, as presented in Section 5.2.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. In this study, we use a dataset of 9,052 experimental IR spectra from the NIST database, which has been widely adopted in prior IR spectra modeling studies [14, 29, 36]. The use of experi-

mental spectra is particularly important, as they reflect the noise, peak broadening, and variability inherent in real-world measurements, making them more representative of practical compound analysis scenarios. These spectra also reflect the types of challenges typically encountered in laboratory settings, where structural elucidation requires interpreting imperfect signals through expert knowledge and heuristics. Since our framework relies heavily on absorption table interpretation and human-like reasoning with retrieval-based search, experimental spectra provide a realistic and practical basis for evaluating its effectiveness in real-world analytical workflows. Following [29], we apply polynomial interpolation over wavenumbers ranging from 500 to 4000 cm^{-1} to obtain a structured format, addressing the inconsistent number of absorbance points across samples. For spectra recorded in transmittance mode, intensity values are converted to absorbance using a standard conversion formula.

External Knowledge. We use the IR absorption table available online² and employ the training set as an IR Spectra Database for retrieval.

Methods Compared. To validate the effectiveness of IR-Agent, we compare it with the standalone Transformer model used as our IR Spectra Translator, showing that our framework provides additional gains in structure elucidation. We further evaluate a single-agent variant of IR-Agent, where a single LLM agent simultaneously handles all sub-tasks. To assess the impact of the underlying LLM, we vary the backbone model used in both the **single-agent** and **multi-agent** settings across **GPT-4o-mini**, **GPT-4o**, and **o3-mini**. We also consider a setting where o3-mini is used to directly generate a ranked list of 10 SMILES structures, relying solely on the input candidate set \mathcal{C} .

Evaluation Protocol. We randomly split the dataset into train/valid/test of 80/10/10%. The IR Spectra Translator is trained on this split prior to applying IR-Agent. We adopt Top- K exact match accuracy as the evaluation metric to assess the effectiveness of the proposed method. This metric checks whether the correct SMILES is included among the top K generated candidates, comparing structures after conversion to the InChI representation [11]. We report the average performance across three independent experiments.

5.2 Results of Structure Elucidation

Effectiveness of IR-Agent. As shown in Table 1, we observe the following: (1) Comprehensive reasoning based on the analyses from the TI Expert and the Ret Expert leads to more accurate molecular structure predictions. Given the candidate set \mathcal{C} ($K = 3$) generated by the IR Spectra Translator, IR-Agent achieves higher Top- K accuracy compared to the standalone Transformer model, which functions as the IR Spectra Translator in our system. This improvement is attributed to the complementary insights provided by both experts. Their collaborative analyses enable the Structure Elucidation (SE) Expert to refine the candidates and generate more accurate final structures. (2) The multi-agent framework consistently outperforms the single-agent approach. Compared to the single-agent version of IR-Agent, in which a single LLM handles all tasks simultaneously, the multi-agent version, where each expert agent is responsible for a specific sub-task, demonstrates more consistent and superior performance in the structure elucidation task. This observation is further supported by the following finding: While using a more advanced LLM backbone generally leads to improved performance, the multi-agent version of IR-Agent (GPT-4o) achieves comparable or even superior accuracy compared to the single-agent system built on o3-mini, despite the former relying on a simpler model. This trend is also observed when comparing the multi-agent system (GPT-4o-mini) with the single-agent version (GPT-4o). This result underscores the effectiveness of the multi-agent framework in handling the molecular structure elucidation, demonstrating its strength in performing integrative analysis beyond what a single-agent can achieve.

Table 1: Overall model performance for structure elucidation from IR spectra.

| Method | Agent | Top-K Accuracy | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Top-1 | Top-3 | Top-5 | Top-10 |
| Transformer | - | 0.098 (0.007) | 0.169 (0.000) | 0.176 (0.003) | 0.176 (0.003) |
| IR-Agent (GPT-4o-mini) | single | 0.072 (0.008) | 0.118 (0.002) | 0.133 (0.002) | 0.157 (0.003) |
| | multi | 0.093 (0.005) | 0.152 (0.003) | 0.167 (0.005) | 0.176 (0.005) |
| IR-Agent (GPT-4o) | single | 0.083 (0.004) | 0.135 (0.002) | 0.165 (0.007) | 0.194 (0.008) |
| | multi | 0.093 (0.007) | 0.153 (0.005) | 0.177 (0.005) | 0.204 (0.005) |
| IR-Agent (o3-mini) | single | 0.087 (0.006) | 0.153 (0.005) | 0.179 (0.002) | 0.197 (0.004) |
| | multi | 0.103 (0.005) | 0.178 (0.007) | 0.199 (0.004) | 0.216 (0.001) |

²https://chem.libretexts.org/Ancillary_Materials/Reference/Reference_Tables/Spectroscopic_Reference_Tables/Infrared_Spectroscopy_Absorption_Table

Table 2: Overall model performance with various chemical information.

| Chemical Information | o3-mini | | | | IR-Agent (single) (o3-mini) | | | | IR-Agent (multi) (o3-mini) | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Top-1 | Top-3 | Top-5 | Top-10 | Top-1 | Top-3 | Top-5 | Top-10 | Top-1 | Top-3 | Top-5 | Top-10 |
| | No Knowledge | 0.073 (0.010) | 0.131 (0.011) | 0.157 (0.011) | 0.185 (0.005) | 0.087 (0.010) | 0.153 (0.011) | 0.179 (0.011) | 0.197 (0.005) | 0.103 (0.005) | 0.178 (0.007) | 0.199 (0.004) |
| Scaffold | 0.096 (0.002) | 0.160 (0.006) | 0.177 (0.003) | 0.198 (0.003) | 0.112 (0.003) | 0.195 (0.009) | 0.208 (0.008) | 0.228 (0.010) | 0.118 (0.003) | 0.208 (0.009) | 0.232 (0.008) | 0.258 (0.010) |
| Carbon Count | 0.105 (0.009) | 0.158 (0.014) | 0.186 (0.014) | 0.214 (0.013) | 0.121 (0.003) | 0.177 (0.008) | 0.194 (0.010) | 0.219 (0.009) | 0.123 (0.003) | 0.190 (0.0005) | 0.215 (0.009) | 0.252 (0.007) |
| Atom Types | 0.104 (0.011) | 0.182 (0.007) | 0.209 (0.005) | 0.237 (0.003) | 0.123 (0.006) | 0.208 (0.003) | 0.235 (0.011) | 0.266 (0.009) | 0.127 (0.006) | 0.213 (0.003) | 0.250 (0.011) | 0.278 (0.009) |

Structure Elucidation with Chemical Information. While our IR-Agent is primarily designed under the assumption that only the IR spectrum is available, in real-world analytical settings, it is common to incorporate additional chemical information to support structure elucidation [2]. To reflect this practical scenario, we consider three types of chemical information: atom types, scaffold (i.e., molecular backbone), and carbon count. In each case, the relevant chemical information is appended as a textual sentence to the prompt of the corresponding expert agent as described in Section 4.4. From Table 2, we make the following observations: **(1)** Even a brief textual prompt containing chemical information can enhance the model’s ability to predict accurate molecular structures. Without requiring any architecture modifications or retraining, IR-Agent is able to successfully incorporate additional information into each expert’s reasoning process through prompt-based interaction, leveraging the inherent reasoning capabilities of LLMs. **(2)** Among the various types of chemical information, we observe that incorporating **Atom Types** information enables the model to generate more accurate molecular structures compared to other types of chemical information. This is due to the inherent challenge of determining the exact set of constituent elements solely from an IR spectrum. **(3)** However, incorporating any form of chemical information consistently improved performance over using only IR spectra (**No Knowledge**), highlighting the importance of a flexible framework capable of integrating various types of available chemical information. In conclusion, each expert in IR-Agent plays a distinct and effective role in structure elucidation while flexibly integrating various forms of chemical information, demonstrating the potential extensibility of the multi-agent framework for spectral analysis tasks.

5.3 In-depth Analysis

Ablation Studies. To assess the contribution of each expert agent, we conduct ablation studies by selectively removing them from the system. As shown in Table 3, relying solely on the IR Spectra Translator without any expert assistance (**No Experts**) results in a significant drop in performance. Furthermore, using only one expert (i.e., either the **TI Expert only** or **Ret Expert only**) underperforms compared to the case where both experts are employed. When only the TI Expert is used, the system struggles to capture global structural patterns, whereas the Ret Expert alone often fails to extract fine-grained local information from the IR Absorption Table. Nevertheless, the Ret Expert alone achieves slightly better performance than the TI Expert alone, as it can access a broader range of structural patterns by leveraging multiple retrieved SMILES candidates, resulting in richer overall structural information. These results highlight that utilizing both TI and Ret Experts is essential for providing complementary structural insights, enabling effective integrative analysis for structure elucidation.

Sensitivity Analysis: Number of SMILES candidates \mathcal{C} . Moreover, we investigate how varying the number of SMILES candidates \mathcal{C} affects performance. As shown in Figure 2 (a), the performance of IR-Agent improves as \mathcal{C} increase up to 3 or 5, but tends to decline beyond that point. This degradation may be attributed to the introduction of noisy candidates, which can hinder the experts’ reasoning. In particular, the TI Expert is required to manually align information from the IR absorption table with an increasing number of candidates,

Table 3: Ablation study of IR-Agent (o3-mini).

| Expert | Top-K Accuracy | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Top-1 | Top-3 | Top-5 | Top-10 |
| No Expert | 0.073 (0.010) | 0.131 (0.011) | 0.157 (0.011) | 0.185 (0.005) |
| TI Expert only | 0.089 (0.011) | 0.154 (0.004) | 0.171 (0.002) | 0.190 (0.002) |
| Ret Expert only | <u>0.098</u> (0.003) | <u>0.169</u> (0.006) | <u>0.188</u> (0.001) | <u>0.211</u> (0.003) |
| IR-Agent (TI + Ret) | 0.103 (0.005) | 0.178 (0.007) | 0.199 (0.004) | 0.216 (0.001) |




Figure 3: Outputs of expert agents in IR-Agent during the structure elucidation process.

which raises the risk of incorporating irrelevant or misleading structural features. These results suggest that selecting an appropriate number of SMILES candidates is crucial for effective expert reasoning.

Performance of IR-Agent using the Transferred IR Spectra Translator.

As our framework is compatible with various IR spectra translators for generating initial SMILES candidates, we replace our original translator with one that was pretrained on a large-scale simulated IR dataset[2] (790k spectra) and subsequently finetuned on our experimental data.

Although simulated and experimental spectra differ in nature, the pretrained translator captures rich spectral patterns from large-scale simulated data, which remain beneficial when transferred and adapted to experimental data through fine-tuning. Figure 2 (b) shows that the transferred translator alone achieves strong performance. When integrated into our framework, it leads to further improvements, highlighting the robustness of our method to different spectra translator choices.

Case Study. In Figure 3, we present how IR-Agent performs the structure elucidation process. The TI Expert identifies local substructures by comparing the IR absorption table interpretation with the output of the IR Spectra Translator. For instance, the TI Expert infers the presence of a C–F group with high confidence, as both the Translator output and the table interpretation consistently point to C–F bonds. In contrast, the presence of a halogen substitution such as Br is inferred with low confidence, since the table interpretation refers to C–Cl bonds, which are not found in the Translator output. On the other hand, the Ret Expert extracts global structural patterns from the retrieved candidates, identifying a benzene ring substituted with a CF₃ group as a dominant motif, which serves as the broader structural context. Based on the complementary analyses from both experts, the SE Expert successfully infers the complete molecular structure of the target spectrum.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose IR-Agent, a novel multi-agent framework for structure elucidation from IR spectra that mimics the expert analytical process. To achieve this, we design a system composed of three specialized agents: a Table Interpretation (TI) Expert that extracts local substructures from the IR absorption table; a Retriever (Ret) Expert that provides global structural cues from retrieved candidates; and a Structure Elucidation (SE) Expert that integrates both sources of information to infer the final molecular structure. Furthermore, our framework supports the integration of chemical information in a lightweight and concise manner, which highlights its practicality in real-world analytical scenarios. Through extensive experiments including diverse chemical information conditions, we demonstrate both the effectiveness of IR-Agent in structure elucidation and the flexibility of the multi-agent framework in adapting to various analytical scenarios.




Figure 2: In-depth Analysis results.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants from the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF), funded by the Ministry of Science and ICT (RS-2022-NR068758 and RS-2024-00335098), and by the Institute of Information & Communications Technology Planning & Evaluation (IITP), funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (RS-2025-02304967, AI Star Fellowship (KAIST)).

References

- [1] Alberts, M., Laino, T., and Vaucher, A. C. Leveraging infrared spectroscopy for automated structure elucidation. *Communications Chemistry*, 7(1):268, 2024.
- [2] Alberts, M., Schilter, O., Zipoli, F., Hartrampf, N., and Laino, T. Unraveling molecular structure: A multimodal spectroscopic dataset for chemistry. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:125780–125808, 2024.
- [3] Boiko, D. A., MacKnight, R., Kline, B., and Gomes, G. Autonomous chemical research with large language models. *Nature*, 624(7992):570–578, 2023.
- [4] Bran, A. M., Cox, S., Schilter, O., Baldassari, C., White, A. D., and Schwaller, P. Chemcrow: Augmenting large-language models with chemistry tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05376*, 2023.
- [5] Chen, P., Han, B., and Zhang, S. Comm: Collaborative multi-agent, multi-reasoning-path prompting for complex problem solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17729*, 2024.
- [6] Coates, J. et al. Interpretation of infrared spectra, a practical approach. *Encyclopedia of analytical chemistry*, 12:10815–10837, 2000.
- [7] Devata, S., Sridharan, B., Mehta, S., Pathak, Y., Laghuvarapu, S., Varma, G., and Priyakumar, U. D. Deepspinn–deep reinforcement learning for molecular structure prediction from infrared and 13 c nmr spectra. *Digital Discovery*, 3(4):818–829, 2024.
- [8] Edwards, C., Lai, T., Ros, K., Honke, G., Cho, K., and Ji, H. Translation between molecules and natural language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.11817*, 2022.
- [9] Griffiths, P. R. Introduction to vibrational spectroscopy. *Handbook of vibrational spectroscopy*, 2006.
- [10] Guo, K., Nan, B., Zhou, Y., Guo, T., Guo, Z., Surve, M., Liang, Z., Chawla, N., Wiest, O., and Zhang, X. Can llms solve molecule puzzles? a multimodal benchmark for molecular structure elucidation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:134721–134746, 2024.
- [11] Heller, S. R., McNaught, A., Pletnev, I., Stein, S., and Tchekhovskoi, D. Inchi, the iupac international chemical identifier. *Journal of cheminformatics*, 7:1–34, 2015.
- [12] Huang, Z., Chen, M. S., Woroch, C. P., Markland, T. E., and Kanan, M. W. A framework for automated structure elucidation from routine nmr spectra. *Chemical Science*, 12(46):15329–15338, 2021.
- [13] Inoue, Y., Song, T., and Fu, T. Drugagent: Explainable drug repurposing agent with large language model-based reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13378*, 2024.
- [14] Jung, G., Jung, S. G., and Cole, J. M. Automatic materials characterization from infrared spectra using convolutional neural networks. *Chemical Science*, 14(13):3600–3609, 2023.
- [15] Klein, D. R. *Organic chemistry*. Wiley Global Education, 2013.
- [16] Larkin, P. *Infrared and Raman spectroscopy: principles and spectral interpretation*. Elsevier, 2017.
- [17] Lee, N., Hyun, D., Na, G. S., Kim, S., Lee, J., and Park, C. Conditional graph information bottleneck for molecular relational learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 18852–18871. PMLR, 2023.

- [18] Lee, N., Noh, H., Kim, S., Hyun, D., Na, G. S., and Park, C. Density of states prediction of crystalline materials via prompt-guided multi-modal transformer. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:61678–61698, 2023.
- [19] Lee, N., Yoon, K., Na, G. S., Kim, S., and Park, C. Shift-robust molecular relational learning with causal substructure. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 1200–1212, 2023.
- [20] Lee, N., Laghuvarapu, S., Park, C., and Sun, J. Vision language model is not all you need: Augmentation strategies for molecule language models. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pp. 1153–1162, 2024.
- [21] Lee, N., De Brouwer, E., Hajiramezanali, E., Biancalani, T., Park, C., and Scalia, G. Rag-enhanced collaborative llm agents for drug discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17506*, 2025.
- [22] Lee, T. A. *A beginner’s guide to mass spectral interpretation*. John Wiley & Sons, 1998.
- [23] Li, J., Liu, Y., Fan, W., Wei, X.-Y., Liu, H., Tang, J., and Li, Q. Empowering molecule discovery for molecule-caption translation with large language models: A chatgpt perspective. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 2024.
- [24] Li, Q. and Kang, C. A practical perspective on the roles of solution nmr spectroscopy in drug discovery. *Molecules*, 25(13):2974, 2020.
- [25] Liu, S., Lu, Y., Chen, S., Hu, X., Zhao, J., Lu, Y., and Zhao, Y. Drugagent: Automating ai-aided drug discovery programming through llm multi-agent collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15692*, 2024.
- [26] Liu, S., Wang, J., Yang, Y., Wang, C., Liu, L., Guo, H., and Xiao, C. Conversational drug editing using retrieval and domain feedback. In *The twelfth international conference on learning representations*, 2024.
- [27] Mistek, E. and Lednev, I. K. *Ft-ir spectroscopy for identification of biological stains for forensic purposes*. 2018.
- [28] Moldoveanu, S. and Rapson, C. A. Spectral interpretation for organic analysis using an expert system. *Analytical Chemistry*, 59(8):1207–1212, 1987.
- [29] Na, G. S. Deep learning for generating phase-conditioned infrared spectra. *Analytical Chemistry*, 96(49):19659–19669, 2024.
- [30] Na, G. S. and Rho, Y. C. Learning m -order spectrum graphs to identify unknown chemical compounds from infrared spectroscopy data. In *2024 9th International Conference on Big Data Analytics (ICBDA)*, pp. 134–143. IEEE, 2024.
- [31] Roohani, Y., Lee, A., Huang, Q., Vora, J., Steinhart, Z., Huang, K., Marson, A., Liang, P., and Leskovec, J. Biodiscoveryagent: An ai agent for designing genetic perturbation experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17631*, 2024.
- [32] Socrates, G. *Infrared and Raman characteristic group frequencies: tables and charts*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- [33] Sun, Q., Yin, Z., Li, X., Wu, Z., Qiu, X., and Kong, L. Corex: Pushing the boundaries of complex reasoning through multi-model collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00280*, 2023.
- [34] Varmuza, K., Penchev, P., and Scsibraný, H. Large and frequently occurring substructures in organic compounds obtained by library search of infrared spectra. *Vibrational Spectroscopy*, 19(2):407–412, 1999.
- [35] Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.

- [36] Wang, T., Tan, Y., Chen, Y. Z., and Tan, C. Infrared spectral analysis for prediction of functional groups based on feature-aggregated deep learning. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 63(15):4615–4622, 2023.
- [37] Wu, W., Leonardis, A., Jiao, J., Jiang, J., and Chen, L. Transformer-based models for predicting molecular structures from infrared spectra using patch-based self-attention. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 2025.
- [38] Xue, X., Sun, H., Yang, M., Liu, X., Hu, H.-Y., Deng, Y., and Wang, X. Advances in the application of artificial intelligence-based spectral data interpretation: a perspective. *Analytical Chemistry*, 95(37):13733–13745, 2023.
- [39] Zhang, H., Song, Y., Hou, Z., Miret, S., and Liu, B. Honeycomb: A flexible llm-based agent system for materials science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.00135*, 2024.

Supplementary Material for IR-Agent: Expert-Inspired LLM Agents for Structure Elucidation from Infrared Spectra

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Implementation Details | 14 |
| A.1 | IR Spectra Preprocessing | 14 |
| A.2 | IR Spectra Translator | 14 |
| A.3 | IR Absorption Table | 14 |
| A.4 | IR Peak Table Assigner | 17 |
| A.5 | LLM Agents | 17 |
| B | Further Analysis | 17 |
| B.1 | Performance Comparison Across Different Beam Widths | 17 |
| B.2 | Additional Case Studies | 17 |
| C | Limitations & Future Work | 18 |
| D | Broader Impacts | 18 |
| E | Prompt Templates for Expert Agents | 19 |

A Implementation Details

Implementation details of IR-Agent are presented in this section.

A.1 IR Spectra Preprocessing

We convert spectra from transmittance to absorbance using the standard formula:

$$A = -\log_{10}(T) \quad (6)$$

where T denotes the transmittance and A denotes the absorbance. To avoid mathematical errors during the logarithmic transformation and ensure numerical stability, any zero-valued entries are replaced with a small positive constant, 10^{-10} .

A.2 IR Spectra Translator

We represent the IR spectrum as a 1D sequence $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times L}$, where L is the number of absorbance values aligned with wavenumber positions. This input is then passed through a learnable linear transformation to produce a higher-dimensional feature sequence $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$. To inject positional information, we define a learnable positional embedding matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, where each row \mathbf{P}_i corresponds to the positional embedding at the i -th wavenumber. The input to the Transformer encoder is computed as:

$$\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{P}_i, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, L. \quad (7)$$

The resulting spectrum representations $\mathbf{Z} = \{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^L \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ are first fed into the Transformer encoder and subsequently into the Transformer decoder, which autoregressively generates the target molecular sequence. The model is trained to maximize the likelihood of the ground-truth output tokens given the input spectrum by minimizing the following cross-entropy (CE) loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^{T_n} \log p_{\theta}(y_t^{(n)} | y_{<t}^{(n)}, \mathcal{X}^{(n)}), \quad (8)$$

where N is the number of training examples, T_n is the length of the target sequence for the n -th example, $y_t^{(n)}$ denotes the t -th token in the ground-truth molecular SMILES for the n -th example, and p_{θ} denotes the model’s predicted probability distribution parameterized by θ , where θ represents the learnable parameters of the translator. This objective corresponds to the standard next-token prediction loss widely used in training language models [35].

Training Details. The Translator is implemented in Python 3.11.10 and PyTorch 2.5.1. We use the Adam optimizer for model training. The model is trained for up to 300 epochs, with early stopping applied if the best validation BLEU score does not improve for 25 consecutive epochs. All the experiments are conducted on a 48GB NVIDIA RTX A6000.

Hyperparameters. For the Translator, we use a batch size of 16, hidden dimension $d = 128$, and a learning rate of 0.001 with a linear scheduler and 8,000 warm-up steps. The model consists of 2 encoder layers and 2 decoder layers, and the number of retrieved spectra (N) is set to 10. A beam width of 3 is chosen to reflect a practical decoding setting with moderate computational cost. A comparison of performance across larger beam widths is provided in Section B.1. Note that when the model fails to generate the desired number of outputs, we apply greedy decoding to supplement the remaining outputs and guarantee a fixed output size. We perform a grid search over learning rates $\{0.0001, 0.0005, 0.001\}$, batch sizes $\{16, 32, 64\}$, and hidden dimensions $\{64, 128\}$, and report test performance based on the best model selected according to validation set results.

A.3 IR Absorption Table

Table 4 shows the IR absorption table used in this paper, which is available online³. For wavenumber entries specified as single points rather than ranges, we convert them into ranges by applying a $\pm 5 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ window around each point.

³https://chem.libretexts.org/Ancillary_Materials/Reference/Reference_Tables/Spectroscopic_Reference_Tables/Infrared_Spectroscopy_Absorption_Table

Table 4: Wavenumber Range and Substructure Assignments

| Wavenumber (cm ⁻¹) | Substructure |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 3700–3584 | alcohol (O–H) |
| 3550–3200 | alcohol (O–H) |
| 3500–3400 | primary amine (N–H) |
| 3400–3300 | aliphatic primary amine (N–H) |
| 3330–3250 | aliphatic primary amine (N–H) |
| 3350–3310 | secondary amine (N–H) |
| 3100–2900 | carboxylic acid (O–H) |
| 3200–2700 | alcohol (O–H) |
| 3000–2800 | amine salt (N–H) |
| 3333–3267 | alkyne (C–H) |
| 3100–3000 | alkene (C–H) |
| 3080–2840 | alkane (C–H) |
| 2830–2695 | aldehyde (C–H) |
| 2600–2550 | thiol (S–H) |
| 2354–2344 | carbon dioxide (O=C=O) |
| 2285–2250 | isocyanate (N=C=O) |
| 2260–2222 | nitrile (C≡N) |
| 2260–2190 | disubstituted alkyne (C≡C) |
| 2175–2140 | thiocyanate (S–C=N) |
| 2160–2120 | azide (N=N=N) |
| 2155–2145 | ketene (C=C=O) |
| 2145–2120 | carbodiimide (N=C=N) |
| 2140–2100 | monosubstituted alkyne (C≡C) |
| 2140–1990 | isothiocyanate (N=C=S) |
| 2005–1995 | ketenimine (C=C=N) |
| 2000–1900 | allene (C=C=C) |
| 2000–1650 | aromatic compound (C–H) |
| 1818–1750 | anhydride (C=O) |
| 1815–1785 | acid halide (C=O) |
| 1800–1770 | conjugated acid halide (C=O) |
| 1780–1770 | conjugated anhydride (C=O) |
| 1770–1780 | vinyl/phenyl ester (C=O) |
| 1765–1755 | carboxylic acid (C=O) |
| 1750–1735 | esters (C=O) |
| 1750–1740 | cyclopentanone (C=O) |
| 1740–1720 | aldehyde (C=O) |
| 1730–1715 | α,β-unsaturated ester (C=O) |
| 1725–1715 | conjugated anhydride (C=O) |
| 1725–1705 | aliphatic ketone (C=O) |
| 1720–1706 | carboxylic acid (C=O) |
| 1710–1685 | conjugated aldehyde (C=O) |
| 1710–1680 | conjugated acid (C=O) |
| 1695–1685 | primary amide (C=O) |
| 1690–1640 | imine/oxime (C=N) |
| 1685–1675 | tertiary amide (C=O) |
| 1685–1666 | conjugated ketone (C=O) |
| 1678–1668 | trans-disubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 1675–1665 | tetrasubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 1662–1626 | cis-disubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 1658–1600 | alkene (vinylidene) (C=C) |
| 1655–1645 | δ-lactam (C=O) |
| 1650–1600 | conjugated alkene (C=C) |
| 1650–1580 | amine (N–H) |
| 1650–1566 | cyclic alkene (C=C) |

Continued on next page

Table 4: Wavenumber Range and Substructure Assignments

| Wavenumber (cm ⁻¹) | Substructure |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1648–1638 | monosubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 1620–1610 | α,β -unsaturated ketone (C=C) |
| 1550–1500 | nitro compound (N–O) |
| 1470–1460 | alkane (methylene group) (C–H) |
| 1455–1445 | alkane (methyl group) (C–H) |
| 1440–1395 | carboxylic acid (O–H) |
| 1420–1330 | alcohol (O–H) |
| 1415–1380 | sulfate (S=O) |
| 1410–1380 | sulfonyl chloride (S=O) |
| 1390–1380 | aldehyde (C–H) |
| 1390–1310 | phenol (O–H) |
| 1385–1380 | alkane (gem dimethyl) (C–H) |
| 1380–1370 | alkane (methyl group) (C–H) |
| 1372–1335 | sulfonate (S=O) |
| 1372–1290 | nitro compound (N–O) |
| 1370–1365 | alkane (gem dimethyl) (C–H) |
| 1370–1335 | sulfonamide (S=O) |
| 1350–1342 | sulfonic acid (S=O) |
| 1350–1300 | sulfone (S=O) |
| 1342–1266 | aromatic amine (C–N) |
| 1310–1250 | aromatic ester (C–O) |
| 1300–1250 | phosphorus oxide (P–O) |
| 1275–1200 | alkyl aryl ether (C–O) |
| 1250–1195 | phosphorus oxide (P–O) |
| 1250–1020 | amine (C–N) |
| 1225–1200 | vinyl ether (C–O) |
| 1210–1163 | ester (C–O) |
| 1205–1124 | tertiary alcohol (C–O) |
| 1204–1177 | sulfonyl chloride (S=O) |
| 1200–1185 | sulfate (S=O) |
| 1200–1000 | fluoro compound (C–F) |
| 1195–1168 | sulfonate (S=O) |
| 1170–1155 | sulfonamide (S=O) |
| 1165–1150 | sulfonic acid (S=O) |
| 1160–1120 | sulfone (S=O) |
| 1150–1085 | aliphatic ether (C–O) |
| 1124–1087 | secondary alcohol (C–O) |
| 1085–1050 | primary alcohol (C–O) |
| 1075–1020 | alkyl aryl ether (C–O) |
| 1075–1020 | vinyl ether (C–O) |
| 1070–1030 | sulfoxide (S=O) |
| 1050–1040 | anhydride (CO–O–CO) |
| 995–985 | monosubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 915–905 | monosubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 980–960 | trans-disubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 895–885 | alkene (vinylidene) (C=C) |
| 840–790 | trisubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 760–540 | halo compound (C–Cl) |
| 730–665 | cis-disubstituted alkene (C=C) |
| 690–515 | halo compound (C–Br) |
| 600–500 | halo compound (C–I) |
| 750–700 | monosubstituted benzene derivative |
| 710–690 | monosubstituted benzene derivative |

Table 5: Cost analysis comparison across different LLMs.

| Cost & Tokens | GPT-4o-mini | GPT-4o | o3-mini |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Input cost (per 1M token) | \$0.15 | \$ 2.50 | \$1.10 |
| Output cost (per 1M token) | \$0.6 | \$10.00 | \$4.40 |
| Average input token | 1500 | 1500 | 1400 |
| Average output token | 600 | 600 | 4400 |
| Avg. cost per call (IR-Agent) | \$0.0006 | \$0.0097 | \$0.0209 |

A.4 IR Peak Table Assigner

The IR Peak Table Assigner consists of two main components: (1) extracting peaks from the input spectrum, and (2) identifying relevant substructures using the IR Absorption Table (Table 4). To extract peaks, we use the `find_peaks` function from SciPy⁴, setting the hyperparameters to `height=1` and `distance=50`. This allows us to identify wavenumber positions where the absorbance exhibits local maxima, which we refer to as peaks. After extracting the peaks, we assign the corresponding substructures based on the IR absorption table, and generate textual interpretations. For example, if a peak is found within the range of (1200, 1000) cm^{-1} , the interpretation might be: "Peaks observed between 1200 and 1000 cm^{-1} are typically associated with fluoro compounds (C-F)."

A.5 LLM Agents

System Setup. Our agent system is implemented using Python 3.11.10, with `langchain` 0.3.25, `langchain-openai` 0.2.11, and `langgraph` 0.2.59. We utilize three LLMs: GPT-4o-mini⁵, GPT-4o⁶, and o3-mini⁷. For GPT-4o-mini, we use the `gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18` model with a temperature setting of 0.8. For GPT-4o, we use `gpt-4o-2024-08-06`, also with a temperature of 0.8. For o3-mini, we use `o3-mini-2025-01-31` with default settings and medium reasoning mode.

Cost Analysis. In Table 5, we summarize the cost per LLM, along with input and output token counts. Although the output length for both the TI and Ret Experts is constrained to fewer than 300 tokens, we observe that o3-mini, which is designed as a reasoning model, tends to generate a higher number of output tokens due to reasoning tokens that are not explicitly reflected in the final output. The overall API cost for a single run of IR-Agent increases in the order of GPT-4o-mini, GPT-4o, and o3-mini.

B Further Analysis

B.1 Performance Comparison Across Different Beam Widths

We validate the effectiveness of IR-Agent when using the IR Spectra Translator with larger beam widths. As shown in Figure 4, increasing the beam width beyond the default setting of 3 improves the performance of the Translator, thanks to the increased diversity in the decoding process. Moreover, when integrated into our framework, IR-Agent consistently yields additional performance gains by leveraging the SMILES candidates generated by the enhanced translator.

B.2 Additional Case Studies

In Figure 5, we present an additional case study for IR-Agent. The TI Expert infers the presence of halogen atoms such as F and Cl with high confidence, based on the consistency between the translator output and the table interpretation (e.g., C-F, C-Cl bonds). Additionally, the Ret Expert identifies a structural pattern consisting of an aromatic ring substituted with one or more halogen atoms. Based

⁴https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.signal.find_peaks.html

⁵<https://openai.com/index/gpt-4o-mini-advancing-cost-efficient-intelligence/>

⁶<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

⁷<https://openai.com/index/openai-o3-mini/>




Figure 4: Performance of IR-Agent using Translator across different beam widths

on these integrative analyses, the SE Expert accurately infers the complete molecular structure of the target spectrum.

Translator Output(C)
'Fc1ccc(Cl)c(Br)c1', 'Fc1ccc(Br)c(Cl)c1', 'Fc1ccc(Cl)cc1Br'

TI Expert

- For Fc1ccc(Cl)c(Br)c1
 - C-F → High confidence → The "Fc" fragment indicates a fluorine directly bonded to the aromatic ring, matching the **1200–1000 cm⁻¹ fluoro absorption**.
 - C-Cl → High confidence → The presence of a **chlorine substituent on the ring is consistent with the halo (C-Cl) absorption at 760–540 cm⁻¹**.
- For Fc1ccc(Br)c(Cl)c1
 - C-F → High confidence → The fluorine substituent ("Fc") on the aromatic ring aligns with the **1200–1000 cm⁻¹ peak for C-F**.
 - C-Cl → High confidence → The chloro substituent is present and explains the **IR band at 760–540 cm⁻¹ for halo (C-Cl) compounds**.
- For Fc1ccc(Cl)cc1Br
 - C-F → High confidence → The aromatic fluorine ("Fc") confirms the IR feature at **1200–1000 cm⁻¹ attributed to C-F bonds**.
 - C-Cl → High confidence → The chlorine attached to the benzene ring supports the **halo absorption observed at 760–540 cm⁻¹**.

Ret Expert

Most of the candidate SMILES show an **aromatic ring decorated with electronegative substituents (primarily Cl, sometimes F or Br)** and additional functional groups like -S (thiol/ thioether) or -OCH₃. For example, the top candidate (Fc1ccc(S)c(Cl)c1) features a benzene ring with a fluorine, a chlorine, and a sulfur substituent. Other SMILES reinforce this pattern by having dichloro-substitution (e.g., COc1ccc(Cl)c(Cl)c1) or a sulfur linker (SCc1ccc(Cl)c(Cl)c1).

Thus, it is likely that the **target structure also consists of a substituted aromatic core bearing one or more halogen atoms (notably Cl)** along with heteroatom substituents such as sulfur or methoxy groups. These features would match the vibrational modes found in the IR spectrum and justify the high cosine similarities observed.

SE Expert

1. Fc1ccc(Cl)c(Br)c1, 2. Fc1ccc(Br)c(Cl)c1, ..., 7. SCc1ccc(Cl)c(F)c1, 8. Fc1cc(OC)c(Cl)c1, **9. Fc1ccc(Cl)c(Cl)c1**, 10. Fc1c(Cl)cc(Br)c1

Figure 5: Additional Case Study: Outputs of expert agents in IR-Agent.

C Limitations & Future Work

We focus on extracting local structural information based on interpretations from the IR absorption table. However, accurate interpretation requires considering not only the peak positions, but also the peak shapes and intensities. Our framework is designed to incorporate diverse types of chemical information without requiring retraining or architectural modifications. Nonetheless, the IR Spectra Translator still needs to be retrained when adapting to new spectral datasets, similar to prior approaches. An alternative approach would be to directly input the IR spectrum as an image along with its raw spectral values into an LLM. With an effective prompting strategy or collaboration with external tools, this would enable the model to capture peak shapes and intensities during the interpretation of the IR absorption table, and to generate candidate SMILES without requiring retraining when adapting to new spectral datasets, effectively functioning as a translator.

D Broader Impacts

Potential Positive Scientific Impacts. In this work, we present IR-Agent, a multi-agent system that automates molecular structure elucidation from IR spectra by emulating expert analytical processes.

The reasoning capabilities of individual agents, each equipped with distinct knowledge, contribute to a more effective structure elucidation pipeline, with clearly defined and specialized reasoning steps. Unlike prior methods, the proposed multi-agent framework offers the flexibility to incorporate various types of chemical information, making it adaptable to a wide range of analytical scenarios.

Potential Negative Societal Impacts. While our approach demonstrates promising performance in structure elucidation, it relies on large language model (LLM) agents, which may occasionally produce hallucinated outputs or misinterpret information. Therefore, it is essential that this framework be used under the supervision of domain experts when applied to real-world IR spectral analysis.

E Prompt Templates for Expert Agents

In this section, we provide the prompt templates used for each agent described in Section 4. In addition to the default setting without chemical information, we present modified prompt templates that incorporate additional chemical information in three scenarios: atom types, scaffold, and carbon count. For each case, a single sentence describing the given chemical information is appended to the original prompt.

Table 6: Prompt for Table Interpretation (TI) Expert (Section 4.1)

| |
|---|
| <p>System Prompt: You are an expert organic chemist with specialized knowledge in analyzing infrared (IR) spectra.</p> <p>Prompt: You have an IR absorption interpretation that suggests certain substructures (e.g. nitrile, carbonyl, etc.), but this table-based mapping can be imprecise.</p> <p>Given SMILES: {SMILES Candidates} IR interpretation: {Table Interpretation}</p> <p>Your task is to: For each SMILES in the given SMILES list, identify substructures that are present both in the IR interpretation and in the that SMILES.</p> <p>Return a bulleted list in the format: substructure → confidence → brief rationale</p> <p>KEEP THE RESPONSE UNDER 300 TOKENS. ONLY RETURN: - A bulleted list of (substructure → confidence → brief rationale).</p> |
|---|

Table 7: Prompt for Table Interpretation (TI) Expert with Chemical Information(Section 4.4)

System Prompt: You are an expert organic chemist with specialized knowledge in analyzing infrared (IR) spectra.

Prompt: You have an IR absorption interpretation that suggests certain substructures (e.g. nitrile, carbonyl, etc.), but this table-based mapping can be imprecise.

Given SMILES: {SMILES Candidates}
IR interpretation: {Table Interpretation}

The molecule corresponding to the target spectrum is known to include the following atom types: {Atom Types}.

The molecule corresponding to the target spectrum is known to include the following scaffold: {Scaffold}.

The molecule corresponding to the target spectrum is known to include exactly {Carbon Count} carbon atoms.

Your task is to:

For each SMILES in the given SMILES list, identify substructures that are present both in the IR interpretation and in the that SMILES.

Return a bulleted list in the format:

substructure → confidence → brief rationale

KEEP THE RESPONSE UNDER 300 TOKENS.

ONLY RETURN:

- A bulleted list of (substructure → confidence → brief rationale).

Table 8: Prompt for Retriever (Ret) Expert (Section 4.2)

System Prompt: You are an expert organic chemist with specialized knowledge in analyzing infrared (IR) spectra.

Prompt: Your task is to analyze the SMILES of the candidate spectra, whose cosine similarity to the target spectrum is high.

If the target spectrum and candidate spectra exhibit high similarity, the SMILES of the target spectrum may have a similar structural characteristics to the SMILES of the candidate spectrum.

SMILES of candidate spectra and their cosine similarities to the target spectrum:
{Output of IR Spectra Retriever}

Based on the SMILES list, extract the structural information to complement the SMILES of the target spectrum.

Provide reasoning to support your analysis.

Let's think step-by-step.

KEEP THE RESPONSE UNDER 300 TOKENS.

ONLY THE REQUESTED CONTENT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN YOUR RESPONSE.

Table 9: Prompt for Retriever (Ret) Expert with Chemical Information (Section 4.4)

System Prompt: You are an expert organic chemist with specialized knowledge in analyzing infrared (IR) spectra.

Prompt: Your task is to analyze the SMILES of the candidate spectra, whose cosine similarity to the target spectrum is high.

If the target spectrum and candidate spectra exhibit high similarity, the SMILES of the target spectrum may have a similar structural characteristics to the SMILES of the candidate spectrum.

SMILES of candidate spectra and their cosine similarities to the target spectrum:
{Output of IR Spectra Retriever}

The molecule corresponding to the target spectrum is known to include the following atom types: {Atom Types}.

The molecule corresponding to the target spectrum is known to include the following scaffold: {Scaffold}.

The molecule corresponding to the target spectrum is known to include exactly {Carbon Count} carbon atoms.

Based on the SMILES list, extract the structural information to complement the SMILES of the target spectrum.

Provide reasoning to support your analysis.

Let's think step-by-step.

KEEP THE RESPONSE UNDER 300 TOKENS.

ONLY THE REQUESTED CONTENT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN YOUR RESPONSE.

Table 10: Prompt for Structure Elucidation (SE) Expert (Section 4.3)

System Prompt: You are an expert organic chemist with specialized knowledge in analyzing infrared (IR) spectra.

Prompt: Your task is to refine the given SMILES list and generate a N candidate list that aligns well with the IR spectrum while preserving structural diversity and plausibility.

The IR Absorption Table Agent provides potentially useful insights by interpreting the IR spectrum and suggesting possible substructures based on known absorption patterns.

IR Spectrum Retriever Agent examines the structural features of candidate SMILES that exhibit high cosine similarity to the target spectrum.

IR Absorption Table Agent Output: { $\mathcal{A}_{TI}^{Expert}$ }

IR Spectrum Retriever Agent Output (high-similarity spectra & analysis): { $\mathcal{A}_{Ret}^{Expert}$ }

- 1) Identify the substructures that are common to both the IR table interpretation and at least one SMILES in the list.
- 2) From the retriever agent output, extract structural information (e.g., recurring motifs / scaffolds) suggested by high-similarity candidates.
- 3) Guided by the structural insights from steps 1 and 2, produce a refined Top-N list of SMILES candidates.
- 4) Ensure the final list is chemically diverse and plausible—do not overfit to any single interpretation.

Based on these analyses, regenerate a list of Top-N SMILES by refining the target smiles: {SMILES Candidates}.

Let's think step-by-step.

ONLY THE REQUESTED CONTENT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN YOUR RESPONSE.

YOUR ANSWER FORMAT MUST BE AS FOLLOWS ONLY CONTAINING THE SMILES:

1. SMILES_1, 2. SMILES_2, 3. SMILES_3, ..., N. SMILES_N

Table 11: Prompt for Structure Elucidation (SE) Expert with Chemical Information (Section 4.4)

System Prompt: You are an expert organic chemist with specialized knowledge in analyzing infrared (IR) spectra.

Prompt: Your task is to refine the given SMILES list and generate a N candidate list that aligns well with the IR spectrum while preserving structural diversity and plausibility.

The IR Absorption Table Agent provides potentially useful insights by interpreting the IR spectrum and suggesting possible substructures based on known absorption patterns.

IR Spectrum Retriever Agent examines the structural features of candidate SMILES that exhibit high cosine similarity to the target spectrum.

IR Absorption Table Agent Output: $\{A_{TI}^{Expert}\}$

IR Spectrum Retriever Agent Output (high-similarity spectra & analysis): $\{A_{Ret}^{Expert}\}$

The final predicted molecular structures are constrained to contain only the following atom types: $\{Atom\ Types\}$.

The final predicted molecular structures must incorporate the specified scaffold $\{Scaffold\}$.

The final predicted molecular structures are required to contain exactly $\{Carbon\ Count\}$ carbon atoms.

- 1) Identify the substructures that are common to both the IR table interpretation and at least one SMILES in the list.
- 2) From the retriever agent output, extract structural information (e.g., recurring motifs / scaffolds) suggested by high-similarity candidates.
- 3) Guided by the structural insights from steps 1,2, and $[\{Atom\ Types\}, \{Scaffold\}, \{Carbon\ Count\}]$ constraint, produce a refined Top-N list of SMILES candidates.
- 4) Ensure the final list is chemically diverse and plausible—do not overfit to any single interpretation.

Based on these analyses, regenerate a list of Top-N SMILES by refining the target smiles: $\{SMILES\ Candidates\}$.

Let's think step-by-step.

ONLY THE REQUESTED CONTENT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN YOUR RESPONSE.

YOUR ANSWER FORMAT MUST BE AS FOLLOWS ONLY CONTAINING THE SMILES:

1. SMILES_1, 2. SMILES_2, 3. SMILES_3, ..., N. SMILES_N