

Evaluation of Causal Reasoning for Large Language Models in Contextualized Clinical Scenarios of Laboratory Test Interpretation

Balu Bhasuran¹, Mattia Prospero², Karim Hanna³, John Petrilli³, Caretia JeLayne Washington², Zhe He^{1, *}

¹School of Information, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA; ²Department of Epidemiology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA; ³Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

Abstract

This study evaluates causal reasoning in large language models (LLMs) using 99 clinically grounded laboratory test scenarios mapped to Pearl’s Ladder of Causation: association, intervention, and counterfactual reasoning. We focused on common lab tests such as Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), creatinine, and vitamin D, and paired them with clinically relevant causal factors, including age, gender, obesity, and smoking. Two LLMs GPT-o1 and Llama-3.2-8b-instruct were tested, with responses rated by four medically trained human experts. GPT-o1 demonstrated superior discriminative performance (AUROC overall = 0.80 ± 0.12) compared to Llama-3.2-8b-instruct (0.73 ± 0.15), with higher association (0.75 vs. 0.72), intervention (0.84 vs. 0.70), and counterfactual scores (0.84 vs. 0.69). Sensitivity (0.90 vs. 0.84) and specificity (0.93 vs. 0.80) were also greater for GPT-o1. Reasoning ratings followed similar trends. Both models performed best on intervention questions and worst on counterfactuals, particularly “altered outcome” scenarios. Findings suggest GPT-o1 offers more consistent causal reasoning, but further refinement is needed before high-stakes clinical deployment.

Keywords: causal reasoning; large language models; laboratory tests; clinical decision support; Pearl’s Ladder of Causation

Introduction

The field of large language models (LLMs) has witnessed rapid and transformative advancements in recent years. Cutting-edge models such as ChatGPT-4¹ and Gemini 2.5 Pro² now demonstrate capabilities that emulate human reasoning and problem-solving across a wide range of professional

domains. In medicine, these models often outperform clinicians on standardized benchmarks. For example, Med-PaLM 2³—a fine-tuned version of Google’s PaLM (Pathways Language Model) model trained on medical data—achieves state-of-the-art performance with scores of 86.5% on MedQA (USMLE), 81.8% on PubMedQA, and 95.2% on Massive Multitask Language Understanding (MMLU) Professional Medicine. Its ensemble-refined configurations also lead in MMLU Clinical Knowledge (88.7%) and College Medicine (83.2%). Building on these benchmarks, researchers and clinicians have increasingly applied LLMs to real-world clinical tasks such as differential diagnosis prediction⁴, discharge summary generation⁵, patient portal message drafting⁶, lab test interpretation⁷, clinical note summarization⁸, and clinical trial matching⁹.

More recently, the focus of LLM research in healthcare has begun to shift from output accuracy to reasoning quality, particularly as clinical decision support systems require transparent, interpretable justifications for medical decisions. Emerging models such as OpenAI’s GPT-o series¹⁰, Gemini 2.5 Pro^{2,11}, DeepSeek-R1¹², and Claude 4¹³ have shown improved abilities to generate clinically coherent and valid reasoning. For instance, Brodeur et al. demonstrated that a GPT-4-based system achieved superhuman diagnostic and management performance across five clinical reasoning tasks, outperforming attending and resident physicians in accuracy, clarity of reasoning, and inclusion of high-risk ("cannot-miss") diagnoses¹⁴. Tordjman et al. benchmarked DeepSeek-R1 against GPT-o1 and Llama-3.1, demonstrating competitive performance across diagnostic tasks, including USMLE questions, NEJM challenges, and RECIST tumor classification, which highlights DeepSeek’s strength in clinical reasoning¹⁵.

Despite these promising developments, a critical and underexplored aspect of LLM-based clinical decision-making is causal reasoning—the ability to understand and infer cause-and-effect relationships. In medicine, causal inference is essential for tasks ranging from identifying disease etiology to evaluating treatment outcomes and recommending interventions^{16,17}. As LLMs are increasingly integrated into high-stakes healthcare environments, evaluating and enhancing their capacity for causal reasoning is both urgent and necessary. Causal reasoning is fundamental to human intelligence, enabling us to understand the complex interplay of factors involved in clinical decision-making. Clinicians routinely assess symptoms, laboratory results, and comorbidities to determine the best course of action—decisions that rely on understanding cause-and-effect relationships rather than solely associations. While GenAI is widely expected to accelerate

scientific discovery and improve medicine, its role in strengthening causal evidence in healthcare remains uncertain.

General frameworks for evaluating causal reasoning in LLMs have begun to emerge, many of which are grounded in Judea Pearl's Ladder of Causation¹⁸, which outlines three levels of causal reasoning: association (rung 1), intervention (rung 2), and counterfactual (rung 3). Association refers to identifying statistical correlations without inferring causality. For example, one might observe that older, obese smokers tend to have higher HbA1c levels compared to younger, healthy individuals. However, this observation alone cannot tell us whether smoking or obesity causes elevated HbA1c as other unmeasured variables could be at play, and the direction of causality remains unclear. The second level, intervention, involves deliberately changing one variable to observe its impact on another. For instance, we might evaluate how quitting smoking affects HbA1c levels, enabling a more causal interpretation of the relationship. Finally, the third level, counterfactual, goes a step further by asking what would have happened under different conditions. For example, given that an older, obese smoker has an elevated HbA1c level, one might ask: *"Would their HbA1c level have been lower if they had never smoked or maintained a healthy weight earlier in life?"*. This reasoning involves imagining alternate life scenarios and requires considering unmeasured confounders such as diet, physical activity, or genetic predisposition. These levels provide a structured foundation for assessing how well LLMs can understand and reason about causality in medical contexts.

Several foundational works have proposed benchmarks and frameworks to evaluate LLMs' causal reasoning capabilities. Jin et al. developed CLADDER, a 10,000-question dataset aligned with Pearl's Ladder of Causation, translating symbolic causal queries into natural language to assess LLMs' formal causal inference¹⁹. Similarly, Zhou et al. introduced CausalBench²⁰, a real-world benchmark evaluating LLMs' abilities across associational, interventional, and counterfactual, while Chen et al. presented CaLM (Causal evaluation of Language Models), a framework offering systematic performance metrics to measure reasoning depth in LLMs²¹. Complementing these, Khatibi et al. proposed ALCM (Autonomous LLM-Augmented Causal Discovery Framework), which integrates LLMs with causal discovery pipelines to generate interpretable causal graphs from observational data²². Vashishtha et al. introduced causal order as a more robust and accurate alternative to pairwise causal graphs when using expert feedback (including LLMs), proposing a novel triplet querying method that improves order inference accuracy, reduces cycles, and

enhances performance across models and human annotators²³. Kıcıman et al. conducted a behavioral study of LLMs, demonstrating their strong capabilities in generating causal arguments across diverse tasks, which often outperform traditional methods, while also highlighting their limitations and potential for integration with formal causal techniques²⁴. Due to the importance of causality in medicine, Dang et al. introduced the Causal Roadmap, a rigorous framework for generating high-quality real-world evidence (RWE) from real-world data (RWD), emphasizing causal estimand specification, identifiability, and sensitivity analyses²⁵. Building on this, Petersen et al. developed a causal copilot, an AI-guided tool using LLMs to assist researchers throughout the causal inference process, from formulating clinical questions to executing statistical plans, thus enhancing reproducibility and transparency in healthcare research¹⁶. Current AI models, including LLMs, are not well equipped to handle confounding, selection bias, and other challenges inherent in real-world data. Moreover, both causal claims derived from RWD (e.g., assessing whether elevated HbA1c levels causally increase the risk of developing type 2 diabetes) and predictions from black-box AI models (e.g., estimating cancer risk based on smoking history and lab test patterns without revealing which features drive the prediction) are often difficult to validate, an essential requirement for high-stakes clinical decision-making. Generating reliable causal evidence requires translating a clinical question into a well-defined “causal estimand,”²⁵ a process that is frequently hindered by poorly defined target populations, mismatched baseline time points, and vague or unrealistic treatment interventions.

This study systematically evaluates the causal reasoning abilities of LLMs in lab test-specific contexts, focusing on their performance across the three levels of Pearl’s Ladder of Causation: association, intervention, and counterfactual. In alignment with the need to define precise causal estimands, we developed questions based on common laboratory tests such as Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), Creatinine, and Vitamin D, and paired them with clinically relevant causal factors, including age, gender, obesity, smoking, physical activity, medication use, and inflammation. To assess model performance, each causal question was verbalized using a structured prompt designed to elicit clear, medically accurate responses from two representative LLMs. The responses generated were evaluated by medically trained human experts, who rated both the answer and the reliability of reasoning.

Results

This study systematically evaluated the causal reasoning abilities of LLMs in the context of laboratory testing. Specifically, we assessed their performance across the three levels of Pearl's Ladder of Causation: association, intervention, and counterfactual reasoning. To ensure precise causal estimands, we generated 99 causal questions anchored in eight widely used blood tests: Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), Creatinine, Vitamin D, C-reactive protein (CRP), Cortisol, Low-Density Lipoprotein (LDL), High-Density Lipoprotein (HDL), and Albumin. For each test, we identified clinically relevant causal factors—including age, gender, obesity, smoking, physical activity, medication use, and inflammation—using authoritative medical sources such as MedlinePlus and the Mayo Clinic. The questions were developed within carefully defined clinical contexts that specified the target population, baseline characteristics, and potential interventions, allowing each to meaningfully support causal inference. To test model performance, the causal questions were verbalized into structured prompts designed to elicit accurate and clinically grounded responses. These were administered to two representative LLMs: GPT-o1 and Llama 3.2-8b-instruct. A detailed description of the causal question generation process is provided in the Methods section. Figure 1 summarizes the framework for evaluating LLM reasoning across three causal rungs: associational (is smoking associated with elevated HbA1c in older females?), interventional (what will happen to HbA1c if a patient quits smoking?), and counterfactual (was the smoking the cause of increased HbA1c?).




Figure 1. Overview of the Pipeline for Generating and Evaluating Causal Questions and Reasoning. The figure illustrates the end-to-end process used to generate causal questions based on laboratory tests and clinically relevant factors, produce reasoning responses using large language models, and evaluate these responses through expert review and quantitative metrics.

A total of 99 lab test-related causal questions were generated using Python code, with 33 questions for each of the three rungs of the causation ladder. LLM responses were expected to include a definitive answer indicating the direction or presence of a causal effect (e.g., “Yes”, “No”, “Increased”, “Decreased”, or “Altered outcome”), along with concise reasoning grounded in relevant risk factors, established clinical guidelines, or pathophysiological principles. The agreement rates varied across reasoning rungs and outcome types, highlighting differences in consistency. In rung 1: associational, perfect agreement was observed for “No” outcomes (1.00, n=9), while “Decreased” showed no agreement (0.00, n=5). Moderate agreement was found for “Increased” (0.56, n=9) and “Yes” (0.60, n=10). In rung 2: interventional, agreement was high for “Decreased” (0.91, n=22) and “Increased” (0.86, n=7), moderate for “No significant change” (0.50, n=2), but absent for both “Yes” and “Altered outcome” (0.00, n=1 each). In rung 3: counterfactual, agreement was very low for “Altered outcome” (0.04, n=24), yet high for “Yes”

(0.75, n=8) and perfect for “No” (1.00, n=1), suggesting stronger consensus when outcomes were binary. Overall, outcomes with clearer interpretations (e.g., “No” or “Decreased”) tended to yield higher agreement, while more ambiguous or nuanced outcomes like “Altered outcome” introduced greater variability in judgment.

The LLMs response was independently assessed by four clinical raters, who classified the correctness of the answer using binary labels: “Yes” or “No”. For the Association rung, 45 out of 66 responses (from both LLMs) had “Yes” as the majority response with an average agreement of 0.87, while eight responses had “No” (0.75), and 13 resulted in ties (0.50). The Intervention rung showed the highest agreement overall, with “Yes” as the majority in 60 of the 66 responses (0.95 agreement). The Counterfactual rung yielded 54 “Yes” responses (0.91), three “No” (0.75), and nine ties. When disaggregated by LLM, GPT-o1 consistently outperformed Llama 3.2 in agreement across all rungs, with particularly strong performance in the Counterfactual (0.92 vs. 0.77) and Association (0.81 vs. 0.76) categories. Both models performed well on Intervention questions, though GPT-o1 again had slightly higher rater consensus (0.92 vs. 0.90). This indicates that GPT-o1’s outputs were generally more consistent with expert consensus, especially for complex causal reasoning tasks. The examples in Table 1 illustrate how LLMs responded to lab test-related causal questions using a context-rich prompt. These scenarios are grouped according to the three levels of Pearl’s causal hierarchy—Rung 1 (Association), Rung 2 (Intervention), and Rung 3 (Counterfactual)—to showcase the diversity and complexity of causal reasoning tasks evaluated.

Table 1. Example use case scenarios generated by LLMs using the context-rich prompt, categorized by Causal Rung 1 (Association), Rung 2 (Intervention), and Rung 3 (Counterfactual).

Question [Rung 1: Association]: Does a 68-year-old female a smoker with Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) = 6.3 have a higher Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) level than a 30-year-old female non-smoker?																
<p><u>GPT-o1</u></p> <p><i>Response:</i> Increased</p> <p><i>Reasoning:</i> Smoking is a well-established risk factor for impaired glucose metabolism and insulin resistance, which can lead to higher HbA1c levels. Additionally, older age is associated with an increased risk of type 2 diabetes and higher HbA1c levels compared to younger individuals.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Accuracy</th> <th>Reliability of reasoning</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>N</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>N</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>N</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Y</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Accuracy	Reliability of reasoning		N	3		N	5		N	4		Y	1
	Accuracy	Reliability of reasoning														
	N	3														
	N	5														
	N	4														
	Y	1														
<u>Llama 3.2</u>																

Response: Yes

Reasoning: Elevated HbA1c levels are associated with impaired glucose metabolism, which can be influenced by aging, smoking, and other risk factors. The patient's age and smoking history increase her risk of insulin resistance, a key driver of elevated HbA1c levels.

	Accuracy	Reliability of reasoning	
	N		3
	Y		2
	Y	1	
	N		3

Question [Rung 2: Intervention]: If a 61-year-old female patient with Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) = 8.2, quits smoking, what is the expected change in their Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) level in 7 months?

GPT-o1

Response: Decreased

Reasoning: Smoking cessation can improve insulin sensitivity and glucose metabolism over time. Evidence suggests that quitting smoking can lead to better glycemic control, potentially resulting in a decrease in HbA1c levels. Over a period of 7 months, it is reasonable to expect some improvement, although individual responses may vary.

	Accuracy	Reliability of reasoning	
	Y	1	
	Y		3
	Y		2
	Y	1	

Llama 3.2

Response: Decrease

Reasoning: Quitting smoking improves insulin sensitivity and reduces inflammation, leading to better blood glucose control. This reduction in cardiovascular risk factors can help mitigate the impact of aging on insulin metabolism.

	Accuracy	Reliability of reasoning	
	Y	1	
	Y	1	
	Y		2
	Y		2

Question [Rung 3: Counterfactual]: If this patient had never been a smoker, would their Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) still be 8.2?

GPT-o1

Response: Altered outcome

Reasoning: Smoking is a known risk factor for insulin resistance and impaired glucose metabolism. If the patient had never smoked, it is likely that their HbA1c level could be lower than 8.2, assuming other factors remain constant.

	Accuracy	Reliability of reasoning	
	Y	1	
	Y		3
	Y		3
	Y		2

Llama 3.2

Response: Decrease


Reasoning: The patient's current HbA1c level of 8.2 suggests that she has developed insulin resistance or impaired glucose metabolism over time, likely influenced by her smoking history. Without this exposure, it is reasonable to expect that her metabolic profile would be less compromised, leading to a lower HbA1c level.

	Accuracy	Reliability of reasoning	
	Y	1	
	Y		2
	Y	1	
	Y	1	

Table 2 presents the average performance metrics (with standard deviation) for two large language models—GPT-o1 and Llama 3.2-8b-instruct—across binary classification and reasoning tasks stratified by causal rung: Associational, Interventional, and Counterfactual. For binary accuracy, GPT-o1 outperformed Llama 3.2 across all metrics and rungs, with an overall AUROC of 0.80 (± 0.12) compared to Llama’s 0.73 (± 0.15). GPT-o1 also demonstrated higher precision (0.98 vs. 0.92), sensitivity (0.90 vs. 0.84), and specificity (0.70 vs. 0.62), particularly excelling in interventional and counterfactual reasoning scenarios where clinical implications are most critical. For the reasoning task, both models showed comparable AUROC values, with GPT-o1 scoring 0.76 (± 0.13) and Llama 3.2 slightly higher at 0.81 (± 0.01). However, GPT-o1 exhibited superior consistency in precision, sensitivity, and specificity, especially in the counterfactual category, where it achieved perfect performance (1.00 across all metrics). In contrast, Llama 3.2 displayed greater variability in specificity and sensitivity, particularly in counterfactual questions where its performance dropped (e.g., specificity = 0.50 ± 0.43). These results suggest that while Llama 3.2 can provide strong reasoning in certain cases, GPT-o1 delivers more stable and clinically aligned outputs across the spectrum of causal complexity.

Metric	Model	Area under the receiver operating characteristic				Precision				Sensitivity				Specificity			
		Overall	Associational	Interventional	Counterfactual	Overall	Associational	Interventional	Counterfactual	Overall	Associational	Interventional	Counterfactual	Overall	Associational	Interventional	Counterfactual
Accuracy	gpt-ol	0.80 (0.12)	0.75 (0.16)	0.84 (0.24)	0.84 (0.24)	0.98 (0.01)	0.96 (0.03)	0.99 (0.02)	0.99 (0.02)	0.90 (0.08)	0.82 (0.15)	0.93 (0.06)	0.93 (0.07)	0.70 (0.26)	0.67 (0.27)	0.75 (0.50)	0.75 (0.50)
	Llama-3.2-8b-instr	0.73 (0.15)	0.72 (0.19)	0.70 (0.28)	0.69 (0.20)	0.92 (0.06)	0.84 (0.12)	0.98 (0.02)	0.90 (0.09)	0.84 (0.05)	0.80 (0.15)	0.92 (0.06)	0.80 (0.10)	0.62 (0.28)	0.65 (0.24)	0.50 (0.58)	0.58 (0.40)
Reasoning	gpt-ol	0.76 (0.13)	0.76 (0.13)	0.78 (0.26)	1.00 (0.00)	0.97 (0.02)	0.94 (0.03)	0.96 (0.05)	1.00 (0.00)	0.96 (0.03)	0.96 (0.03)	0.97 (0.03)	0.96 (0.06)	0.57 (0.26)	0.56 (0.24)	0.58 (0.50)	1.00 (0.00)
	Llama-3.2-8b-instr	0.81 (0.01)	0.81 (0.05)	0.79 (0.35)	0.78 (0.17)	0.95 (0.03)	0.91 (0.06)	0.98 (0.02)	0.95 (0.04)	0.91 (0.08)	0.88 (0.09)	0.93 (0.12)	0.92 (0.06)	0.55 (0.37)	0.58 (0.40)	0.50 (0.58)	0.50 (0.43)

3 SFigure 1 shows the heatmap of binary accuracy ratings (0 = inaccurate, 1 = accurate) provided
 4 by four expert raters for 99 causal reasoning questions, comparing GPT-o1 (left) and Llama 3.2
 5 (right). Figure 2 shows the heatmap of Likert-scale reasoning ratings (1 = excellent, 5 = poor) for
 6 the same set of questions, stratified by causal rung (association, intervention, counterfactual).
 7 Rows represent individual questions and columns represent raters, with lighter colors indicating
 8 higher reasoning quality and darker colors indicating poorer reasoning.



9

10 **Figure 2. Heatmaps of Reliable Reasoning Ratings (1 = Excellent, 5 = Poor) Stratified by**
 11 **Causal Rung for GPT-o1 and Llama 3.2.** Each heatmap panel shows expert ratings of reasoning
 12 quality for 33 causal reasoning questions per rung (Association, Intervention, Counterfactual)
 13 answered by two large language models (GPT-o1, top row; Llama 3.2, bottom row). Ratings were
 14 provided by four independent raters using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = high-quality reasoning, 5 =
 15 poor reasoning). Rows correspond to individual questions (Q1–Q99, evenly distributed across
 16 rungs), and columns to raters. Colors encode reasoning quality, with lighter tones representing
 17 better reasoning and darker tones representing poorer reasoning. Row order within each panel is
 18 sorted by inter-rater agreement to highlight consistency in judgments.

19 Discussion

20 This preliminary study introduced a structured framework to assess causal reasoning in LLMs
21 (GPT-o1 and Llama-3.2_8b) using 99 clinically grounded laboratory test scenarios mapped to
22 Pearl’s Ladder of Causation—association, intervention, and counterfactual reasoning. Both
23 models were able to generate medically relevant responses, with GPT-o1 consistently aligning
24 more closely with expert consensus, particularly for complex counterfactual and associational
25 tasks. Interventional questions, which often reflected widely known clinical relationships, saw
26 strong performance from both models. Domain experts’ ratings revealed that high-quality
27 responses clearly explained causal pathways, reflected clinical mechanisms, and considered
28 confounders such as age, gender, or comorbidities, whereas vague answers (e.g., “altered
29 outcome”) led to lower agreement and reliability scores. Quantitatively, binary outcomes that were
30 inherently definitive (“No,” “Decreased”) produced the highest consensus (e.g., Association “No”
31 = 1.00; Intervention “Decreased” = 0.91), while ambiguous counterfactual outcomes yielded near-
32 zero agreement (0.04). GPT-o1 consistently outperformed Llama-3.2 across rungs, with the largest
33 gaps on Counterfactual (0.92 vs. 0.77) and Association (0.81 vs. 0.76) questions, indicating more
34 stable causal reasoning. These results underscore that while LLMs show potential for causal
35 reasoning in medicine, their performance is uneven and often sensitive to question framing and
36 clinical nuance. Our findings suggest that LLMs may be most reliable for well-established
37 interventions but remain less stable for complex counterfactual reasoning. Future work should
38 expand beyond lab tests to include history and physical exam findings, imaging, genomics, and
39 longitudinal data, while integrating guardrails—such as retrieval augmentation, explicit
40 assumption disclosure, and uncertainty tagging—to improve model reliability and trustworthiness
41 in clinical settings.

42 We selected GPT-o1 and Llama-3.2-8b for causal reasoning because they embody two distinct yet
43 complementary paradigms in current LLM development: a high-performing proprietary model and
44 a leading small-scale open-source alternative with the potential for fine-tuning into causal
45 reasoning-specific models. GPT-o1 delivers strong instruction-following and reasoning
46 capabilities, while Llama-3.2-8b enables transparent, locally controlled experimentation, critical
47 for ensuring reproducibility and safeguarding privacy in healthcare research. Compared to
48 healthcare-specific models, these two offer broader generalization potential, allowing for unbiased
49 evaluation of causal reasoning. We intentionally excluded medicine-specialized LLMs, as large

50 electronic health record vendors continue to rely primarily on general-purpose commercial models
51 in day-to-day clinical deployments.

52 GPT-o1's higher agreement suggests that larger or instruction-tuned proprietary models may
53 internalize clinically coherent causal schemas better than smaller open-source counterparts.
54 However, both models were strong in interventions, implying that widely available clinical
55 knowledge (e.g., CRP levels fall after smoking cessation) is accessible even to smaller models.
56 This pattern is evident in the heatmap (Figure 2), which is based on a 5-point Likert scale where 1
57 indicates a high rating and 5 indicates a poor one. GPT-o1's reasoning was rated closer to 1 (deep
58 red) and more uniform, whereas Llama-3.2 showed broader dispersion, especially for
59 counterfactual questions. Ties and mid-scale Likert scores cluster around questions with multiple
60 plausible pathways or unclear temporal ordering. Grounding factors in authoritative sources
61 (MedlinePlus, Mayo Clinic) likely reduced hallucinated mechanisms and gave raters a common
62 frame of reference. Our few-shot plus instructions to reason step-by-step prompt probably
63 improved coherence, yet did not eliminate failures on nuanced counterfactuals.

64 Analyzing example cases reveals a clear evaluation pattern: medically trained domain experts
65 favored responses that not only stated the correct direction but also provided a well-reasoned
66 explanation grounded in medical knowledge. In contrast, they rated responses lower when the
67 reasoning was vague, inconsistent, or poorly worded—even if the final answer matched the
68 consensus.

69 For instance, Llama-3.2's HbA1c intervention item (Q103: "*If a 63-year-old male with*
70 *Hemoglobin A1c = 9.7 quits smoking, what is the expected change in HbA1c in 4 months?*") was
71 unanimously rated (4/4 "Yes"; all Likert = 1) because the model explicitly articulated that smoking
72 cessation attenuates insulin resistance and chronic low-grade inflammation—key drivers of
73 sustained hyperglycemia—thereby lowering average glucose exposure and, consequently, HbA1c
74 over the ensuing months. A similar pattern was observed for lab test LDL (Q196: "*If a 53-year-old*
75 *male with elevated LDL quits smoking, what is the expected change in LDL?*"), where the model
76 again earned perfect scores by linking cessation to reduced oxidative stress, improved endothelial
77 function, and favorable lipid metabolism, logically predicting a decrease in LDL concentrations.
78 GPT-o1 demonstrated comparable mechanistic fidelity on analogous prompts (e.g., "*Smoking*
79 *cessation can improve insulin sensitivity and lower chronic inflammation, which reduces HbA1c*

80 *over time*” and “*Smoking cessation is associated with improved lipid metabolism and modest LDL*
81 *reductions*”), although a minority of raters nudged Likert scores to 2, reflecting minor reservations
82 about completeness or nuance rather than fundamental causal soundness.

83 In contrast, the incorrect responses help explain why lower reasoning scores (4–5) were often
84 associated with disagreement among domain experts. In an Association CRP test question (Q111:
85 “*Do 66-year-old male smokers have higher CRP than non-smokers?*”), Llama-3.2 answered “No”
86 and offered only a vague assertion of “no clear difference,” disregarding extensive evidence that
87 tobacco exposure upregulates inflammatory pathways (e.g., NF-κB activation) and elevates
88 acute-phase reactants such as CRP; three raters therefore judged the answer incorrect. Likewise,
89 for HbA1c Association (Q105: “*Does a 54-year-old female smoker with HbA1c = 6.2 have a*
90 *higher HbA1c than a 24-year-old female non-smoker?*”), the model’s “No” aligned with the
91 majority binary decision, but the explanation—hinging on age and “shorter duration of smoking”
92 without interrogating dose–response relationships, adiposity, or medication status—was deemed
93 superficial (Likert 5/3/1/5).

94 When answering questions about kidney function using creatinine levels, GPT-o1 consistently
95 provided correct answers and clear reasoning across all three levels of causality. All four domain
96 experts agreed with GPT-o1’s answers on both the association and intervention prompts. Its
97 association response explained that “*elderly males generally experience age-related changes in*
98 *renal function, including reduced glomerular filtration rate (GFR), leading to higher creatinine*
99 *levels compared to younger females,*” and was rated highly (Likert 1–2 by all four raters). In the
100 intervention scenario, GPT-o1 reasoned that “*increasing water intake can improve renal perfusion*
101 *and hydration, leading to better creatinine clearance,*” again earning full agreement and Likert
102 scores between 1 and 2. For the counterfactual—if the male patient had been female—three
103 domain experts agreed with GPT-o1’s “Yes” response, but one disagreed. Reasoning was rated
104 slightly lower (Likert 1–3), suggesting mild uncertainty about how sex alone would normalize
105 values. In contrast, Llama-3.2 showed a more variable performance. While its intervention
106 response was supported by all domain experts— “we can expect a decrease... a study found
107 significant reductions in creatinine levels”—one domain expert rated the reasoning a 5 for being
108 too reliant on external data without tightly connecting it to the patient. For the association and
109 counterfactual questions, only half the domain experts agreed with Llama-3.2’s answers, and

110 reasoning scores ranged widely (Likert 1 to 5), with raters pointing to vagueness, internal
111 contradiction, or overgeneralization about age and gender effects.

112 For lab test cholesterol (LDL) questions, GPT-o1 again performed best on intervention and
113 counterfactual tasks. In the intervention prompt about quitting smoking, GPT-o1 stated, “*smoking*
114 *does not have a direct, immediate effect on LDL... the benefits are seen in inflammation and*
115 *vascular function,*” which all four domain experts endorsed, giving Likert scores between 1 and 3.
116 The counterfactual reasoning—“*absence of smoking would likely result in a lower LDL level*”—
117 was also accepted by all, with strong ratings (Likert 1–2). However, on the association prompt
118 (comparing a 58-year-old smoker to a 29-year-old non-smoker), GPT-o1 answered “No” and failed
119 to elaborate on smoking’s known effects on LDL; only one domain expert agreed, and reasoning
120 scores were poor (Likert 5/5/2/5). Llama-3.2, in contrast, offered much stronger explanations, such
121 as “*smoking damages the endothelium, increases inflammation... contributing to increased LDL*
122 *levels,*” which was clinically accurate responses. Three domain experts agreed with this association
123 answer and rated the reasoning between 1 and 3. For the counterfactual, Llama-3.2 again gave a
124 comprehensive explanation, referencing multiple studies, and three domain experts agreed with
125 both the answer and reasoning (Likert 1–3), though one domain expert disagreed with the final
126 label. Overall, domain expert ratings revealed that GPT-o1 was more consistent in aligning
127 answers with clinical consensus, while Llama-3.2 stood out for its richer scientific explanations,
128 though sometimes at the cost of clarity or alignment with expert judgment.

129 Collectively, these cases underscore a consistent evaluative heuristic: domain experts privileged
130 responses that traced a logically consistent causal pathway (e.g., smoking cessation → reduced
131 systemic inflammation/insulin resistance → lower HbA1c) and penalized those lacking
132 mechanistic specificity (e.g., failing to explain how smoking influences lipid metabolism or how
133 hydration affects renal function), internal coherence (e.g., contradicting the stated lab values or
134 patient demographics), or appropriate consideration of clinical confounders and effect modifiers
135 (e.g., overlooking age, sex, medication use, or comorbid conditions that could influence lab
136 results). Notably, GPT-o1 never produced a continuous sequence of Likert 1 scores, with isolated
137 2–3 scores signaling the domain experts’ stringent expectations for completeness, precision, and
138 clinical plausibility.

139 The study has certain limitations; we limited ourselves to eight common blood tests;
140 generalizability to imaging, genomics, or longitudinal EHR trajectories remains unknown. Results
141 cannot be extrapolated across the rapidly evolving LLM landscape. Collapsing rich causal
142 statements into a small set of categorical answers (“Altered outcome”) may have inflated
143 ambiguity. Our findings caution against assuming uniform “causal competence” in LLMs. Models
144 are reliable for well-trodden interventional knowledge but unstable for counterfactual reasoning
145 that requires disentangling multiple interacting causes. For deployment, LLM guardrails such as
146 retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) with clinical causal guideline documents, explicit
147 requirement to state assumptions, and automatic uncertainty tagging could mitigate risk.
148 Evaluations should move beyond surface correctness to probe whether models identify appropriate
149 confounders, temporal ordering, and effect modifiers.

150 **Methods**

151 **Study Design**

152 This study systematically evaluates the causal reasoning abilities of LLMs in lab test-specific
153 contexts, focusing on their performance across the three levels of Pearl’s Ladder of Causation:
154 association, intervention, and counterfactual. In alignment with the need to define precise causal
155 estimands, we generated the questions grounded in eight common blood laboratory tests:
156 Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), Creatinine, Vitamin D, C-reactive protein (CRP), Cortisol, Low-
157 Density Lipoprotein (LDL), High-Density Lipoprotein (HDL), and Albumin. For each test, we
158 identified clinically relevant causal factors—such as age, gender, obesity, smoking, physical
159 activity, medication use, and inflammation—by using reputable medical sources like MedlinePlus
160 and the Mayo Clinic. This process involved clearly specifying the clinical context, target
161 population, baseline characteristics, and potential interventions to ensure that each question could
162 meaningfully support causal inference. Questions were then crafted to reflect the three causal
163 levels: Associational (e.g., *comparing HbA1c levels between older obese smokers and younger*
164 *healthy individuals*), Interventional (e.g., *evaluating the impact of quitting smoking on HbA1c*
165 *levels*), and Counterfactual (e.g., *would HbA1c levels have been lower if the patient were not*
166 *obese?*). To assess model performance, each causal question was verbalized using a structured
167 prompt designed to elicit clear, medically accurate responses from two representative LLMs: GPT-
168 o1(a widely used proprietary reasoning model) and Llama-3.2(a popular open-source model). The

169 responses generated were evaluated by medically trained human experts, who rated both the
170 answer (Binary [yes/no]) and the clinical validity of the reasoning (Likert scale [1-5]). GPT-o1
171 (*o1-2024-12-17*) was accessed via Application Programming Interfaces (API) calls to OpenAI,
172 while Llama-3.2(*8b_instruct*) was downloaded locally and accessed using an open-source
173 application called Jan (<https://jan.ai/>). For both models, the temperature was set to 0 and the top-p
174 parameter to 1.

175 For causal question answering and reasoning, we employed a few-shot learning approach, where
176 the model was provided with multiple example outputs formatted in a tab-separated structure. The
177 prompt (detailed in Box 1) explicitly instructed the model to generate responses where each answer
178 was paired with its corresponding reasoning. The model was tasked with analyzing clinical
179 scenarios and applying medical knowledge to the aforementioned laboratory markers,
180 systematically explaining causal relationships through the three rungs of reasoning. Specific
181 instructions were provided that each question must be answered using step-by-step reasoning
182 grounded in clinical evidence, physiological mechanisms, and standard medical guidelines. For
183 rung-1 association questions, the prompt instructed the LLM to identify statistical or observational
184 relationships between variables and detect trends and risk factors. For rung-2 intervention
185 questions, the model assessed how changes in risk factors, e.g., lifestyle modifications or
186 medications, would impact lab markers and clinical outcomes. When addressing rung-3
187 counterfactual questions, the LLM “imagined” how alterations in a patient’s history or behavior
188 would have changed the outcome, or more specifically, if it was a specific factor that led to their
189 current status.

190 Table 3 presents a summary of the unique causal factors used in generating causal reasoning
191 questions for each laboratory test. For each test (e.g., Hemoglobin A1c, Creatinine, Cortisol), the
192 associated causal factors include demographic (e.g., age, gender), lifestyle (e.g., smoking, physical
193 activity), clinical (e.g., diabetes, kidney disease), and treatment-related variables (e.g., medication
194 use). These factors reflect known physiological and clinical influences on the respective lab test
195 values and were used to construct association, intervention, and counterfactual reasoning
196 questions.

197 **Table 3. Causal Factors Associated with Each Laboratory Test**

Lab Test	Causal Factors
Albumin	hydration, infection, inflammation, kidney disease, liver disease, medication use
C-Reactive Protein (CRP)	autoimmune diseases, cardiovascular disease, medication use, infection, obesity, smoking
Cortisol	age, chronic illness, gender, obesity, medication use
Creatinine	age, diabetes, gender, high protein intake, hydration status, kidney disease
Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c)	age, gender, medication use, physical activity, smoking
High-Density Lipoprotein (HDL)	alcohol consumption, medication use, physical activity, smoking
Low-Density Lipoprotein (LDL)	diabetes, lack of exercise, medication use, obesity, smoking
Vitamin D (25-hydroxyvitamin D)	age, kidney disease, gender, lifestyle, medication use

198 The selected panel of eight laboratory tests—Albumin, C-Reactive Protein (CRP), Cortisol,
199 Creatinine, Hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), High-Density Lipoprotein (HDL), Low-Density
200 Lipoprotein (LDL), and Vitamin D (25-hydroxyvitamin D)—represents a clinically diverse set of
201 biomarkers commonly used in diagnosing and monitoring chronic diseases, metabolic status, organ
202 function, and systemic inflammation. Each lab test is influenced by a distinct set of causal factors
203 that modulate its levels and clinical interpretation. For instance, Albumin, a key marker of
204 nutritional status and liver/kidney function, is sensitive to hydration, infection, inflammation, and
205 organ dysfunction. CRP, an acute-phase reactant, reflects systemic inflammation and is elevated
206 in the context of autoimmune disorders, cardiovascular disease, obesity, and smoking. Cortisol,
207 the primary stress hormone, is affected by age, gender, chronic illness, and medication, serving as
208 a window into endocrine and psychological health. Creatinine, a renal function marker, varies with
209 age, hydration status, protein intake, and kidney disease. HbA1c, a marker of long-term glucose
210 control, is influenced by age, lifestyle, and medication use, making it central to diabetes
211 management. HDL and LDL, critical indicators of lipid metabolism and cardiovascular risk, are
212 shaped by smoking, physical activity, alcohol consumption, and metabolic disorders such as
213 obesity and diabetes. Lastly, Vitamin D status is governed by age, ethnicity, gender, lifestyle, and
214 medication, with implications for bone health, immunity, and chronic disease prevention.

215 Understanding how these diverse causal factors interact with each lab test enhances the precision
216 of clinical assessments and supports the development of context-aware LLM reasoning models.
217

Box 1. Few-shot prompt used in this study to generate answers and reasoning for causal questions.

Please act as a medical professional specializing in laboratory diagnostics and clinical decision-making. Your task is to analyze causal relationships related to various laboratory markers (e.g., HbA1c, creatinine, CRP, cortisol) by assessing association, intervention effects, and counterfactual scenarios.

You must approach each question by:

Analyzing the Scenario: Carefully examine the provided medical context.
Applying Medical Knowledge: Utilize established research, clinical guidelines, and pathophysiological principles.
Reasoning Step-by-Step: Break down causal relationships systematically.
Providing Evidence-Based Answers: Support responses with medical literature, standard clinical guidelines, or physiological mechanisms.

The question-and-answer format should be:

Association Q: [Question comparing two groups or conditions] A: [Yes/No/Increased/Decreased/etc.] Reasoning: [Brief explanation based on relevant risk factors, pathophysiology, or established evidence]

Intervention Q: [Question describing an intervention and its likely effect on a lab marker or clinical outcome] A: [Expected direction of change or result] Reasoning: [Explanation of how the intervention mechanistically alters the lab marker or outcome, supported by evidence or guidelines]

Counterfactual Q: [Hypothetical scenario where a key risk factor or condition is absent or changed] A: [Yes/No/Altered outcome] Reasoning: [Explanation of how the absence or alteration of the factor would affect the outcome, based on pathophysiology or epidemiological data]

Please produce the response and reasoning in tab-separated format '\t'

Example output

Response \t Reasoning

Yes Older age, obesity, and smoking are all associated with insulin resistance and impaired glucose metabolism, leading to elevated HbA1c levels.\n

Decrease Regular exercise improves insulin sensitivity and enhances peripheral glucose uptake, gradually lowering blood glucose levels and thus HbA1c over time.\n

No Obesity is a key driver of insulin resistance. Without excess adiposity, the patient's insulin sensitivity would likely be better, contributing to lower HbA1c levels.\n

218

219

220

221 Four medically trained human experts were instructed to evaluate the performance of GPT-o1 and
222 Llama-3.2_8b in response to a curated set of clinical causal reasoning questions. Each domain
223 expert independently assessed the responses using a structured evaluation rubric. They judged
224 accuracy based on whether the final answer was categorically correct (yes/no/NA) and rated the
225 reliability of reasoning—the clarity, scientific validity, and clinical usefulness of the explanation—
226 on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = highly reliable to 5 = highly unreliable). Participation was voluntary,
227 with the option to complete the full set or only a portion, and to withdraw at any time. No
228 compensation was offered. Domain experts were asked to return their evaluations within ten days,
229 after which two weekly reminders would be sent before the survey closed.

230 Inter-rater agreement on LLM evaluations was assessed using two complementary approaches:
231 Fleiss' kappa with Conger's exact procedure for binary correctness judgments and Kendall's
232 coefficient of concordance (W) with ties correction for ordinal reasoning quality ratings. As shown
233 in SFigure 2, binary correctness (Yes/No) ratings across four domain expert raters revealed higher
234 agreement for intervention-type questions—particularly for GPT-o1—while counterfactual
235 scenarios, especially for LLaMA 3.2, showed the lowest agreement. SFigure 3 illustrates ordinal
236 concordance on Likert-scale reasoning quality ratings (1 = highly reliable, 5 = poor), where
237 agreement again peaked for intervention tasks and was weakest for counterfactuals, indicating
238 greater subjectivity in hypothetical reasoning. Finally, SFigure 4 highlights domain expert-specific
239 variability in median reliability ratings, underscoring differences in subjective perceptions of
240 model performance across raters. To evaluate the consistency and reliability of model
241 performance, we computed a comprehensive set of binary classification metrics, including Area
242 Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUROC), Precision, Sensitivity, and
243 Specificity. Analyses were stratified by the rung level of causality. Each domain expert's binary
244 or Likert-based evaluation was compared against a consensus ground truth—defined as a majority
245 vote for binary responses or the median rating for Likert-scale assessments. All analyses were
246 conducted using R (v4.3.0), with packages including DescTools, grDevices, irr, ROCR, stringr,
247 and xlsx. Python packages such as matplotlib, seaborn, pandas, and numpy were used to generate
248 visualizations. Data and reproducible code are provided in the supplementary materials.

249 The study protocol was approved as exempt by the University of Florida Institutional Review
250 Board (Ref. ET00046340, approved on 03/25/2025), and all authors adhered to the principles of
251 the Declaration of Helsinki.

252 **Code Availability**

253 All code, inference outputs, and scripts used to generate the results in this study are publicly
254 accessible at https://github.com/balubhasuran/LLM_Causality_LabTest . Experiments were
255 performed using Python 3.11 with the following open-source libraries: matplotlib =3.8.4, numpy
256 =1.24.4, openai =1.97.1, pandas =1.5.3, scikit_learn =1.3.2, scipy =1.11.4, seaborn =0.13.2,
257 statsmodels = 0.14.0. Statistical analyses were conducted in R 4.5.1 using the following
258 packages: tidyverse =v1.3.0, ggplot2 = v3.5.2, lme4 = v1.1-37, DescTools = v0.99.60, grDevices
259 = base, irr = v0.84.1, ROCR = v1.0-11, stringr = v1.5.1, and xlsx = v0.6.5.

260 **Acknowledgment**

261 This work was supported by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality grant R21HS029969
262 (PI: Z.H.). This project was also partially supported by the University of Florida-Florida State
263 University Clinical and Translational Science Award, which is supported in part by the National
264 Institutes of Health (NIH) National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences under award
265 UL1TR001427. We would like to thank Dr. Julian R. Mark (Department of Neuroscience,
266 University of Florida, College of Medicine) for evaluating the LLM-generated responses.

267 **References**

- 268 1. OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. (2023) doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2303.08774.
- 269 2. Gemini Team *et al.* Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models. Preprint at
270 <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2312.11805> (2023).
- 271 3. Singhal, K. *et al.* Toward expert-level medical question answering with large language
272 models. *Nat Med* **31**, 943–950 (2025).
- 273 4. Bhasuran, B. *et al.* Preliminary analysis of the impact of lab results on large language
274 model generated differential diagnoses. *NPJ Digit Med* **8**, 166 (2025).
- 275 5. Williams, C. Y. K. *et al.* Physician- and Large Language Model–Generated Hospital
276 Discharge Summaries. *JAMA Intern Med* (2025) doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2025.0821.

- 277 6. Liu, S. *et al.* Using large language model to guide patients to create efficient and
278 comprehensive clinical care message. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*
279 **31**, 1665–1670 (2024).
- 280 7. He, Z. *et al.* Quality of Answers of Generative Large Language Models Versus Peer
281 Users for Interpreting Laboratory Test Results for Lay Patients: Evaluation Study. *J Med Internet*
282 *Res* **26**, e56655 (2024).
- 283 8. Van Veen, D. *et al.* Adapted large language models can outperform medical experts in
284 clinical text summarization. *Nat Med* **30**, 1134–1142 (2024).
- 285 9. Jin, Q. *et al.* Matching patients to clinical trials with large language models. *Nat Commun*
286 **15**, 9074 (2024).
- 287 10. OpenAI *et al.* OpenAI o1 System Card. Preprint at
288 <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2412.16720> (2024).
- 289 11. Gemini Our most intelligent AI models. <https://deepmind.google/models/gemini/pro/>.
- 290 12. DeepSeek-AI *et al.* DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via
291 Reinforcement Learning. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2501.12948> (2025).
- 292 13. Introducing Claude 4. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-4>.
- 293 14. Brodeur, P. G. *et al.* Superhuman performance of a large language model on the
294 reasoning tasks of a physician. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2412.10849> (2024).
- 295 15. Tordjman, M. *et al.* Comparative benchmarking of the DeepSeek large language model
296 on medical tasks and clinical reasoning. *Nat Med* (2025) doi:10.1038/s41591-025-03726-3.
- 297 16. Petersen, M., Alaa, A., Kiciman, E., Holmes, C. & Van Der Laan, M. Artificial
298 Intelligence–Based Copilots to Generate Causal Evidence. *NEJM AI* **1**, (2024).
- 299 17. Proserpi, M. *et al.* Causal inference and counterfactual prediction in machine learning for
300 actionable healthcare. *Nat Mach Intell* **2**, 369–375 (2020).
- 301 18. Pearl, J. An introduction to causal inference. *Int J Biostat* **6**, Article 7 (2010).

- 302 19. Jin, Z. *et al.* CLadder: Assessing Causal Reasoning in Language Models. Preprint at
303 <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2312.04350> (2023).
- 304 20. Zhou, Y. *et al.* CausalBench: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Causal Learning
305 Capability of LLMs. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2404.06349> (2024).
- 306 21. Chen, S. *et al.* Causal Evaluation of Language Models. Preprint at
307 <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2405.00622> (2024).
- 308 22. Khatibi, E., Abbasian, M., Yang, Z., Azimi, I. & Rahmani, A. M. ALCM: Autonomous
309 LLM-Augmented Causal Discovery Framework. Preprint at
310 <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2405.01744> (2024).
- 311 23. Vashishtha, A. *et al.* Causal Order: The Key to Leveraging Imperfect Experts in Causal
312 Inference. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2310.15117> (2023).
- 313 24. Kıcıman, E., Ness, R., Sharma, A. & Tan, C. Causal Reasoning and Large Language
314 Models: Opening a New Frontier for Causality. Preprint at
315 <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.00050> (2023).
- 316 25. Dang, L. E. *et al.* A causal roadmap for generating high-quality real-world evidence. *J*
317 *Clin Transl Sci* **7**, e212 (2023).

318