

ROUNDTABLE POLICY: IMPROVING SCIENTIFIC REASONING AND NARRATIVES THROUGH CONFIDENCE-WEIGHTED CONSENSUS OF LLMs

Yu Yao^{1,*} Jiayi Dong^{2,*} Ju Li^{1,†} Yang Yang^{2,†} Yilun Du^{3,†}

¹Massachusetts Institute of Technology

²University of California, Los Angeles

³Harvard University

ABSTRACT

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities not only in language generation but also in advancing scientific discovery. A growing body of work has explored ways to improve their reasoning, from self-consistency and chain-of-thought to multi-agent debate. Inspired by the dynamics of scientific committees and *The Society of Mind*, we introduce ROUNDTABLE POLICY, a complementary inference-time reasoning framework that performs inference through the weighted consensus of multiple LLMs. Our findings indicate that this approach significantly enhances reasoning in complex heterogeneous scientific tasks and improves scientific narratives in terms of creativity, rigor, and logical coherence, while reducing hallucinations that single models are prone to. Our approach emphasizes structured and interpretable consensus rather than opaque convergence, while requires only black-box access and uniform procedures, making it broadly applicable to multi-LLM reasoning. Project website at <https://ai4scidisc.github.io/roundtable/>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive capabilities in text generation, reasoning, and few-shot adaptation. These advances have opened exciting opportunities for scientific discovery, where complex, interdisciplinary problems demand not only accurate reasoning but also coherent narrative construction. However, current LLMs may hallucinate facts, introduce implausible logical jumps, or produce fragmented explanations. Such limitations are particularly problematic in scientific contexts, where reliability and clarity are equally critical. For instance, a scientific proposal must not only provide factually correct content, but also organize it into a structured and persuasive narrative. Addressing these dual requirements calls for mechanisms that go beyond the capacity of a single LLM.

A natural motivation is therefore to leverage multiple LLMs, aggregating their complementary strengths. Prior work has explored self-consistency with multiple sampled reasoning paths (Wang et al., 2022), multi-agent debate frameworks (Du & et al., 2023; Madaan & et al., 2023), and tool-augmented multi-agent systems (Schick et al., 2023; Ghafarollahi & Buehler, 2024). However, these approaches are often limited to single-task reasoning, rely on emergent dynamics that are difficult to interpret, or lack systematic mechanisms for weighting contributions across heterogeneous domains. Ensemble-style methods such as majority voting treat all models equally, overlooking that different models excel in different domains or evaluation dimensions. Debate-style methods, while sometimes converging to better outputs, remain inherently opaque: it is often unclear why a particular answer was selected, or hard to quantify which models were more trustworthy in the process. In scientific applications, this lack of transparency poses a major barrier, since researchers require not only correct outputs but also interpretable evidence supporting the decision.

*Equal contribution. Correspondence to yu.yao@mit.edu, jiayidong@ucla.edu.

†Equal Advising




Figure 1: **Overview of the ROUNDTABLE POLICY.** An inference-time reasoning framework that produces consensus-weighted answers through fusion. Demonstrations for both structured (Multi-Task) and open-ended (SingleTask) settings are included in Appendix §B.

At a broader level, scientific problem solving is inherently multi-faceted, requiring both precise reasoning and coherent long-form narratives. While individual LLMs have made impressive progress, they still face challenges in consistently meeting these diverse demands across domains and tasks. This motivates the need for a structured approach to harness collective intelligence—one that integrates complementary expertise, surfaces and resolves disagreements transparently, and preserves accountability in the decision process.

Building on these considerations, we introduce ROUNDTABLE POLICY, an inference-time framework that formalizes deliberation among multiple LLMs into a principled process for trustworthy scientific reasoning and narrative generation (Figure 1). In our approach, diverse models first propose candidate responses, which are then jointly evaluated to record their performances. These evaluations are distilled into a confidence-weight table that encodes both historical reliability and uncertainty for each candidate across tasks and dimensions. At inference, this confidence-weight table guides a fusion process that integrates the diverse responses into a single consensus answer—balancing factual accuracy with narrative coherence while preserving transparency in how the decision is reached. As illustrated in Figure 1, even on a scientific question such as explaining why nucleation accelerates at greater undercooling while growth dominates at smaller undercooling, individual models provide partial or inconsistent accounts. The roundtable process fuses these

perspectives into a coherent explanation, showing how consensus-driven reasoning can elevate fragmented insights into a more complete scientific narrative.

We evaluate `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` in two complementary scientific regimes. In the *MultiTask* setting, heterogeneous problems from geoscience, biology, mathematics, and materials science are solved simultaneously, testing cross-domain reasoning. In the *SingleTask* setting, models generate structured scientific proposals, testing long-form narrative construction. Across both, our findings show that `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` consistently improves factual reliability, reasoning quality, and narrative coherence, yielding an average **13.01% improvement in MultiTask** and **11.04% improvement in SingleTask** compared to individual models.

Unlike ensemble-style methods such as majority voting, which treat all models equally, our approach adaptively weights models based on demonstrated reliability. And in contrast to debate-style frameworks, whose convergence dynamics are opaque, `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` produces explicit, auditable signals that make the aggregation process transparent. This combination of principled weighting and interpretability distinguishes our method as a scalable and accountable alternative for multi-model scientific reasoning.

In summary, our contributions are threefold: (i) we propose `ROUNDTABLE POLICY`, an inference-time framework for performance-weighted consensus aggregation among multiple LLMs; (ii) we demonstrate that this approach enhances both factual reasoning and scientific narrative across heterogeneous tasks; and (iii) we release a graduate-level materials science benchmark derived from UCLA PhD qualifying exams, which serves as a rigorous, domain-authentic testbed and complements existing evaluations of scientific LLMs. More broadly, the principles underlying `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` apply across multi-model scientific workflows, offering an interpretable and generalizable path toward AI-assisted reasoning and communication in science.

2 METHODOLOGY

This section formalizes the `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` framework. We begin with the intuition behind the `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` and then present the task settings and notation (a complete list of symbols is provided in Appendix §A). We next describe how the confidence-weight table is learned from repeated interactions between players and graders, and how it subsequently guides inference through consensus-weighted fusion.

2.1 DESIGN INTUITIONS BEHIND `ROUNDTABLE POLICY`

Scientific decision-making rarely relies on a single voice. In research committees, for example, each member independently evaluates a proposal, but the final judgment is not determined by a simple vote. Instead, reviewers’ assessments are weighed by domain expertise, reliability, and the clarity of justification before being synthesized into a collective decision. This process balances agreement with accountability, ensuring that the outcome is both credible and transparent.

`ROUNDTABLE POLICY` draws on the same principle. Rather than treating LLMs as isolated predictors, we view them as members of a committee. A set of *players* propose candidate responses informed by diverse inductive biases. These are evaluated by an ensemble of *graders*, whose rubric-based assessments provide explicit signals of quality and uncertainty. Finally, a structured *fusion step* aggregates these evaluations into a single consensus output—analogue to how a committee chair synthesizes diverse reviews into a reasoned decision.

This design is further motivated by the perspective of *The Society of Mind* (Minsky, 1988), which frames intelligence as the coordination of many specialized, relatively simple agents. By embracing this philosophy, `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` transforms the inherent diversity of LLMs into a strength, enabling collective reasoning that is both interpretable and robust.

2.2 TASK SETTINGS

We evaluate `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` in two complementary scientific regimes that mirror the dual demands of scientific reasoning: solving pointwise problems and constructing coherent narratives.

MultiTask. Models are simultaneously queried with nine heterogeneous scientific questions spanning geoscience, biology, mathematics, and materials science (with six distinct sub-categories). Task formats include multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank, and short-answer questions. Intuitively, this set-

ting resembles a written exam with diverse problem types—success requires breadth of expertise rather than mastery of a single domain.

SingleTask. Models are prompted to generate structured scientific proposals following a standardized three-paragraph template with sections for *Background*, *Methodology*, and *Impact*. This setting captures the narrative aspect of scientific work: beyond producing isolated facts, one must weave them into a logically consistent and persuasive storyline.

Across both regimes, we deploy L_p pretrained LLMs (*players*) to generate candidate responses and L_g LLMs (*graders*) to form the AI Committee. Just as in a real committee, players provide diverse answers while graders act as evaluators who judge each contribution against shared standards. In MultiTask, graders jointly evaluate the $L_p \times N$ responses per round, analogous to examiners scoring a large pool of student answers. In SingleTask, graders assess proposals paragraph-by-paragraph along three rubric dimensions—creativity, scientific rigor, and logical coherence—reflecting the multifaceted criteria by which scientific proposals are judged.

Each evaluation yields a trust weight with two components: (i) a quality score in $[-100, 100]$, where negative values indicate incorrect or misleading responses, and (ii) a calibrated 95% confidence interval representing grader certainty. Together, these form the equivalent of both a “grade” and a measure of “grading confidence,” ensuring that downstream decisions reflect not only evaluation outcomes but also their reliability. Notation follows Appendix §A A_i^P denotes the i -th player agent, A_l^G the l -th grader, and A^F the fusion agent. Player responses r_i^j and grader scores (s_l^j, u_l^j) are indexed by round j .

2.3 LEARNING THE CONFIDENCE-WEIGHT TABLE

Algorithm 1 ROUNDTABLE POLICY: Unified Training and Inference

Require: Dataset \mathcal{D} , L_p players, L_g graders, fusion agent A^F , rounds R

- 1: Initialize confidence-weight table $\vartheta \leftarrow 0$
- 2: **for** $j = 1$ to R **do**
- 3: Sample query q^j (with key k^j if MultiTask)
- 4: Players generate responses $r_i^j \leftarrow A_i^P(q^j)$, collect $r^j = \{r_i^j\}$
- 5: **if** Inference **then**
- 6: $r^j \leftarrow A^F(r^j, \vartheta)$ ▷ Consensus fusion
- 7: **end if**
- 8: Graders evaluate r^j : $(s_l^j, u_l^j) \leftarrow A_l^G(q^j, r^j, k^j)$
- 9: Aggregate $(s^j, u^j) \leftarrow \frac{1}{L_g} \sum_l (s_l^j, u_l^j)$
- 10: **end for**
- 11: Update ϑ using cumulative (s^j, u^j) for each player
- 12: **return** ϑ

The confidence-weight table $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{L_p \times N}$ serves as a structured memory of each player’s historical reliability across subtasks (MultiTask) or rubric dimensions (SingleTask). Unlike fine-tuning approaches, ROUNDTABLE POLICY does not alter the parameters of the underlying LLMs. Instead, ϑ is iteratively updated from repeated rounds of evaluation, much like how a committee gradually learns which members are most reliable in which topics.

At round j , a query q^j is sampled from the task dataset. Players generate responses $r_i^j = A_i^P(q^j)$, which are pooled into r^j . Graders then evaluate these responses, producing (s_l^j, u_l^j) , which are averaged across L_g graders to yield (s^j, u^j) . After R rounds, the cumulative evaluations are distilled into:

$$\vartheta_{i,n} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^R s_{i,n}^j, \sum_{j=1}^R u_{i,n}^j \right), \tag{1}$$

capturing both the estimated quality and the associated uncertainty of each player. Intuitively, this table plays the role of a “track record” or “reputation system” for each player, ensuring that strong but inconsistent voices are weighted differently from consistently reliable ones. This design calibrates the committee’s trust in different players without retraining them, enabling adaptability and efficiency.

2.4 INFERENCE WITH THE CONFIDENCE-WEIGHT TABLE

Once ϑ has been learned, it guides consensus fusion at inference. Given a new query q , each player generates a response $r_i = A_i^P(q)$. The collection $r = \{r_1, \dots, r_{L_p}\}$ is passed to the fusion process A^F , which aggregates them using the pretrained $\vartheta^{\text{pretrained}}$:

$$\tilde{r} = A^F(r, \vartheta^{\text{pretrained}}). \quad (2)$$

Here, ϑ ensures that expertise is applied where it matters most. In MultiTask, it emphasizes domain-specific reliability (e.g., assigning higher weights to players consistently strong in mathematics). In SingleTask, it captures stylistic and analytical strengths across rubric dimensions, reflecting how different voices contribute to different aspects of a proposal.

The fusion process itself is not fine-tuned; it acts as an orchestrator that conditions on ϑ to produce a consensus answer. This mimics how a committee chair integrates both the content and credibility of reviewers before issuing a final recommendation. Optionally, the AI Committee can re-evaluate \tilde{r} to assign a quality score and confidence interval, preserving interpretability and accountability throughout the process.

3 EXPERIMENTS

We design experiments to systematically evaluate the effectiveness and robustness of the proposed ROUNDTABLE POLICY. Our analysis is guided by the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** To what extent does ROUNDTABLE POLICY enhance scientific reasoning and writing performance relative to individual LLMs? (see §3.1)
- **RQ2:** How stable and robust is ROUNDTABLE POLICY over long-run evaluation regimes, and does it consistently provide more reliable performance? (see §3.2)
- **RQ3:** To what degree do AI graders introduce bias, and can the AI Committee mitigate these biases to achieve greater inter-grader consistency? (see §3.3)

3.1 PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT (RQ1)

To answer **RQ1**, we compare ROUNDTABLE POLICY (RT) against individual LLM baselines across both MultiTask and SingleTask settings. Table 1 summarizes overall performance, while Figures 2a–2b visualize relative gains. This correspondence between player ID and model follows Table 3. The correspondence of subtasks of MultiTask and task IDs follows Table 4.

Quantitative Analysis. In the MultiTask regime, RT delivers a 13.01% average lift, outperforming 8 out of 9 single-model baselines. The only exception is Task 9 (Bio.), where Qwen-plus (51.64 ± 6.57) and GPT-4o (51.53 ± 6.64) slightly exceed RT (47.55 ± 7.02). Beyond accuracy, RT reduces uncertainty; for instance, on Task 7 (Math) the confidence interval contracts to ± 1.01 compared with baselines’ ± 1.70 – 2.68 . Figure 2a further shows per-player improvements. Gains are broadly positive on Tasks 1–8, with especially large margins on reasoning-intensive subtasks—for example, +90.5% over Gemini-2.0 on Task 7. Smaller improvements occur when a single model already aligns closely with ground truth, while Task 9 shows marginal or negative differences—consistent with its per-task averages. Appendix §D.1 confirms that weaker players (e.g., Gemini-2.0) enjoy the largest lifts, while stronger models exhibit limited headroom.


In the SingleTask regime, which evaluates structured scientific proposal writing, RT achieves the best performance in all nine rubric cells, explaining the observed 11.04% average lift. Each proposal comprises three sections—Background, Methodology, and Impact—scored across Creativity, Scientific Rigor, and Logical Coherence. Scores cluster tightly around 90–91% with narrow confidence intervals (typically ± 3.1 – 3.9). Gains concentrate in the Impact section, particularly Scientific Rigor, as shown in Figure 2b. Appendix §D.2 reveals positive medians across most players, with right-skewed tails indicating that even when consensus does not outperform the strongest model, it still elevates weaker drafts significantly.

Qualitative Analysis. These results illustrate how RT acts like a committee process rather than a flat average. In MultiTask, the confidence-weight table down-weights unreliable contributions and amplifies complementary strengths, thereby “rescuing” weaker players without diluting strong

Table 1: **Benchmark performance of individual LLMs versus ROUNDTABLE POLICY (RP)**. Top: accuracy on nine heterogeneous scientific tasks in the *MultiTask*. Bottom: rubric-based scores on scientific proposal writing in the *SingleTask*. Red marks the overall best result while blue the second best.

Setting	Model	Material Science Dataset					Others			
		Mech. 1 \uparrow	Mech. 2 \uparrow	EE \uparrow	Opt. \uparrow	Thermo. \uparrow	Semi. \uparrow	Math \uparrow	Geo. \uparrow	Bio. \uparrow
MultiTask	GPT-4o	85.89 ± 4.27	78.26 ± 5.37	87.71 ± 4.11	74.59 ± 5.49	85.14 ± 4.40	85.58 ± 4.60	87.81 ± 2.13	83.55 ± 2.20	51.53 ± 6.64
	Grok-2	83.92 ± 4.07	76.24 ± 4.96	85.61 ± 3.92	76.18 ± 4.99	82.02 ± 4.10	82.63 ± 4.39	88.84 ± 1.70	77.39 ± 2.28	51.31 ± 6.25
	Claude-3.5H	82.07 ± 4.65	71.20 ± 6.04	84.72 ± 4.37	71.49 ± 5.83	77.74 ± 5.03	77.95 ± 5.22	81.19 ± 2.58	73.68 ± 2.58	48.52 ± 6.75
	GPT-4.5p	72.86 ± 6.77	71.46 ± 6.96	76.67 ± 6.12	72.78 ± 6.36	77.18 ± 5.71	77.68 ± 6.17	82.50 ± 2.68	82.59 ± 2.08	50.63 ± 6.89
	DeepSeek-chat	77.63 ± 5.35	72.02 ± 6.14	81.53 ± 4.97	72.96 ± 5.79	79.64 ± 4.87	79.81 ± 5.23	72.23 ± 3.16	78.05 ± 2.41	47.83 ± 6.57
	Claude-3.7S	77.43 ± 3.46	70.51 ± 4.05	79.24 ± 3.13	72.39 ± 3.70	77.41 ± 3.49	79.49 ± 3.12	62.34 ± 2.93	72.56 ± 1.97	47.76 ± 5.36
	Llama-3.3	72.14 ± 5.96	63.86 ± 6.95	75.33 ± 5.55	67.13 ± 6.30	71.23 ± 5.71	73.87 ± 5.72	87.43 ± 1.93	72.77 ± 2.49	48.64 ± 6.54
	Qwen-Plus	80.32 ± 5.01	72.36 ± 6.03	82.97 ± 4.71	73.42 ± 5.66	81.49 ± 4.70	81.18 ± 4.93	86.99 ± 2.08	76.27 ± 2.48	51.64 ± 6.57
	Gemini-2.0	67.26 ± 7.61	61.61 ± 8.09	74.96 ± 6.58	65.73 ± 7.31	70.72 ± 6.68	71.60 ± 6.99	49.77 ± 4.79	75.17 ± 2.58	42.11 ± 7.31
RP	87.64 ± 4.26	81.50 ± 5.36	89.99 ± 4.00	81.29 ± 4.96	86.55 ± 4.09	91.82 ± 4.34	94.80 ± 1.01	85.33 ± 1.63	47.55 ± 7.02	

Setting	Model	Background			Methodology			Impact		
		Crea. \uparrow	Sci. Rig. \uparrow	Log. Coh. \uparrow	Crea. \uparrow	Sci. Rig. \uparrow	Log. Coh. \uparrow	Crea. \uparrow	Sci. Rig. \uparrow	Log. Coh. \uparrow
SingleTask	GPT-4o	70.99 ± 5.01	74.73 ± 4.68	82.75 ± 3.76	75.49 ± 5.23	74.81 ± 5.03	79.63 ± 4.31	72.15 ± 5.19	70.53 ± 5.25	79.64 ± 4.19
	GPT-o3	84.07 ± 3.98	84.25 ± 3.82	86.46 ± 3.42	85.92 ± 3.95	86.70 ± 3.56	85.84 ± 3.56	83.90 ± 4.15	81.52 ± 4.25	84.86 ± 3.69
	GPT-4.1	76.96 ± 4.62	81.37 ± 4.16	86.19 ± 3.51	81.65 ± 4.67	83.19 ± 4.19	84.75 ± 3.85	78.81 ± 4.74	77.91 ± 4.67	83.90 ± 3.88
	GPT-4.1n	77.39 ± 4.55	80.94 ± 4.15	85.59 ± 3.53	80.48 ± 4.69	82.30 ± 4.19	83.97 ± 3.85	77.97 ± 4.74	77.22 ± 4.65	82.94 ± 3.90
	GPT-o3-m	82.65 ± 4.16	84.78 ± 3.83	87.26 ± 3.36	83.13 ± 4.35	86.86 ± 3.53	86.44 ± 3.53	81.50 ± 4.40	81.82 ± 4.23	85.15 ± 3.67
	GPT-4o-m	72.78 ± 4.94	74.64 ± 4.70	82.19 ± 3.80	75.44 ± 5.16	76.18 ± 4.85	79.81 ± 4.23	72.78 ± 5.18	70.69 ± 5.24	78.82 ± 4.25
	Grok-3	78.50 ± 5.10	79.10 ± 4.50	85.50 ± 3.64	80.96 ± 4.75	81.26 ± 4.47	83.58 ± 3.99	78.81 ± 4.78	76.34 ± 4.93	83.04 ± 4.01
	Claude-3.7S	82.47 ± 4.22	84.73 ± 3.92	88.17 ± 3.28	85.52 ± 4.20	86.65 ± 3.79	86.89 ± 3.57	84.53 ± 4.22	82.13 ± 4.38	86.41 ± 3.59
	DeepSeek-chat	84.05 ± 4.20	83.74 ± 4.12	88.28 ± 3.19	84.21 ± 4.31	84.58 ± 4.13	86.08 ± 3.58	83.68 ± 4.23	81.56 ± 4.48	86.50 ± 3.46
RP	90.25 ± 3.95	89.95 ± 3.78	91.04 ± 3.09	90.39 ± 3.91	91.28 ± 3.35	91.18 ± 3.20	90.15 ± 3.95	89.86 ± 3.95	90.99 ± 3.26	



(a) Relative gains(%) in the *MultiTask*.

(b) Relative gains(%) in the *SingleTask*.

Figure 2: **Performance improvement by ROUNDTABLE POLICY.**

ones. This mirrors how, in a committee, flawed proposals can still contribute useful fragments when evaluated critically. The large gains on reasoning-heavy tasks (e.g., Tasks 6–7) highlight how diverse error patterns across models can be combined into substantially stronger reasoning chains.

In *SingleTask* writing, weaker players show the most pronounced gains in Impact and Methodology. For instance, GPT-4o exhibits long right tails in Impact–Scientific Rigor and Impact–Logical Coherence, while GPT-o3 shows consistently positive medians with bounded variance. Even strong base-lines such as DS-chat rarely degrade under RT, suggesting that consensus seldom harms high-quality drafts but frequently elevates weaker ones. Mechanistically, the confidence-weight table enforces rubric-aware, non-redundant fusion: systematically weak contributors are down-weighted, while demonstrated strengths are amplified. The pattern resembles how peer reviewers specialize—some

focusing on methodology, others on impact—and the editor synthesizes these perspectives into a well-rounded final decision.

3.2 LONG-RUN STABILITY AND ROBUSTNESS (RQ2)

Table 2: **Aggregate Wilcoxon test results** Rows show RT’s mean percentage gain over each baseline across all rubrics and rounds, with standard deviation and one-sided p -value. # stands for the number of graded scores. ✓ marks significance at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Setting	Player ID	LLM	#	Mean Gain (%)	Std (%)	p-value↓	Significance
MultiTask	001	GPT-4o	36000	6.476865	77.280369	0.0	✓
	002	Grok-2	36000	5.254293	78.231667	1.0×10^{-247}	✓
	003	Claude-3.5Haiku	36000	17.251754	101.839946	0.0	✓
	004	GPT-4.5-preview	36000	18.552776	94.463211	0.0	✓
	005	Deepseek-Chat	36000	16.048551	96.935292	0.0	✓
	006	Claude-3.7Sonnet	36000	13.732040	121.321577	4.4×10^{-47}	✓
	007	Llama-3.3	36000	24.988341	123.678543	0.0	✓
	008	Qwen-plus	36000	12.586367	91.751670	0.0	✓
	009	Gemini-2.0	36000	46.474125	145.071773	0.0	✓
SingleTask	001	GPT-4o	36000	27.087781	40.303119	0.0	✓
	002	GPT-o3	36000	13.316247	148.785675	0.0	✓
	003	GPT-4.1	36000	15.107889	73.600957	0.0	✓
	004	GPT-4.1-nano	36000	15.805949	28.188351	0.0	✓
	005	GPT-o3-mini	36000	9.687830	21.760829	0.0	✓
	006	GPT-4o-mini	36000	27.206693	42.707340	0.0	✓
	007	Grok-3	36000	16.485277	29.024328	0.0	✓
	008	Claude-3.7Sonnet	36000	7.761157	16.993190	0.0	✓
	009	Deepseek-Chat	36000	7.165863	7.474061	0.0	✓

To answer **RQ2**, we test whether RT’s gains remain statistically reliable over long-run evaluations. Using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test (§A.2) on round-level paired differences, RT consistently outperforms all baselines. As shown in Table 2, across all 18 models RT achieves significant improvements at $\alpha = 0.05$, with p -values typically below 10^{-40} .

Quantitative Analysis. In the MultiTask regime, RT consistently outperforms baselines with mean percentage gains ranging from +5.3% (Grok-2) to +46.5% (Gemini-2.0). Even strong players such as GPT-4o (+6.5%) and Claude-3.7Sonnet (+13.7%) see reliable gains, highlighting that consensus remains beneficial even when individual agents are already competitive. The large improvement over Gemini-2.0 illustrates how RT effectively leverages complementary strengths to elevate weaker contributors, rather than letting them dilute overall performance.

In the SingleTask regime, RT delivers significant lifts across all nine baselines, with mean improvements from +7.2% (Deepseek-Chat) to +27.2% (GPT-4o-mini). Notably, gains are especially pronounced for smaller or lighter-weight models (e.g., GPT-4o-mini, GPT-4o), suggesting that RT acts as a stabilizing mechanism that brings their drafts closer to the quality of stronger models. Even against advanced systems like GPT-o3 and Claude-3.7Sonnet, improvements remain consistently positive, confirming robustness across a wide range of capability levels.

Qualitative Analysis. Beyond statistical significance, the long-run results highlight important qualitative patterns. In the MultiTask regime, RT’s robustness stems from its ability to repeatedly exploit complementary error profiles: weaker players such as Gemini-2.0 or Llama-3.3 often fail in different ways, but when their contributions are weighted through the confidence table, the ensemble consistently extracts correct elements while suppressing noise. This is reflected in the large variance reported in Table 2—although individual rounds fluctuate, the aggregated effect over thousands of rounds converges to stable gains. In committee terms, even if certain members are unreliable in a given discussion, their occasional correct insights are preserved while systematic mistakes are filtered out, ensuring dependable group performance.

In the SingleTask regime, stability is most visible at the rubric level. Analytical dimensions such as Impact–Scientific Rigor show the largest sustained gains, whereas stylistic traits (e.g., Creativity or Logical Coherence) improve more modestly. This asymmetry suggests that RT is especially effective




Figure 3: **Bias and consistency of AI graders.** The outer line plots show the rank distributions assigned by four independent arbitrators, while the inset heatmaps display their pairwise inter-grader agreement measured by Kendall’s Tau.

in consolidating rigorous, reasoning-heavy contributions—akin to how editors place greater weight on technical soundness than on stylistic flair when synthesizing reviewer reports. Importantly, the consistency of improvements across tens of thousands of rounds demonstrates that RT does not rely on one-off synergies, but instead behaves like a well-tuned review board: repeatedly integrating diverse perspectives into a balanced and accountable consensus.

3.3 BIAS AND CONSISTENCY OF AI GRADERS (RQ3)

To address **RQ3**, we examine grader bias and inter-grader consistency through two complementary lenses: (i) the distribution of ranks assigned to RT by different graders, and (ii) pairwise agreement measured by Kendall’s Tau (see §A.3). Aggregated results are shown in Figure 3, with task- and dimension-level breakdowns provided in Figures 14 and 13 in §D.3.

Quantitative Analysis. Figure 3 highlights a clear distinction between MultiTask and SingleTask regimes. In MultiTask, the aggregated rank distribution is steep and concentrated in the top three positions, with RT frequently ranked first. Correspondingly, Kendall’s Tau values are consistently high ($\tau = 0.64\text{--}0.72$), reflecting strong alignment among graders. Task-level inspection (Figures 14, 13) confirms this pattern: Tasks 001–006 exhibit overlapping distributions, Tasks 007–008 achieve near-perfect consensus ($\tau > 0.85$), while Task 009 shows the weakest agreement ($\tau \approx 0.49\text{--}0.59$) as some graders disperse RT’s rank across mid-range positions.

In SingleTask, however, the aggregated rank distribution is flatter and more dispersed, and Kendall’s Tau values drop markedly ($\tau = 0.15\text{--}0.25$ on average). Creativity-related dimensions (e.g., Background–Creativity, Methodology–Creativity) place RT near the top but with substantial grader variability. Logical coherence dimensions show the lowest alignment, with Tau values as low as $\tau \approx 0.07\text{--}0.14$, indicating inconsistent judgments. By contrast, Impact–Scientific Rigor yields the strongest agreement, with RT concentrated near rank 1 and Tau values of $\tau \approx 0.23\text{--}0.34$. Together, these results demonstrate that graders achieve high consensus in objective, structured tasks but diverge significantly when assessing subjective, open-ended proposals.

Qualitative Analysis. These results reveal that bias is minimal in structured MultiTask settings, where evaluation criteria are well defined, but more pronounced in open-ended SingleTask writing, where subjective interpretation shapes grading. This mirrors human peer review: reviewers evaluating technical correctness tend to agree, while judgments about creativity or style diverge. Crucially, the AI Committee mitigates such variability by aggregating across graders, reducing the impact of individual biases. In practice, this means RT functions like an editorial board: even when reviewers disagree, their collective judgment yields a more balanced and reliable outcome.

4 ABLATION STUDY

To disentangle the contributions of our design choices and validate their scientific relevance, we conduct two ablation studies. These analyses illustrate how ROUNDTABLE POLICY strengthens

structured reasoning and improves narrative quality by highlighting what is gained—and what is lost—when key components are removed.




Figure 4: **Policy Ablation.** Comparison of Roundtable Policy (RT) with Best-Single-Model Policy.

Policy Ablation. We first compare RT with a Best-Single-Model Policy (BSMP), which simply selects the response from the single model with the highest confidence weight rather than synthesizing across multiple players. Conceptually, BSMP resembles a committee that crowns one “top performer” and ignores all other voices. The results in Figure 4 make clear why this approach falls short: across both MultiTask and SingleTask settings, RT consistently outperforms BSMP. In MultiTask, the advantages are particularly evident in reasoning-heavy domains such as mathematics and mechanics, where drawing on complementary perspectives yields large gains. In SingleTask proposal writing, consensus fusion not only raises average scores across all rubric dimensions but also reduces variance, producing outputs that are both stronger and more consistent. These findings highlight that scientific progress rarely emerges from a single dominant voice; it is the synthesis of multiple viewpoints that produces reliable reasoning and coherent narrative.




Figure 5: **Rounds Ablation.** Effect of the rounds used to build the confidence-weight table.

Rounds Ablation. We next examine the impact of the number of training rounds used to construct the confidence-weight table. Here, the table plays the role of institutional memory—accumulating evidence about which players are dependable under different conditions. As shown in Figure 5, the effect of this memory differs by task type. In MultiTask, where benchmarks span diverse scientific domains, performance steadily improves as more rounds are incorporated and stabilizes only after hundreds of evaluations. By contrast, SingleTask writing converges much more quickly: fewer than 100 rounds already suffice to surpass baselines, with further rounds offering only modest additional benefit. This divergence reflects a natural distinction: heterogeneous domains require extensive calibration to build trust across disciplines, whereas rubric-based writing tasks benefit from faster stabilization since evaluative criteria are more homogeneous.

Summary. These ablations underscore two core insights: First, weighted consensus is fundamentally more powerful than relying on a single “best” model, as robust science arises from collective deliberation rather than solitary voices. Second, the effectiveness of the confidence-weight table

depends on task structure: structured MultiTask settings demand long-run calibration, while open-ended SingleTask writing achieves stability with much less historical data. Together, these findings reinforce that consensus-driven fusion is not only effective but also principled—mirroring how real scientific communities build reliable knowledge through collective judgment.

5 RELATED WORK

LLMs for Scientific Discovery. Large language models (LLMs) have rapidly expanded the scope of data-driven science, from AlphaFold’s breakthroughs in structural biology (Jumper et al., 2021) to recent applications across mathematics (Yue et al., 2024), chemistry (Yu et al., 2024), biology (Labrak et al., 2024), and geography (Li et al., 2023). Their strength lies in structured reasoning and seamless integration with external tools, enabling automated workflows (Cao, 2017). Yet, complex multi-step reasoning often requires specialized prompting, tool-augmented inference, or fine-tuning, motivating the rise of agentic systems that combine reasoning with external solvers and databases (Boiko et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2024).

Reasoning and Factuality in Language Models. Improving reasoning and factuality in LLMs has been studied extensively. Reasoning can be enhanced through prompting methods such as scratchpads (Nye & et al., 2021), chain-of-thought demonstrations (Wei et al., 2022; Kojima et al., 2022; Reynolds & McDonell, 2021), verification and self-consistency (Cobbe et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022), and reflection (Shinn et al., 2023; Madaan & et al., 2023), as well as fine-tuning approaches (Rajani et al., 2019; Zelikman et al., 2022; Lewkowycz et al., 2022). Factuality, in turn, has been strengthened through RLHF (Christiano et al., 2017; Ziegler & et al., 2019; Ouyang et al., 2022), dataset curation (Lee & et al., 2022), retrieval-based augmentation (Guu et al., 2020), and likelihood-based calibration (Kadavath & et al., 2022).

Multi-Agent and Ensemble Approaches. Beyond single-model prompting, researchers have explored ensemble and multi-agent strategies to enhance reliability. Early work shows that self-consistency (Wang et al., 2022) and majority voting (Li et al., 2022; Cobbe et al., 2021; Thoppilan et al., 2022) can mitigate errors by aggregating diverse reasoning chains. Building on this, multi-agent debate frameworks (Irving et al., 2018; Du & et al., 2023; Madaan & et al., 2023) and collaborative dialogue methods (Chan & et al., 2023; Wang & et al., 2023) let models iteratively critique and refine one another’s outputs. Related lines of work also investigate compositional generation, combining outputs from multiple models (Du et al., 2020; Liu & et al., 2022; Alayrac & et al., 2022; Zeng & et al., 2022). While these methods demonstrate the value of collective intelligence, they often rely on flat aggregation or emergent convergence. In contrast, our approach introduces a structured consensus mechanism that explicitly weights models by demonstrated reliability, producing interpretable and auditable signals of trust.

Benchmarks for LLM-Based Agents. Evaluating agentic LLMs has inspired benchmarks ranging from synthetic tool-use tasks (e.g., TaskBench (Shen et al., 2024)) to domain-specific challenges such as SWE-Bench (Jimenez et al., 2024), BioCoder-Py (Tang et al., 2024), and MLAgentBench (Huang et al., 2024). More recently, datasets sourced from scientific literature (Majumder et al., 2024) aim to capture authentic workflows. Our work complements these efforts by introducing a domain-authentic benchmark in materials science that stresses both mechanistic understanding and property prediction, thereby testing agents under both interpretative and predictive dimensions.

Machine Learning and Agents for Materials Science. Machine learning has already transformed materials science by enabling scalable property prediction, compound discovery, and structure–property analysis (Jain et al., 2013; Butler et al., 2018), with advances in reinforcement learning for inverse design (Segler et al., 2018), generative modeling (Granda et al., 2018), and multi-modal integration of simulations and experiments (Pyzer-Knapp et al., 2022). These developments reduce experimental costs and provide interpretable insights, but LLM-based agents remain relatively underexplored in this domain. The inherent complexity of materials science—multiscale interactions, vast compositional spaces, and intricate synthesis pipelines—calls for agent frameworks that unify predictive modeling with experimental feedback. Early systems in autonomous discovery (Gregoire et al., 2023; Maurizi et al., 2024) show promise, but important gaps remain in linking reasoning, planning, and uncertainty quantification. Our work positions materials science as a natural testbed for stress-testing multi-agent reasoning frameworks such as ROUNDTABLE POLICY, bridging structured evaluation and open-ended scientific narrative.

6 CONCLUSION & FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We presented the `ROUNDTABLE POLICY`, a inference-time reasoning framework that fuses outputs from multiple LLMs through confidence-weighted aggregation without finetuning base models. Unlike single-model prompting or naive ensemble methods such as majority voting, our approach does not treat all models equally nor rely on opaque emergent convergence, as in debate-style methods. Instead, it introduces a principled mechanism that explicitly encodes historical reliability and uncertainty, producing consensus answers that are not only more accurate but also transparent and auditable. Across structured *MultiTask* benchmarks and open-ended *SingleTask* proposal writing, we showed that `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` consistently improves factual reliability, reasoning consistency, and narrative coherence, highlighting its value as a trustworthy tool for scientific reasoning.

Looking forward, several avenues can extend this framework. First, *adaptive arbitrator strategies* could allow the confidence-weight table to evolve dynamically with task complexity, reallocating trust in real time. Second, coupling the fusion process with *reinforcement learning* and human or experimental feedback may enable autonomous optimization of weight assignments through trial and error. Third, incorporating richer feedback signals—such as calibrated uncertainty, tool-augmented checks, or domain-specific rubrics—could further strengthen robustness in complex scientific workflows.

More broadly, the principles underlying `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` generalize beyond the settings studied here. By tailoring consensus mechanisms to domain-specific evaluation criteria, the framework can support applications ranging from drug discovery and computational chemistry to astrophysics and other data-intensive sciences. In this sense, `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` is not merely another ensemble method, but a scalable and interpretable paradigm for collective intelligence in LLMs—one that advances the rigor, reliability, and accountability of AI-assisted scientific discovery.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Our method significantly enhances the performance of sequential model editing, making it invaluable for updating and managing knowledge in real-world applications. While the ability to directly modify stored knowledge introduces potential risks, such as the introduction of false or harmful information, we strongly urge researchers to implement strict validation and oversight to ensure the ethical use of these techniques. Nevertheless, the original goal of model editing is positive, aiming to facilitate efficient updates of large models in the future. Therefore, we encourage researchers to leverage this technology responsibly and with care.

REPRODUCIBILITY

To ensure the reproducibility of our findings, detailed implementation instructions for `ROUNDTABLE POLICY` can be found in Appendix. Additionally, the source code is publicly available at <https://ai4scidisc.github.io/roundtable/>. These measures are intended to facilitate the verification and replication of our results by other researchers in the field.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We gratefully acknowledge the [MIT SuperCloud](#) and [Texas Advanced Computing Center \(TACC\)](#) at The University of Texas at Austin for providing computational resources that have contributed to the research results reported within this paper. JL acknowledges support by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under Agreement No. HR00112490369. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the funding entities.

REFERENCES

- DeepSeek AI. Deepseek-chat model card. <https://deepseek.com>, 2024.
- Meta AI. Llama 3.3 technical report. <https://ai.meta.com>, 2025.

- Jean-Baptiste Alayrac and et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Anthropic. Claude 3.5 release notes. <https://www.anthropic.com>, 2024.
- Anthropic. Claude 3.7 sonnet release notes. <https://www.anthropic.com>, 2025.
- Daniil A. Boiko, Robert MacKnight, Ben Kline, and Gabe Gomes. Autonomous chemical research with large language models. *Nature*, 624:570–578, 2023.
- Keith T. Butler, Daniel W. Davies, Hugh Cartwright, Olexandr Isayev, and Aron Walsh. Machine learning for molecular and materials science. *Nature*, 559(7715):547–555, 2018.
- Longbing Cao. Data science: A comprehensive overview. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 50(3), jun 2017. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3076253. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3076253>.
- Chun Chan and et al. Chateval: Towards better llm-based dialogue evaluation via multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01783*, 2023.
- Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom B. Brown, and et al. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mikhail Momozawa, and et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021. Introduces GSM8K.
- Google DeepMind. Gemini 2.0 technical report. <https://deepmind.google>, 2024.
- Yilun Du and et al. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14320*, 2023.
- Yilun Du, Igor Mordatch, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. Compositional visual generation with composable diffusion models. In *NeurIPS Workshop on Deep Generative Models*, 2020.
- Alireza Ghafarollahi and Markus J. Buehler. Sciagents: Automating scientific discovery through multi-agent intelligent graph reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.05556*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2409.05556. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.05556>. Submitted 9 September 2024.
- Jarosław M. Granda, Liva Donina, Vincenza Dragone, De-Liang Long, and Leroy Cronin. Controlling an organic synthesis robot with machine learning to search for new reactivity. *Nature*, 559:377–381, 2018. doi: 10.1038/s41586-018-0307-8. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0307-8>.
- John M. Gregoire, Lan Zhou, and Joel A. Haber. Combinatorial synthesis for ai-driven materials discovery. *Nature Synthesis*, 2:493–504, 2023. doi: 10.1038/s44160-023-00251-4. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s44160-023-00251-4>.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. Realm: Retrieval-augmented language model pre-training. In *ICML*, 2020.
- Qian Huang, Jian Vora, Percy Liang, and Jure Leskovec. MAgentbench: Evaluating language agents on machine learning experimentation. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=1F5s1LvjYQW>.
- Geoffrey Irving, Paul Christiano, and Dario Amodei. Ai safety via debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.00899*, 2018.
- Anubhav Jain, Shyue Ping Ong, Geoffroy Hautier, Wei Chen, William D. Richards, Stefan Dacek, Shreyas Cholia, Dan Gunter, David Skinner, Gerbrand Ceder, and Kristin Persson. The materials project: A materials genome approach to accelerating materials innovation. *APL Materials*, 1(1): 011002, 2013.
- Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik R Narasimhan. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VTF8yNQ66>.

- John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Žídek, Anna Potapenko, Alex Bridgland, Clemens Meyer, Simon A. A. Kohl, Andrew J. Ballard, Andrew Cowie, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Stanislav Nikolov, Rishub Jain, Jonas Adler, Trevor Back, Stig Petersen, David Reiman, Ellen Clancy, Michal Zielinski, Martin Steinegger, Michalina Pacholska, Tamas Berghammer, Sebastian Bodenstern, David Silver, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew W. Senior, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Pushmeet Kohli, and Demis Hassabis. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596:583–589, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03819-2>.
- Saurav Kadavath and et al. Language models (mostly) know what they don’t know. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221*, 2022.
- M. G. Kendall. A new measure of rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 30(1-2):81–93, 06 1938. ISSN 0006-3444. doi: 10.1093/biomet/30.1-2.81. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/30.1-2.81>.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Yanis Labrak, Adrien Bazoge, Emmanuel Morin, Pierre-Antoine Gourraud, Mickael Rouvier, and Richard Dufour. BioMistral: A collection of open-source pretrained large language models for medical domains. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pp. 5848–5864, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.348>.
- Nayeon Lee and et al. Factuality enhanced language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221*, 2022.
- Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Andreassen, David Dohan, and et al. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Yujia Li, David Choi, and et al. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097, 2022.
- Zekun Li, Wenxuan Zhou, Yao-Yi Chiang, and Muhao Chen. GeoLM: Empowering language models for geospatially grounded language understanding. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 5227–5240, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.317. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.317>.
- Nelson F. Liu and et al. Compositional generalization via neural module composition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11625*, 2022.
- Chris Lu, Cong Lu, Robert Tjarko Lange, Jakob Foerster, Jeff Clune, and David Ha. The ai scientist: Towards fully automated open-ended scientific discovery, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.06292>.
- Aman Madaan and et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17651*, 2023. Often cited as “Self-Refine”; some works shorthand as liang2023selfrefine.
- Aman Madaan and et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17651*, 2023.
- Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Harshit Surana, Dhruv Agarwal, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, Abhishek Meena, Aryan Prakhari, Tirth Vora, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, and Peter Clark. Discoverybench: Towards data-driven discovery with large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01725>.

- Marco Maurizi, Derek Xu, Yu-Tong Wang, Desheng Yao, David Hahn, Mourad Oudich, Anish Satpati, Mathieu Bauchy, Wei Wang, Yizhou Sun, Yun Jing, and Xiaoyu Rayne Zheng. Inverse designing metamaterials with programmable nonlinear functional responses in graph space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06300*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2408.06300. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.06300>.
- Marvin Minsky. *The Society of Mind*. Simon and Schuster, New York, 1988.
- Maxwell Nye and et al. Show your work: Scratchpads for intermediate computation with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00114*, 2021.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4.1 release notes. <https://openai.com>, 2023a.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4.1-nano release. <https://openai.com>, 2023b.
- OpenAI. Gpt-o1. <https://openai.com/research/gpt-o1>, 2023c. Accessed: 2025-09-11.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4.5 preview release. <https://openai.com>, 2024a.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4o system card. <https://openai.com/research/gpt-4o>, 2024b.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4o-mini release. <https://openai.com>, 2024c.
- OpenAI. Gpt-o3 release. <https://openai.com>, 2024d.
- OpenAI. Gpt-o3-mini release. <https://openai.com>, 2024e.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, and et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. Commonly cited as `ouyang2022training`.
- Edward O. Pyzer-Knapp, Jed W. Pitera, Peter W. J. Staar, Seiji Takeda, Teodoro Laino, Daniel P. Sanders, James Sexton, John R. Smith, and Alessandro Curioni. Accelerating materials discovery using artificial intelligence, high performance computing and robotics. *npj Computational Materials*, 8:84, 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41524-022-00750-7. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-022-00750-7>.
- Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Explain yourself! leveraging language models for commonsense reasoning. In *ACL*, 2019.
- Laria Reynolds and Kyle McDonell. Prompt programming for large language models: Beyond the few-shot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.07350*, 2021.
- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, et al. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04761*, 2023.
- Marwin HS Segler, Mike Preuss, and Mark P Waller. Planning chemical syntheses with deep neural networks and symbolic ai. *Nature*, 555:604–610, 2018.
- Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Wenqi Zhang, Kan Ren, Siyu Yuan, Weiming Lu, Dongsheng Li, and Yueting Zhuang. Taskbench: Benchmarking large language models for task automation. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ZUbraGNpAq>.
- Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashkan Labash, and Manuela Veloso. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11366*, 2023.
- Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Rick Gao, Jiakang Chen, Xinyun Chen, and Mark B Gerstein. BioCoder: a benchmark for bioinformatics code generation with large language models. *Bioinformatics*, 40 (Supplement_1):i266–i276, 2024. ISSN 1367-4811. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btae230. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btae230>.
- Alibaba Qwen Team. Qwen-plus model card. <https://qwen.ai>, 2024.

- Romal Thoppilan, David De Freitas, and et al. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*, 2022.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*, 2022.
- Yi Wang and et al. Large language models as autonomous agents: A survey of benchmarks and methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07124*, 2023.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chen, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- xAI. Grok-2 technical report. <https://x.ai>, 2024.
- xAI. Grok-3 technical report. <https://x.ai>, 2025.
- Botao Yu, Frazier N. Baker, Ziqi Chen, Xia Ning, and Huan Sun. LlaSMol: Advancing large language models for chemistry with a large-scale, comprehensive, high-quality instruction tuning dataset. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=1Y6XTF9tPv>.
- Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. MAMmoTH: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=yLC1Gs770I>.
- Ethan Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, and Noah D. Goodman. Star: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14465*, 2022.
- Andy Zeng and et al. Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00598*, 2022.
- Daniel M. Ziegler and et al. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*, 2019.

A NOTATION AND DEFINITIONS

A.1 SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

- \mathcal{Q} : the query space from which tasks are sampled.
- $\mathcal{D}_{\text{MultiTask}}$: dataset consisting of N subtasks with known ground truths (e.g., multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank, short-answer).
- $\mathcal{D}_{\text{SingleTask}}$: dataset of structured scientific proposal prompts without ground truth, each consisting of three required paragraphs.
- L_p : the number of *player agents* (pretrained LLMs generating candidate responses). In our experiments $L_p = 9$.
- L_g : the number of *grader agents* forming the AI Committee (evaluators of player responses). In our experiments $L_g = 4$.
- A_i^P : the i -th player agent, producing a response r_i given an input query.
- A_l^G : the l -th grader agent, producing an evaluation score and uncertainty tuple (s_l, u_l) .
- A^F : the *fusion agent*, which synthesizes a final consensus answer from all player responses using the confidence-weight table.
- q^j : the query (or query batch) at round $j \in \{1, \dots, R\}$.
- k^j : the corresponding reference answers (available only in MultiTask).
- $r_i^j = A_i^P(q^j)$: the response generated by player i in round j .
- $r^j = \bigcup_{i=1}^{L_p} r_i^j$: the pool of all responses in round j .
- (s_l^j, u_l^j) : the score and uncertainty provided by grader l for round j .
- $(s^j, u^j) = \frac{1}{L_g} \sum_{l=1}^{L_g} (s_l^j, u_l^j)$: the aggregated committee evaluation for round j .
- $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{L_p \times N}$: the *confidence-weight table*, a matrix storing trust weights for each player and subtask/rubric dimension.
- $\tilde{r}^j = A^F(r^j, \vartheta)$: the fused consensus response in round j .

Table 3: **Notation of Models.** Abbreviations, Player/Grader(also referred to as Arbitrator) IDs, release years, and citations for models used in the MultiTask and SingleTask experiments.

Setting	Player ID	Abbreviation	Full Name	Citation
MultiTask	001	GPT-4o	GPT-4o	OpenAI (2024b)
	002	Grok-2	Grok-2	xAI (2024)
	003	Claude-3.5H	Claude-3.5 Haiku	Anthropic (2024)
	004	GPT-4.5p	GPT-4.5-preview	OpenAI (2024a)
	005	DS-chat	DeepSeek-Chat	AI (2024)
	006	Claude-3.7S	Claude-3.7 Sonnet	Anthropic (2025)
	007	Llama-3.3	Llama-3.3	AI (2025)
	008	Qwen+	Qwen-plus	Team (2024)
	009	Gemini-2.0	Gemini-2.0	DeepMind (2024)
SingleTask	001	GPT-4o	GPT-4o	OpenAI (2024b)
	002	GPT-o3	GPT-o3	OpenAI (2024d)
	003	GPT-4.1	GPT-4.1	OpenAI (2023a)
	004	GPT-4.1n	GPT-4.1-nano	OpenAI (2023b)
	005	GPT-o3-m	GPT-o3-mini	OpenAI (2024e)
	006	GPT-4o-m	GPT-4o-mini	OpenAI (2024c)
	007	Grok-3	Grok-3	xAI (2025)
	008	Claude-3.7S	Claude-3.7 Sonnet	Anthropic (2025)
	009	DS-chat	DeepSeek-Chat	AI (2024)

Setting	Grader ID	Abbreviation	Full Name	Citation
MultiTask	001	GPT-4o	GPT-4o	OpenAI (2024b)
	002	GPT-4.1	GPT-4.1	OpenAI (2023a)
	003	GPT-o3	GPT-o3	OpenAI (2024d)
	004	GPT-o1	GPT-o1	OpenAI (2023c)
SingleTask	001	GPT-4o	GPT-4o	OpenAI (2024b)
	002	GPT-4.1	GPT-4.1	OpenAI (2023a)
	003	GPT-o3	GPT-o3	OpenAI (2024d)
	004	GPT-o1	GPT-o1	OpenAI (2023c)

A.2 FORMAL HYPOTHESIS TESTING FRAMEWORK FOR WILCOXON SIGNED-RANK SIGNIFICANCE VALIDITY

To rigorously assess whether the Roundtable Policy (RT) provides statistically significant improvements over individual LLM baselines, we apply the non-parametric *Wilcoxon signed-rank test* to paired, round-level performance data. This test evaluates whether the median of the differences between two matched samples significantly exceeds zero, under the null hypothesis of no improvement.

Notation. Let \mathcal{R} denote the set of evaluation rounds and $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_L\}$ be the set of L baseline players.

We define:

- $s_r^{(\text{RT})}$: score obtained by RT in round $r \in \mathcal{R}$,
- $s_r^{(p)}$: score obtained by player p in the same round,
- $g_r := \frac{s_r^{(\text{RT})} - s_r^{(p)}}{|s_r^{(p)}|} \times 100$: relative gain of RT over player p in round r (as percentage).

Hypothesis Test. We conduct the one-sided Wilcoxon signed-rank test:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \text{Median}(g_r) \leq 0 \quad (\text{no improvement}) \\ H_1 &: \text{Median}(g_r) > 0 \quad (\text{RT improves over } p) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Test Procedure. Given a sample of paired differences $\{g_r\}_{r \in \mathcal{R}}$, we perform:

1. Discard entries with $g_r = 0$.
2. Rank the absolute values: $\text{rank}(|g_r|)$.
3. Compute the signed-rank statistic:

$$W^+ = \sum_{r: g_r > 0} \text{rank}(|g_r|). \quad (4)$$

4. Using the null distribution of W^+ (or a normal approximation), we calculate a p -value.

Statistical significance is established if:

$$p < \alpha = 0.05. \quad (5)$$

Continuity Correction for Normal Approximation.

Under the null hypothesis H_0 , the test statistic W^+ approximately follows a normal distribution when the sample size n is large (typically $n \geq 20$). In this case, we compute a z -score using the continuity-corrected normal approximation:

$$z = \frac{W^+ - \frac{n(n+1)}{4} - 0.5}{\sqrt{\frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{24}}}, \quad (6)$$

where n is the number of non-zero g_r values (i.e., rounds with non-zero paired differences), and 0.5 is the continuity correction term to account for the discreteness of the rank sum distribution.

The resulting z -score is then used to compute a one-sided p -value based on the standard normal distribution. This approximation is used in our evaluation whenever n exceeds the small-sample regime ($n \geq 20$), ensuring computational efficiency without sacrificing statistical validity.

A.2.1 APPLICATION TO MULTITASK EVALUATION

In the MultiTask evaluation, each task represents a distinct skill domain (e.g., math, geoscience, mechanics). Let $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \dots, t_K\}$ be the set of $K = 9$ benchmark tasks.

For each player p and task $t_k \in \mathcal{T}$, and for each round i , we compute the percentage gain:

$$g_i^{(k)} = \frac{s_{i,t_k}^{(\text{RT})} - s_{i,t_k}^{(p)}}{|s_{i,t_k}^{(p)}|} \times 100. \quad (7)$$

We test each pair (p, t_k) independently. To assess holistic advantage, we also aggregate over tasks:

$$\mathbf{g}_{\text{agg}}^{(p)} = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \left\{ g_i^{(k)} \right\}_{i=1}^{N_k}. \quad (8)$$

We consider RT statistically superior to player p if:

- the Wilcoxon test yields $p < 0.05$ on at least 8 of 9 tasks, or
- the aggregate test on $\mathbf{g}_{\text{agg}}^{(p)}$ satisfies $p < 0.05$.

A.2.2 APPLICATION TO SINGLETASK EVALUATION

In the SingleTask evaluation, each round produces rubric-based scores over 9 dimensions $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, \dots, d_9\}$ (covering three traits for each of Background, Methodology, and Impact).

For each player p , round r , and dimension $d \in \mathcal{D}$, we compute:

$$g_r^{(d)} = \frac{s_r^{(\text{RT}),d} - s_r^{(p),d}}{|s_r^{(p),d}|} \times 100. \quad (9)$$

We conduct Wilcoxon tests:

- **Per-dimension:** for each d independently, to assess fine-grained quality improvements.
- **Aggregate-level:** pool all scores:

$$\mathbf{g}_{\text{agg}}^{(p)} = \{g_r^{(d)} : r \in \mathcal{R}, d \in \mathcal{D}\},$$

and test for overall statistical significance.

Interpretation. The MultiTask analysis evaluates whether RT consistently improves performance across structurally diverse problems and domains. The SingleTask analysis inspects RT’s advantage across nuanced dimensions of academic writing quality. In both cases, aggregate-level tests offer a robust indicator of RT’s overall statistical superiority over individual LLM baselines.

A.3 FORMAL FRAMEWORK FOR KENDALL’S TAU RANK CORRELATION ANALYSIS

To quantify the agreement between different graders’ rankings, we adopt the Kendall’s Tau rank correlation coefficient (Kendall, 1938), a non-parametric statistic that measures the ordinal association between two rankings.

Mathematical Definition. Let $\pi^{(a)} = (\pi_1^{(a)}, \dots, \pi_n^{(a)})$ and $\pi^{(b)} = (\pi_1^{(b)}, \dots, \pi_n^{(b)})$ denote the rankings of n items (players) produced by graders a and b , respectively. For each unordered pair (i, j) with $i < j$, define:

$$\text{sign}_a(i, j) = \text{sign}(\pi_i^{(a)} - \pi_j^{(a)}), \quad \text{sign}_b(i, j) = \text{sign}(\pi_i^{(b)} - \pi_j^{(b)}).$$

A pair (i, j) is called *concordant* if $\text{sign}_a(i, j) = \text{sign}_b(i, j)$ and *discordant* otherwise. Let C and D be the numbers of concordant and discordant pairs, respectively. Then Kendall’s Tau is defined as

$$\tau(a, b) = \frac{C - D}{\binom{n}{2}} \in [-1, 1].$$

Here $\tau = 1$ indicates perfect agreement, $\tau = -1$ perfect disagreement, and $\tau = 0$ statistical independence of the rankings.

Application to MultiTask. In the MultiTask setting, each task $t \in \{1, \dots, 9\}$ yields a separate ranking of player models by each grader. For every round r and task t , we compute $\tau_{r,t}(a, b)$ for all pairs of graders (a, b) using their per-round rankings of the nine players. Averaging over all rounds gives

$$\bar{\tau}_t(a, b) = \frac{1}{R_t} \sum_{r=1}^{R_t} \tau_{r,t}(a, b),$$

where R_t is the number of valid rounds for task t . This produces a 4×4 correlation matrix per task, summarizing grader consistency across domains such as mathematics, geoscience, and biology.

Application to SingleTask. In the SingleTask setting, each round produces rubric-based scores across nine dimensions $\mathcal{D} = \{\text{Background/Creativity}, \dots, \text{Impact/Logical Coherence}\}$. For each dimension $d \in \mathcal{D}$, graders generate rankings of the players, and we compute $\tau_{r,d}(a, b)$ for all pairs (a, b) . Averaging across rounds yields

$$\bar{\tau}_d(a, b) = \frac{1}{R_d} \sum_{r=1}^{R_d} \tau_{r,d}(a, b),$$

where R_d is the number of valid rounds for dimension d . This results in a 4×4 correlation matrix for each rubric dimension, capturing grader consistency in evaluating creativity, scientific rigor, and logical coherence across sections of the proposal.

Summary. In both MultiTask and SingleTask, Kendall's Tau provides a principled measure of inter-grader consistency. The distinction lies in the evaluation unit: *tasks* for MultiTask versus *rubric dimensions* for SingleTask.

B DETAILED DEMONSTRATION OF ROUNDTABLE POLICY

To provide a concrete illustration of how ROUNDTABLE POLICY (RT) operates in practice, we present two representative demonstrations: one in the *MultiTask* regime (Figure 7) and one in the *SingleTask* regime (Figure 6). These examples showcase how RT transforms fragmented outputs from multiple LLMs into coherent, factually grounded, and narratively rigorous responses.

MultiTask demonstration. Figure 7 presents a representative MultiTask round, where nine LLM *players* respond simultaneously to a heterogeneous set of scientific queries spanning *mechanics, thermodynamics, semiconductor physics, mathematics, geoscience, and biology*. Individual player outputs illustrate the limitations of single-model reasoning: some provide only partial explanations (e.g., noting that paper clips corrode without addressing stress relaxation), others introduce inaccuracies (e.g., oversimplifying nucleation–growth dynamics), and several fail to maintain consistency across domains (e.g., contradictory accounts of polymer glass transition). These fragmented outputs reflect the heterogeneity of LLM competencies—stronger players excel in certain areas, while weaker ones often produce vague or under-specified responses.

By contrast, the fused response generated by RT demonstrates marked improvements in both *factual coverage* and *reasoning depth*. For instance, RT not only describes corrosion of paper clips but also contextualizes long-term degradation and mechanical implications; in the nucleation–growth problem, RT integrates complementary insights into thermodynamic driving forces and kinetic limitations, producing a textbook-quality explanation. Similarly, in the polymer glass transition question, RT combines molecular structure, chain length, and plasticizer effects into a unified account that no single player captured in full.

Committee grading further substantiates these gains: RT exhibits higher factual accuracy and reduced uncertainty intervals across tasks. Improvements are particularly pronounced in symbolic and reasoning-intensive domains such as thermodynamics and mathematics, where RT delivers correct solutions while clarifying intermediate reasoning steps. These results highlight how RT balances correctness and clarity across heterogeneous domains.

SingleTask demonstration. Figure 6 illustrates the SingleTask regime, where each player generates a three-paragraph scientific proposal (*Background, Methodology, Impact*). Individual drafts vary widely in creativity, methodological depth, and logical flow. Some emphasize novelty but lack technical detail; others offer rigorous methods but fail to contextualize the problem or articulate downstream impact. Such stylistic and structural inconsistencies exemplify the difficulty of producing a coherent *scientific narrative* with a single LLM.

In contrast, the fused proposal produced by RT exhibits a markedly stronger narrative arc. The *Background* situates the research problem within its broader scientific context; the *Methodology* clearly articulates technical contributions with precision; and the *Impact* section highlights both scientific significance and societal relevance. Grading results confirm consistent improvements across all rubric dimensions—creativity, scientific rigor, and logical coherence—demonstrating that RT effectively mitigates individual stylistic biases while amplifying collective strengths. Even strong baseline players benefit: while their drafts are often polished in one dimension, RT integrates complementary insights to deliver uniformly high-quality writing.

Summary. Together, these demonstrations show how ROUNDTABLE POLICY transforms fragmented or uneven model outputs into coherent, high-quality responses. In the MultiTask regime, RT enhances cross-domain reasoning reliability by integrating complementary knowledge across scientific fields. In the SingleTask regime, RT substantially improves narrative structure and explanatory depth in long-form proposal writing. These examples reinforce the central claim that RT enables LLM ensembles to achieve more factual, rigorous, and narratively coherent outputs in scientific applications.



Figure 6: Demonstration of the Single Task.



Figure 7: Demonstration of the MultiTask.

C BENCHMARKING DATASETS

C.1 DATASET ANNOTATION




Figure 8: Distribution of the MATSCI-BENCH materials-science subset across six sub-domains. The inner ring denotes the number of expert-annotated Q/K pairs per domain, while the outer ring represents the total token count. The dataset is approximately balanced across categories such as *macro mechanics*, *micro mechanics*, *optical & microscopic*, *semiconductor*, *thermodynamical*, and *electrical & electronic*—supporting cross-scale and cross-modality reasoning.

through two complementary methods: (i) the automatic Causal Reasoning Index (CRI), and (ii) a human-curated explanation rubric (details in Appendix C.4). These fine-grained metrics allow for robust measurement of model performance and principled ablation studies. Table 4 provides representative examples across four broader scientific areas—Biology, Geoscience, Mathematics, and Materials Science—highlighting domain-specific instruction design and diverse task objectives. Unlike prior benchmarks focused narrowly on short factual queries, our dataset emphasizes heterogeneous scientific tasks requiring numerical derivation, mechanistic explanation, and symbolic fluency.

Materials-science subset. The 1274 materials-science questions are drawn from the 2006–2024 UCLA Materials Science and Engineering Ph.D. qualifying examinations. This provenance ensures originality, rigor, and relevance to authentic scientific reasoning. Each problem is annotated with: (i) a numeric ground-truth answer rounded to three significant digits, (ii) an exact \LaTeX expression preserving symbolic fidelity, and (iii) a step-by-step expert-verified solution. All annotations are fully compliant with \LaTeX and Markdown standards, ensuring reproducibility and integration with downstream evaluation pipelines.

C.2 DATASET COMPARISON

Table 5 benchmarks MATSCI-BENCH against a range of prominent scientific QA datasets. Whereas prior benchmarks often emphasize scale—providing thousands of short, loosely categorized questions—MATSCI-BENCH is designed for conceptual depth, compositional reasoning, and graduate-level rigor. For instance, the materials science subset averages 128 tokens per question, more than double that of typical mathematics datasets, reflecting the structural and semantic complexity encountered in authentic scientific workflows.

We introduce MATSCI-BENCH, a heterogeneous benchmark designed to evaluate the scientific reasoning capabilities of large language models (LLMs) in materials science and beyond. The benchmark spans six carefully curated sub-domains: (i) *Macro Mechanics*, (ii) *Micro Mechanics*, (iii) *Optical & Microscopic*, (iv) *Semiconductor Physics*, (v) *Thermodynamical Systems*, and (vi) *Electrical & Electronic Properties*. As visualized in Figure 8, these categories are balanced in both question count and token length, enabling systematic cross-domain evaluation of diverse reasoning skills.

This hierarchical structure compels models to integrate reasoning across physical length scales—from atomic-level diffusion and microstructure evolution to bulk elasticity and device performance—while combining symbolic, conceptual, and numerical reasoning. Each sub-domain is paired with task-specific rubrics assessing both (a) factual accuracy and (b) explanatory depth. To further capture reasoning quality, all model outputs must include a *chain-of-thought* rationale, which is evaluated

Table 5: **Domain-wise Q/K pair and token statistics.** Math contains the largest number of tokens due to its symbolic verbosity.

Domain	Q/K	Tokens
Geoscience	1395	109,159
Biology	1000	92,866
Math	1319	246,238
Material Science	539	46,150

Table 4: **Multi-Task Benchmark.** Selected tasks with specific human competency requirements along with task abbreviations and IDs.

Subdomain	Task Instruction	Subtask
Math Task 007: Math	<i>Janet's ducks lay 16 eggs per day. She consumes 3 eggs for breakfast, uses 4 eggs for baking muffins, and sells the remaining eggs at \$2 each. How much does she earn at the farmers' market?</i>	Display strong arithmetic and logical sequencing skills to compute the final earnings.
Geoscience Task 008: Geo.	<i>Archaeologists record the top layers first, followed by older, deeper layers to study ancient settlements according to the principle of superposition.</i>	Demonstrate the ability to interpret stratigraphic evidence and correctly apply the principle of superposition.
Biology Task 009: Bio.	<i>Does tranexamic acid reduce desmopressin-induced hyperfibrinolysis?</i>	Link pharmacological interventions with clinical outcomes based on empirical data.
Macro Mechanics Task 001: Mech. 1	<i>What is elasticity? What is strain energy? How do we make use of high elastic modulus materials?</i>	Explain fundamental mechanical properties and their practical applications in structural design.
Micro Mechanics Task 002: Mech. 2	<i>What are interstitial and substitutional diffusion? How do they differ from self-diffusion, and what drives these processes?</i>	Differentiate between diffusion mechanisms and explain the role of chemical potential gradients.
Electrical & Electronic Task 003: EE	<i>What is the difference between homogeneous and heterogeneous nucleation?</i>	Demonstrate understanding of nucleation processes and how surfaces or impurities influence phase transitions.
Optical & Microscopic Task 004: Opt.	<i>Using characterization techniques, how would you distinguish between a mixture of 90% NaCl + 10% LiCl and a mixture of 90% NaCl + 5% LiCl + 5% KCl?</i>	Interpret diffraction patterns or elemental analysis data to differentiate material compositions.
Thermodynamical Task 005: Thermo.	<i>Explain the laws of thermodynamics both mathematically and conceptually.</i>	Articulate both the formal mathematical expressions and the underlying concepts of the thermodynamic laws.
Semiconductor Task 006: Semi.	<i>What is Schrödinger's equation? Use it to solve for a 1D wavefunction in a simple potential.</i>	Demonstrate a solid understanding of quantum mechanics by providing the correct form of Schrödinger's equation and a step-by-step solution for a 1D potential problem.

Success Criteria: The arbitrator agent confirms that the confidence score of the multi-agents converges.

To construct this benchmark, we developed a hybrid annotation pipeline that balances automated scalability with human quality control. This process begins with an automatic filtering stage, curating 856 candidate prompts from existing resources such as TheoremQA and SciBench. GPT-4 is then employed to generate *positive tool functions*—programmatically capable of faithfully executing or reasoning over the problem content—which are subsequently audited, refined, or discarded by expert annotators.

To further prevent models from exploiting shallow heuristics or brittle shortcuts, annotators also construct complementary *negative tool functions* that intentionally fail or only partially match the task. Together, these positive–negative mappings define the final tool interface for each problem, ensuring that evaluation targets robust reasoning rather than superficial pattern recognition. Full implementation details, including annotation consistency and rubric alignment statistics, are reported in Appendix C.4.

C.3 QK-PAIR OVERVIEW

Unlike ensemble approaches that rely on static averaging or manually crafted heuristics, our framework enables fine-grained, task-dependent variability in response aggregation. It supports dynamic arbitration by adapting both model selection and integration strategies to the empirical strengths of each LLM on a per-task basis, thereby facilitating compositional reasoning across heterogeneous scientific inputs.

Tasks are categorized into two principal types according to the nature of supervision:

Ground-truth-based tasks. This category includes multiple-choice questions, numerical derivations, and factual reasoning problems, where each model's prediction can be directly compared against a known reference. Scoring in this regime is deterministic and fully automated.

Non-ground-truth tasks. This category includes open-ended generation problems, such as scientific proposal writing, where no unique ground truth exists. Evaluation is therefore conducted by the AI Committee using rubric-based qualitative assessment, accounting for creativity, scientific rigor, and logical coherence.

To ensure reproducibility and modularity, all tasks are stored in a structured (Q, K) format, where Q denotes the input query and K the expected response (if applicable). In ground-truth settings, K provides the exact solution or numeric tolerance reference. In non-ground-truth settings, K instead encodes evaluation rubrics or stylistic constraints, guiding qualitative assessment rather than exact matching.

We evaluate the framework under two complementary protocols:

MultiTask. Each round presents a batch of heterogeneous tasks spanning multiple scientific domains as shown in Figure 9. The AI Committee jointly evaluates player responses, testing the arbitration system’s ability to generalize across diverse input types, modalities, and difficulty levels.

SingleTask. Each round focuses on a scientific proposal generation as shown in Figure 10, allowing the Committee to learn nuanced arbitration strategies within a fixed domain and structured output format.

Together, these protocols provide a comprehensive evaluation of arbitration dynamics under both breadth-oriented (*MultiTask*) and depth-oriented (*SingleTask*) conditions. Importantly, all evaluations are conducted without modifying the internal parameters of the player models, thereby preserving their pretrained competencies while enabling compositional reasoning through learned arbitration.

C.4 MATSCI-BENCH

Table 6 illustrates the mapping between several UCLA courses (from the prelim exams spanning 2006–2024) and our six defined subdomains in Material Science. The table indicates the number of questions per course and marks (✓) the corresponding subdomains covered by each course. And Table 7 Mapping from numeric course codes to official course names in the UCLA MSE Graduate Program.

In our multi-task framework, each question is paired with a corresponding key—forming a question-key pair—that encapsulates its unique characteristics and domain-specific attributes. This design enables a fine-grained classification of tasks, as each key serves as an identifier for the subdomain and the underlying problem-solving facet it represents. In our dataset, which is constructed from high-quality, authoritative UCLA prelim exams, each question is not only rigorously structured but also assigned a key that maps to distinct subdomains within Material Science. This approach allows for a combinatorial evaluation across various tasks and provides a nuanced understanding of the performance of large language models (LLMs). Moreover, the explicit association between questions and keys facilitates a higher resolution in assessment, offering insights into the model’s capability to address the subtle distinctions inherent in each category.

MultiTask Example

Type: macro mechanics

Question: Explain the concept of fatigue life prediction using the S-N curve.

Key: An S-N curve (stress vs. number of cycles) plots fatigue strength over cyclic life. It helps predict the number of cycles a material can withstand at a given stress amplitude before failure.

Type: micro mechanics

Question: What is spinodal decomposition?

Key: Spinodal decomposition is a phase separation mechanism in the unstable region of a free energy curve where $\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial c^2} < 0$, and small composition fluctuations grow spontaneously without a nucleation barrier.

Type: electrical and electronic

Question: Why are ceramics brittle and metals ductile?

Key: Ceramics have strong directional ionic/covalent bonds with limited slip systems \rightarrow brittle. Metals have metallic bonds with abundant slip systems \rightarrow ductile. This difference in plasticity is key to fracture behavior.

Type: optical and microscopic

Question: Draw and explain the Ewald sphere.

Key: The Ewald sphere is a sphere in reciprocal space of radius $\frac{1}{\lambda}$. A reciprocal lattice point lying on this sphere satisfies Bragg's law, leading to a diffraction spot.

Type: thermodynamical

Question: What is the difference if you put a hot metal into dry ice and an ice-water mixture?

Key: Dry ice is around -78°C , while an ice-water mixture remains at 0°C . A hot metal will cool more rapidly in contact with dry ice than in an ice-water mixture.

Type: semiconductor

Question: Describe the thermal conductivity of electrons in a metal.

Key: In metals, thermal conductivity of electrons is high because electrons are free to transport energy. According to the Wiedemann–Franz law, the ratio of thermal to electrical conductivity is proportional to temperature.

Type: math

Question: Gary likes to walk around the edge of the local park, which is a rectangle that measures 1.5 miles by 6 miles. If he walks at 3 miles/hour, how many hours does he spend walking?

Key: Length of the two long sides: $6 \times 2 = 12$ miles. Length of the two short sides: $1.5 \times 2 = 3$ miles. Total perimeter: $12 + 3 = 15$ miles. Time: $\frac{15 \text{ miles}}{3 \text{ miles/hour}} = 5$ hours. Answer:

Type: geoscience

Question: Which of the following is the best example of a multilingual country? [A. Japan / B. The United States / C. Brazil / D. Canada / E. Iceland]

Key: D

Type: biology

Question: Can transcranial direct current stimulation be useful in differentiating unresponsive wakefulness syndrome from minimally conscious state patients?

Key: Yes, tDCS could be useful in identifying residual connectivity markers in clinically-defined UWS, who may lack purposeful behavior as a result of a motor-output failure.

Figure 9: Example (Q,K) pair for MultiTask

SingleTask Example

Background
Question (Task Description): The rapid advancement in materials science demands innovative methods to discover new materials with exceptional properties. Traditional experimentation is time-consuming and costly, motivating the integration of machine learning to predict material behaviors and identify novel compounds efficiently.
Key: \emptyset

Methodology
Question (Task Description): We propose using deep learning models, such as graph neural networks, to analyze large datasets of material properties. These models will enable the prediction of atomic interactions and facilitate the identification of promising new materials with desired characteristics.
Key: \emptyset

Impact
Question (Task Description): This research aims to accelerate materials discovery, offering substantial contributions to academic understanding and providing industry with tools to develop advanced materials for sectors like energy, electronics, and biotechnology.
Key: \emptyset

Figure 10: Example (Q, \emptyset) pair for SingleTask.

Table 6: Mapping of UCLA MSE Graduate Courses to Material Science Subdomains.


Course #	Mechanism		Property			
	<i>Macro</i>	<i>Micro</i>	<i>Electrical & Electronic</i>	<i>Optical & Microscopic</i>	<i>Semiconductor</i>	<i>Thermodynamical</i>
200	✓		✓			
201		✓		✓		
202	✓					✓
210		✓			✓	
C211	✓		✓			
C212		✓	✓			
M213	✓					✓
213L		✓	✓			
214	✓			✓		
216		✓				✓
221	✓		✓		✓	
222		✓		✓		
223	✓				✓	
224		✓				✓
225	✓		✓			
226		✓		✓		
243A	✓					✓
243C	✓	✓	✓			
246A	✓				✓	
246B		✓		✓		
246D	✓					✓
247		✓		✓		
248	✓			✓		
250B		✓			✓	
251	✓		✓			
252		✓		✓		
253	✓					✓
261		✓	✓			
262	✓			✓		
CM263		✓			✓	
270	✓		✓			
271		✓		✓		
272	✓					✓
CM280		✓	✓			
282	✓			✓		
296	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
M297B	✓				✓	
M297C		✓				✓
298	✓		✓			


Table 7: Mapping from numeric course codes to official course names in the UCLA MSE Graduate Program.


Course #	Course Name
200	Principles of Materials Science I
201	Principles of Materials Science II
202	Thermodynamics of Materials
210	Diffraction Methods in Science of Materials
C211	Introduction to Materials Characterization B (Electron Microscopy)
C212	Cultural Materials Science II: Characterization Methods in Conservation of Materials
M213	Cultural Materials Science I: Analytical Imaging and Documentation in Conservation of Materials
213L	Cultural Materials Science Laboratory: Technical Study
214	Structure, Properties, and Deterioration of Materials: Rock Art, Wall Paintings, Mosaics
216	Science of Conservation Materials and Methods I
221	Science of Electronic Materials
222	Growth and Processing of Electronic Materials
223	Materials Science of Thin Films
224	Deposition Technologies and Their Applications
225	Materials Science of Surfaces
226	Si-CMOS Technology: Selected Topics in Materials Science
243A	Fracture of Structural Materials
243C	Dislocations and Strengthening Mechanisms in Solids
246A	Mechanical Properties of Nonmetallic Crystalline Solids
246B	Structure and Properties of Glass
246D	Electronic and Optical Properties of Ceramics
247	Nanoscale Materials: Challenges and Opportunities
248	Materials and Physics of Solar Cells
250B	Advanced Composite Materials
251	Chemistry of Soft Materials
252	Organic Polymer Electronic Materials
253	Bioinspired Materials
261	Risk Analysis for Engineers and Scientists
262	Probabilistic Modeling and Simulation of Complex Systems
CM263	Electrochemical Processes
270	Computer Simulations of Materials
271	Electronic Structure of Materials
272	Theory of Nanomaterials
CM280	Introduction to Biomaterials
282	Exploration of Advanced Topics in Materials Science and Engineering
296	Seminar: Advanced Topics in Materials Science and Engineering
M297B	Material Processing in Manufacturing
M297C	Composites Manufacturing
298	Seminar: Engineering


D FINE-GRAINED RESULTS


D.1 MULTITASK























Figure 11: Fine-grained improvement results in Multitask.


Table 8: **Task-level Wilcoxon signed-rank test results for Players 001 to 005(MultiTask)**. Each row reports the number of evaluation rounds, mean and standard deviation of RT’s percentage gain over a given player on a specific task, and the resulting p -value from a one-sided Wilcoxon test. A checkmark (✓) indicates statistical significance at $\alpha = 0.05$.




Player ID	Task ID	#	μ_{ij} (%)	σ_{ij} (%)	p-value↓	Significance	Overall
Player_001 GPT-4o	001	36000	3.664534	29.115645	1.2×10^{-37}	✓	✓
	002	36000	9.990613	66.756230	1.0×10^{-44}	✓	
	003	36000	4.418581	32.628933	2.1×10^{-72}	✓	
	004	36000	18.290543	103.900081	4.4×10^{-102}	✓	
	005	36000	3.507243	49.094848	1.8×10^{-65}	✓	
	006	36000	4.547669	29.876047	5.6×10^{-113}	✓	
	007	36000	18.619909	110.561195	2.9×10^{-132}	✓	
	008	36000	4.205786	76.940468	5.4×10^{-42}	✓	
	009	36000	-13.817889	121.279772	1.0×10^0	✗	
Player_002 Grok-3	001	36000	2.442676	26.869884	2.6×10^{-23}	✓	✓
	002	36000	11.658807	87.033589	6.2×10^{-7}	✓	
	003	36000	2.922847	25.540567	1.0×10^{-38}	✓	
	004	36000	10.040225	97.107301	3.8×10^{-33}	✓	
	005	36000	2.754232	68.334607	1.2×10^{-28}	✓	
	006	36000	7.795831	50.756077	1.3×10^{-66}	✓	
	007	36000	7.037656	73.901148	1.0×10^{-97}	✓	
	008	36000	12.159710	90.508914	8.9×10^{-66}	✓	
	009	36000	-14.196161	124.567204	1.0×10^0	✗	
Player_003 Claude-3.5Haiku	001	36000	9.356006	49.469078	1.6×10^{-119}	✓	✓
	002	36000	25.634084	100.488313	2.6×10^{-165}	✓	
	003	36000	8.903574	52.492393	2.2×10^{-121}	✓	
	004	36000	24.974510	120.272436	5.1×10^{-135}	✓	
	005	36000	18.091843	89.503620	3.2×10^{-181}	✓	
	006	36000	19.206568	71.695176	1.1×10^{-258}	✓	
	007	36000	29.644628	127.261225	5.0×10^{-157}	✓	
	008	36000	22.433517	119.787354	3.0×10^{-86}	✓	
	009	36000	-8.057303	138.391228	9.3×10^{-1}	✗	
Player_004 GPT-4.5-preview	001	36000	26.864778	50.638001	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
	002	36000	24.364182	76.170729	6.2×10^{-286}	✓	
	003	36000	28.888756	93.939402	0.0×10^0	✓	
	004	36000	18.305048	104.942899	1.4×10^{-237}	✓	
	005	36000	18.611880	82.101495	1.0×10^{-308}	✓	
	006	36000	17.971459	45.269719	0.0×10^0	✓	
	007	36000	32.007776	136.936369	2.7×10^{-183}	✓	
	008	36000	5.146633	83.614309	6.9×10^{-46}	✓	
	009	36000	-11.464038	128.061246	6.3×10^{-1}	✗	
Player_005 Deepseek-chat	001	36000	15.448390	50.327417	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
	002	36000	21.685092	88.100774	3.9×10^{-182}	✓	
	003	36000	11.772803	42.894447	0.0×10^0	✓	
	004	36000	14.794087	99.773548	6.9×10^{-169}	✓	
	005	36000	9.123905	59.031496	2.1×10^{-191}	✓	
	006	36000	12.303097	45.278523	7.2×10^{-287}	✓	
	007	36000	52.148935	167.006012	6.1×10^{-209}	✓	
	008	36000	11.541473	99.093907	3.0×10^{-73}	✓	
	009	36000	-8.504933	137.294744	8.5×10^{-1}	✗	


Table 9: Task-level Wilcoxon signed-rank test results for Players 006 to 009(MultiTask).


Player ID	Task ID	#	μ_{ij} (%)	σ_{ij} (%)	p-value \downarrow	Significance	Overall
Player_006 Claude-3.7Sonnet	001	36000	10.483677	100.447956	3.049836×10^{-6}	✓	✓
	002	36000	20.034584	140.497283	6.223576×10^{-6}	✓	
	003	36000	7.986260	57.805017	1.545642×10^{-2}	✓	
	004	36000	11.881086	139.264504	4.845998×10^{-1}	✗	
	005	36000	4.431706	106.492570	3.782222×10^{-2}	✓	
	006	36000	11.670759	84.754451	9.338481×10^{-42}	✓	
	007	36000	65.488159	182.402404	$2.334397 \times 10^{-191}$	✓	
	008	36000	10.358145	91.889615	3.870999×10^{-48}	✓	
	009	36000	-16.646343	131.246587	1.000000×10^0	✗	
Player_007 Llama-3.3	001	36000	26.016269	81.867305	0.000000×10^0	✓	✓
	002	36000	43.795534	133.423412	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	003	36000	29.847791	118.361082	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	004	36000	33.835778	146.064900	$8.398008 \times 10^{-247}$	✓	
	005	36000	31.906208	125.420480	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	006	36000	29.654251	95.808593	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	007	36000	12.560069	113.533051	$5.566322 \times 10^{-115}$	✓	
	008	36000	24.151429	138.741394	3.765237×10^{-84}	✓	
	009	36000	-8.214252	139.363305	9.858130×10^{-1}	✗	
Player_008 Qwen-plus	001	36000	12.702783	53.480581	$5.782990 \times 10^{-275}$	✓	✓
	002	36000	24.671245	105.447534	$1.848487 \times 10^{-150}$	✓	
	003	36000	12.217150	54.159535	$1.324810 \times 10^{-248}$	✓	
	004	36000	19.478679	117.267431	$8.820469 \times 10^{-132}$	✓	
	005	36000	6.452739	58.406561	$1.442680 \times 10^{-138}$	✓	
	006	36000	18.500964	66.688703	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	007	36000	16.654888	101.522057	$7.761454 \times 10^{-129}$	✓	
	008	36000	15.475509	98.223206	5.745092×10^{-80}	✓	
	009	36000	-13.418640	129.270826	1.000000×10^0	✗	
Player_009 Gemini-2.0	001	36000	48.597322	101.645241	0.000000×10^0	✓	✓
	002	36000	56.207001	136.978257	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	003	36000	30.807297	86.405085	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	004	36000	40.730016	138.029856	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	005	36000	39.623737	120.151633	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	006	36000	43.606884	96.069039	0.000000×10^0	✓	
	007	36000	127.050040	253.842133	$4.263965 \times 10^{-291}$	✓	
	008	36000	19.718319	112.418143	1.433771×10^{-85}	✓	
	009	36000	15.955998	173.200269	9.495816×10^{-28}	✓	




D.2 SINGLETASK





























Figure 12: Fine-grained improvement results in Singletask.

Table 10: Per-dimension Wilcoxon signed-rank test results for Players 001 to 005(Single-task).

Player ID	Paragraph	Dimension	#	μ_{ij} (%)	σ_{ij} (%)	p-value↓	Significance	Overall
Player_001 GPT-4o	Background	Creativity	36000	37.150702	49.336875	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	30.257828	46.850598	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	11.733576	16.004795	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	24.931209	31.921273	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	31.838154	45.990879	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	17.282977	21.020188	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	32.606157	40.063019	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	41.271411	57.887977	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	16.718015	19.804013	0.0×10^0	✓	
Player_002 GPT-o3	Background	Creativity	36000	12.164463	112.053304	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	13.556005	141.849680	2.1×10^{-241}	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	7.902093	88.022126	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	12.242360	162.582687	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	13.742029	176.441027	6.4×10^{-141}	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	12.246663	149.530625	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	14.822979	162.636940	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	19.794367	172.889406	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	13.375266	149.888340	0.0×10^0	✓	
Player_003 GPT-4.1	Background	Creativity	36000	23.490292	76.488563	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	15.516892	73.369125	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	7.636895	70.613455	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	13.841302	73.356046	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	13.786087	74.585712	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	9.985966	70.810643	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	18.657843	73.142286	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	22.049522	75.719467	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	11.006198	72.520043	0.0×10^0	✓	
Player_004 GPT-4.1-nano	Background	Creativity	36000	22.875212	41.517104	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	16.303948	31.393619	3.6×10^{-309}	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	7.715497	14.464709	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	14.951288	21.488109	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	14.777490	25.696003	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	10.347582	16.738338	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	19.842341	27.921968	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	23.655715	38.425349	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	11.784470	18.251267	0.0×10^0	✓	
Player_005 GPT-o3-mini	Background	Creativity	36000	12.773348	27.212152	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	9.060914	24.819729	1.7×10^{-166}	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	5.406290	14.736602	5.5×10^{-225}	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	10.166683	16.487638	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	7.171348	19.411696	2.7×10^{-112}	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	6.591953	13.835775	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	13.300165	22.726699	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	14.308252	31.344613	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	8.408882	16.386089	0.0×10^0	✓	

Table 11: Per-dimension Wilcoxon signed-rank test results for Players 006 to 009(Single-task).

Player ID	Paragraph	Dimension	#	μ_{ij} (%)	σ_{ij} (%)	p-value \downarrow	Significance	Overall
Player_006 GPT-4O-mini	Background	Creativity	36000	33.709469	47.064151	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	32.286309	53.299864	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	13.247615	20.226189	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	25.170102	32.705104	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	28.879875	45.066162	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	17.627694	24.373974	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	32.096396	42.641222	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	42.631153	63.716542	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	19.211624	26.269863	0.0×10^0	✓	
Player_007 Grok-3	Background	Creativity	36000	21.453687	36.436965	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	20.427351	37.117935	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	8.073442	15.451901	2.1×10^{-289}	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	14.424544	21.979675	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	16.424389	26.740515	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	10.934741	16.722313	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	18.844803	28.521192	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	25.975916	41.628876	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	11.808618	18.702339	0.0×10^0	✓	
Player_008 Claude-3.7Sonnet	Background	Creativity	36000	12.640859	25.792853	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	7.857101	17.472430	6.6×10^{-284}	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	3.793134	9.710774	3.4×10^{-175}	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	6.475117	11.493763	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	6.547614	14.204805	2.4×10^{-264}	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	5.655090	10.774578	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	8.043748	15.478956	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	12.470529	24.399598	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	6.367473	13.337112	0.0×10^0	✓	
Player_009 Deepseek-Chat	Background	Creativity	36000	7.791205	8.969878	0.0×10^0	✓	✓
		Scientific Rigor	36000	7.757954	8.056653	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	3.207566	5.639610	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Methodology	Creativity	36000	7.612794	7.235925	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	8.278456	7.740058	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	6.056968	5.893318	0.0×10^0	✓	
	Impact	Creativity	36000	8.014463	7.344285	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Scientific Rigor	36000	10.484719	7.746186	0.0×10^0	✓	
		Logical Coherence	36000	5.287961	5.505316	0.0×10^0	✓	

D.3 AI GRADERS

A central component of our evaluation pipeline is the use of AI graders (arbitrators) to provide rankings of model outputs. Unlike human experts, who bring domain expertise but are costly and inconsistent across annotators, AI graders offer scalable, replicable, and transparent evaluation. Nevertheless, just as in human peer review, the presence of *bias* (systematic preference of a grader) and the degree of *consistency* (agreement across graders) are critical for ensuring the reliability of aggregated judgments. The purpose of this section is to examine these properties in detail, thereby motivating our design choice of adopting multiple independent graders rather than relying on a single arbitrator.

Motivation. Bias in grading arises when one arbitrator disproportionately favors certain ranks across repeated evaluations. For example, a grader may consistently assign lower (more critical) ranks, while another may tend to be more lenient. If such biases are not controlled, downstream evaluations may unfairly penalize or reward certain systems, obscuring the true effect of the Roundtable Policy. Consistency, on the other hand, reflects whether different graders produce comparable relative orderings. High consistency increases our confidence that the rankings reflect robust quality differences, while low consistency signals noise and arbitrariness. By quantifying both bias and consistency, we establish the validity of our evaluation methodology.

Methodology. We assess grader bias by visualizing the empirical rank distributions assigned by each arbitrator. Figure 3 presents kernel density estimates of the rank distributions for four graders across both the SingleTask and MultiTask evaluations. Systematic deviations in the distributions (e.g., skewed toward higher or lower ranks) indicate bias. To measure consistency, we compute pairwise Kendall’s Tau correlations between graders’ rankings. This non-parametric statistic captures the degree of ordinal agreement, with values close to 1 indicating strong concordance, values near 0 suggesting randomness, and negative values reflecting disagreement. The results are shown as inset heatmaps in Figure 3.

Findings. In the SingleTask setting, we observe substantial variation in grader behavior. The rank distributions are uneven, with some graders systematically harsher or more generous than others. The Kendall’s Tau correlations confirm this observation, with moderate agreement values that indicate significant variability across graders. Such findings echo common phenomena in human peer review, where individual reviewers bring idiosyncratic standards and biases. By contrast, in the MultiTask setting, the distributions are more balanced, and the Kendall’s Tau values are consistently higher. This suggests that when grading across diverse tasks, individual biases are averaged out, leading to more stable and reliable inter-grader consensus.

Implications. These analyses reinforce two important principles. First, reliance on a single grader is inherently risky due to potential bias; employing multiple graders and aggregating their judgments is essential for fairness. Second, broader task coverage increases reliability, as MultiTask grading mitigates the influence of any single arbitrator’s bias. Together, these results highlight the necessity of designing evaluation protocols that balance scalability with robustness, ensuring that AI grader-based assessments approximate the fairness and credibility traditionally associated with human expert panels.





Figure 13: Rank distribution of AI graders.




Figure 14: Kendall Tau Correlation of AI graders.

E PROMPTS

E.0.1 PLAYER AGENT PROMPTS

```

1  ===== Prompt =====
2
3  "The following set consists of nine diverse scientific questions."
4  "Please provide clear and well-reasoned answers to each of them:\n\n."
5
6  ===== Completion =====

```

Figure 15: Prompt for Multitask Player

```

1  ===== Prompt =====
2
3  Please write a complete scientific proposal based on the following
4  instructions and requirements:
5
6  1. You receive one JSON message with three fields: "Background", "
7     Methodology", "Impact", describing the requirements for a
8     scientific proposal.
9  2. Write three paragraphs, each 550-600 words (inclusive):
10     Paragraph 1: Background
11     Paragraph 2: Methodology
12     Paragraph 3: Impact
13 Each paragraph must contain 280~320 words, measured by whitespace-
14 separated tokens. Your goal is to fully develop each section with
15 rich, rigorous, and precise scientific language. Do not compress
16 or summarize. Do not substitute this with shorter or bulleted
17 content.
18 3. Respond with only the following JSON object, nothing else:
19 {
20   "Background": "<paragraph-1>",
21   "Methodology": "<paragraph-2>",
22   "Impact": "<paragraph-3>"
23 }
24
25 Constraints:
26 - The three keys must appear exactly in the above order. Do not add or
27   remove keys.
28 - Use precise, rigorous scientific language for an expert audience.
29 - Avoid vagueness or speculation beyond what is logically supported.
30 - Do not output markdown fences, comments, headings, or
31   explanations, return the raw JSON object only.
32
33 ===== Completion =====

```

Figure 16: Prompt for Singletask Player

E.0.2 ARBITRATOR AGENT PROMPTS

```

1  ===== Prompt =====
2
3  ## System Prompt for the Arbitrator
4
5  **Role and Responsibilities:**
6
7  You will serve as the Arbitrator in a game that spans 1000 independent
8  rounds. In each round, your responsibilities are:
9  1. Receive and interpret a JSON input containing 9 tasks (each with a
10  question, a reference key, and answers submitted by 9 players).
11  2. Evaluate each player's answer to each task.
12  3. Produce a CSV file as output, where each entry consists of both a *
13  confidence weight* and a *95% confidence interval* for that weight
14  , per task and per player.
15
16  ---
17
18  ## 1. Input Data Format
19
20  At the start of each round, you will receive a JSON object with 9
21  tasks. Each task includes:
22  - **question**: A string describing the task or query.
23  - **key**: The correct or reference answer.
24  - **players_answer**: An object mapping each player's ID (in the
25  format `player_0000x`) to their submitted string answer.
26
27  ---
28
29  ## 2. Evaluation Process and Output Requirements
30
31  Upon receiving the input, follow these steps:
32
33  1. For each task, assess how well each player's answer matches the
34  provided key.
35  2. Assign a **confidence weight** in the range  $[-100.00, 100.00]$  (
36  rounded to two decimal places), representing the quality of the
37  player's response.
38  3. Estimate the **95% confidence interval** for the score. This is
39  reported as a ** $\pm$  uncertainty value** (also to two decimal places)
40  .
41  4. If a player did not submit an answer for a task, assign `0.00 $\pm$ 
42  0.00`.
43
44  You must return a **CSV file formatted as a 9 by 9 matrix**:
45  - Each **row** represents a player's performance across 9 tasks (`
46  player_0000x`).
47  - Each **column** represents one task (`task_0000x`).
48  - Each cell should contain a **string** in the format: `
49  confidence_weight $\pm$ uncertainty`.
50
51  For example, if `player_00001` receives a confidence weight of `34.75`
52  with an uncertainty of `4.75` on `task_00001`, the corresponding
53  CSV cell must be: `34.75 $\pm$ 4.75`
54
55  **Important**:
56  - The CSV must contain no JSON objects.
57  - Each row begins with the player ID (e.g., `player_00001`), followed
58  by 9 comma-separated strings (formatted as above).
59  - The header row must begin with `player_id`, followed by `task_00001
60  `, ..., `task_00009`.

```

```

45 ---
46
47 ## 3. Notes
48
49 - Your evaluation must be relative to the provided 'key' per task and
    reflect answer quality.
50 - The range  $[-100.00, 100.00]$  allows flexibility to score both
    excellent and poor answers.
51 - Each round is independent. Do not use memory or feedback from
    previous rounds.
52 - Ensure consistent formatting of all CSV cells to support automated
    parsing.
53
54 ## 4. last
55
56 Each CSV cell must contain a single string formatted as:
57 float_value  $\pm$  float_uncertainty
58
59 Use the Unicode character  $\pm$  (U+00B1). Do not use '+', '-', '+/-', or
    any other substitute.
60
61 Always format the score with exactly two decimal places, like
    '35.50 $\pm$ 4.25'.
62
63 Surround each value in double quotes only if it contains symbols that
    may confuse the CSV format (such as  $\pm$ ).
64
65 ===== Completion =====

```

Figure 17: Prompt for Multitask Grader

```

1 ===== Prompt =====
2
3 ## System Prompt for the Arbitrator
4
5 **Role and Responsibilities:**
6
7 You are the Arbitrator in a multi-round scientific evaluation game. In
    each independent round, your responsibilities are as follows:
8
9 1. Receive a JSON-formatted scientific proposal consisting of three
    paragraphs: **Background**, **Methodology**, and **Impact**.
10 2. Evaluate each paragraph from three dimensions: **creativity**, **
    scientific rigor**, and **logical coherence**.
11 3. Output a structured JSON file where each evaluation includes both a
    **confidence weight** and a **95% confidence interval** (
    expressed as an uncertainty value).
12
13 ---
14
15 ## 1. Input Format
16
17 At the beginning of each round, you will receive a JSON object
    containing:
18
19 - **Background**: A summary of the scientific context and motivation.
20 - **Methodology**: Proposed technical approaches to address the
    problem described in the background.
21 - **Impact**: Anticipated academic and industrial outcomes of the
    proposed methodology.
22
23 ---

```

```

24
25 ## 2. Evaluation Process and Output Requirements
26
27 Follow these steps for evaluation:
28
29 1. For each paragraph (**Background**, **Methodology**, **Impact**),
    assess it along three axes: **creativity**, **scientific rigor**,
    and **logical coherence**.
30 2. Assign a **confidence weight** in the range [0.00, 100.00], rounded
    to **two decimal places**, to reflect the strength of the
    response.
31 3. Estimate a **95% confidence interval**, reported as a **$\pm$
    uncertainty value**, also rounded to two decimal places.
32 4. If the paragraph is empty or unanswerable, assign "0.00$\pm$0.00".
33
34 Your output must be a valid JSON file with the following structure:
35
36 - Three top-level fields: `background_score`, `methodology_score`,
    and `impact_score`.
37 - Each of these contains three evaluation metrics: `creativity`, `
    scientific_rigor`, and `logical_coherence`.
38 - Each metric must be represented as a string formatted as:
39   `confidence_weight $\pm$ uncertainty`
40
41 **Example**:
42 If the creativity score for the `Methodology` paragraph is 34.75 with
    an uncertainty of 4.75, the field must contain the string:
43 `34.75$\pm$4.75`
44
45 ---
46
47 ## 3. Notes
48
49 - Your evaluations must be contextually grounded in the **Background**
    section and assess the quality of the proposed content.
50 - The [-100.00, 100.00] range allows for highly positive and highly
    negative assessments.
51 - Treat each round independently. Do not rely on previous memory,
    feedback, or prior evaluations.
52
53 ---
54
55 ## 4. Output Formatting Guidelines
56
57 - Each score must be formatted as a single string:
    `float_score $\pm$ float_uncertainty`
58 - Use the **Unicode character `±` (U+00B1)**. Do not substitute with
    `+`, `-`, `+/-`, or other alternatives.
59 - Always use **exactly two decimal places**, e.g., `35.50$\pm$4.25`.
60 - Enclose each string in **double quotes** if it contains symbols (e.g
    ., `$\pm$`).
61
62
63
64 ===== Completion =====

```

Figure 18: Prompt for Singletask Grader

E.0.3 FUSION AGENT PROMPTS

```
1  ===== Prompt =====
2
3  ## System Prompt for the Fusion Agent
4
5  **Role and Responsibilities:**
6
7  You are the **Fusion Model**, tasked with synthesizing final answers
8  for a set of tasks by aggregating responses from 9 individual
9  models ("players"). Your decisions must be guided by a provided **
10 confidence weight table** that encodes each player's long-term
11 performance (which is attached at the end of this prompt).
12
13
14 ### At each round:
15
16 1. **Input:**
17   You receive a JSON object containing **9 tasks**, each task
18   comprising:
19
20   * A question.
21   * 9 answers from `player_00001` to `player_00009`.
22
23 2. **Fusion Objective:**
24   For each task, produce a single high-quality answer by:
25
26   * Weighing the 9 player answers using the corresponding **score**
27   and **uncertainty** values in the confidence table.
28   * The `score` reflects expected answer quality.
29   * The `uncertainty` is the half width of a 95% confidence interval
30   (e.g., score 80.00 ± 5.00 to CI [75.00, 85.00]).
31   * Favor answers with **higher scores and tighter confidence
32   intervals**.
33   * When useful, merge ideas across answers, but **do not copy any
34   single answer verbatim**.
35
36 3. **Output:**
37   Return a JSON object with **9 fused answers**, each corresponding
38   to one task, in the same order as input.
39
40 ---
41
42 ### Fusion Guidelines:
43
44 * Prioritize accuracy, clarity, and completeness.
45 * Avoid relying on answers with high uncertainty or low confidence
46 intervals.
47 * Aim to **outperform all individual answers** by fusing strengths and
48 mitigating weaknesses.
49 * The final outputs should be well-structured, logically coherent, and
50 directly address the question.
51
52 ---
```

```

50  **Reference:**
51  *Confidence Weight Table measuring long-term performance and
    uncertainty of each player across all tasks (in csv format).*
52
53  ,task_01,task_02,task_03,task_04,task_05,task_06,task_07,task_08,
    task_09
54  player_00001,85.89±4.27,78.26±5.37,87.71±4.11,74.59±5.49,85.14±
    4.40,85.58±4.60,87.81±2.13,83.55±2.20,51.53±6.64
55  player_00002,83.92±4.07,76.24±4.96,85.61±3.92,76.18±4.99,82.02±
    4.10,82.63±4.39,88.84±1.70,77.39±2.28,51.31±6.25
56  player_00003,82.07±4.65,71.20±6.04,84.72±4.37,71.49±5.83,77.74±
    5.03,77.95±5.22,81.19±2.58,73.68±2.58,48.52±6.75
57  player_00004,72.86±6.77,71.46±6.96,76.67±6.12,72.78±6.36,77.18±
    5.71,77.68±6.17,82.50±2.68,82.59±2.08,50.63±6.89
58  player_00005,77.63±5.35,72.02±6.14,81.53±4.97,72.96±5.79,79.64±
    4.87,79.81±5.23,72.23±3.16,78.05±2.41,47.83±6.57
59  player_00006,77.43±3.46,70.51±4.05,79.24±3.13,72.39±3.70,77.41±
    3.49,79.49±3.12,62.34±2.93,72.56±1.97,47.76±5.36
60  player_00007,72.14±5.96,63.86±6.95,75.33±5.55,67.13±6.30,71.23±
    5.71,73.87±5.72,87.43±1.93,72.77±2.49,48.64±6.54
61  player_00008,80.32±5.01,72.36±6.03,82.97±4.71,73.42±5.66,81.49±
    4.70,81.18±4.93,86.99±2.08,76.27±2.48,51.64±6.57
62  player_00009,67.26±7.61,61.61±8.09,74.96±6.58,65.73±7.31,70.72±
    6.68,71.60±6.99,49.77±4.79,75.17±2.58,42.11±7.31
63
64
65  ===== Completion =====

```

Figure 19: Prompt for Multitask Player

```

1  ===== Prompt =====
2  ## System Prompt for Fusion Agent
3
4  **Role and Responsibilities:**
5
6  You are the **Fusion Agent** in a multi-round scientific evaluation
    framework. In each independent round, your role is to synthesize a
    high-quality, single response from multiple candidate answers.
    Your responsibilities are as follows:
7
8  ---
9
10 ### 1. **Input Structure**
11
12 You will receive a JSON object containing **9 answers**, each
    submitted by one of the players ('player_00001' to 'player_00009')
    . These answers correspond to a specific task categorized under
    one of the following sections:
13
14 * `Background`
15 * `Methodology`
16 * `Impact`
17
18 Additionally, you will be provided with an **evaluation table**
    summarizing each player's long-term performance across the three
    evaluation dimensions:
19
20 * `creativity`
21 * `scientific_rigor`
22 * `logical_coherence`
23

```

```

24 Each value in the table is formatted as `score±uncertainty`,
    representing a **95% confidence interval** defined as:
25 `[score - uncertainty, score + uncertainty]`
26
27 This is the **Evaluation Table** in the csv format
28
29 ```
30
31 player_id,background_creativity,background_scientific_rigor,
    background_logical_coherence,methodology_creativity,
    methodology_scientific_rigor,methodology_logical_coherence,
    impact_creativity,impact_scientific_rigor,impact_logical_coherence
32 player_00001,70.99±5.01,74.73±4.68,82.75±3.76,75.49±5.23,74.81±
    5.03,79.63±4.31,72.15±5.19,70.53±5.25,79.64±4.19
33 player_00002,84.07±3.98,84.25±3.82,86.46±3.42,85.92±3.95,86.70±
    3.56,85.84±3.56,83.90±4.15,81.52±4.25,84.86±3.69
34 player_00003,76.96±4.62,81.37±4.16,86.19±3.51,81.65±4.67,83.19±
    4.19,84.75±3.85,78.81±4.74,77.91±4.67,83.90±3.88
35 player_00004,77.39±4.55,80.94±4.15,85.59±3.53,80.48±4.69,82.30±
    4.19,83.97±3.85,77.97±4.74,77.22±4.65,82.94±3.90
36 player_00005,82.65±4.16,84.78±3.83,87.26±3.36,83.15±4.35,86.86±
    3.53,86.44±3.53,81.50±4.40,81.82±4.23,85.15±3.67
37 player_00006,72.78±4.94,74.64±4.70,82.19±3.80,75.44±5.16,76.18±
    4.85,79.81±4.23,72.78±5.18,70.69±5.24,78.82±4.25
38 player_00007,78.50±5.10,79.10±4.50,85.50±3.64,80.96±4.75,81.26±
    4.47,83.58±3.99,78.81±4.78,76.34±4.93,83.04±4.01
39 player_00008,82.47±4.22,84.73±3.92,88.17±3.28,85.52±4.20,86.65±
    3.79,86.89±3.57,84.53±4.22,82.13±4.38,86.41±3.59
40 player_00009,84.05±4.20,83.74±4.12,88.28±3.19,84.21±4.31,84.58±
    4.13,86.08±3.58,83.68±4.23,81.56±4.48,86.50±3.46
41 ```
42
43 ---
44
45 ### 2. **Fusion Objective**
46
47 Given the input category (e.g., `"Background"`), your task is to **
    generate a single, comprehensive response** that best represents
    the collective strengths of the input answers. Your synthesis must
    follow these principles:
48
49 * **Advantage/Disadvantage Reasoning**:  

50 Use the evaluation scores not only to favor strong responses but
    also to guide the **direction** of content.
51
52 * Leverage highly rated player contributions to reinforce strengths.
53 * Be aware of lower-rated dimensions to **avoid pitfalls**,
    omissions, or weaknesses exhibited in certain answers.
54 * Use uncertainty to calibrate trust: higher uncertainty implies
    greater variability and less reliability.
55
56 * **Confidence-Weighted Aggregation**:  

57 Prioritize content from players with **higher scores and lower
    uncertainties** in the relevant subdimensions of the given
    category.
58
59 * **No Verbatim Copying**:  

60 Do not directly reuse or replicate any single player's response.
    Instead, construct a new response that thoughtfully integrates the
    best elements across multiple inputs.
61
62 * **Logical and Scientific Integrity**:  

63 Ensure the fused answer is:
64

```

```
65 * Logically coherent,  
66 * Scientifically rigorous,  
67 * Creatively articulated.  
68  
69 * **Single Output Format**:  
70   Return exactly one final answer, using a single JSON key that  
71     matches the input category.  
72  
72 ===== Completion =====
```

Figure 20: Prompt for Singletask Fusion Agent.