
THE-Tree: Can Tracing Historical Evolution Enhance Scientific Verification and Reasoning?

Xin Wang^{1,2} Jiyao Liu^{2,4} Yulong Xiao⁵ Junzhi Ning^{2,6} Lihao Liu² Junjun He²
 Botian Shi^{2,3*} Kaicheng Yu^{1,3*}

¹Westlake University ²Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory ³Shanghai Innovation Institute
⁴Fudan University ⁵Fuzhou University ⁶Imperial College London

 Homepage  Code

{wangxin82, kyu}@westlake.edu.cn, shibotian@pjlab.org.cn

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are accelerating scientific idea generation, but rigorously evaluating these numerous, often superficial, AI-generated propositions for novelty and factual accuracy is a critical bottleneck; manual verification is too slow. Existing validation methods are inadequate: LLMs as standalone verifiers may hallucinate and lack domain knowledge (our findings show 60% unawareness of relevant papers in specific domains), while traditional citation networks lack explicit causality and narrative surveys are unstructured. This underscores a core challenge: the absence of structured, verifiable, and causally-linked historical data of scientific evolution. To address this, we introduce **THE-Tree** (Technology History Evolution Tree), a computational framework that constructs such domain-specific evolution trees from scientific literature. THE-Tree employs a search algorithm to explore evolutionary paths. During its node expansion, it utilizes a novel "Think-Verbalize-Cite-Verify" process: an LLM proposes potential advancements and cites supporting literature. Critically, each proposed evolutionary link is then validated for logical coherence and evidential support by a recovered natural language inference mechanism that interrogates the cited literature, ensuring that each step is grounded. We construct and validate 88 THE-Trees across diverse domains and release a benchmark dataset including up to 71k fact verifications covering 27k papers to foster further research. Experiments demonstrate that i) in graph completion, our THE-Tree improves hit@1 by 8% to 14% across multiple models compared to traditional citation networks; ii) for predicting future scientific developments, it improves hit@1 metric by nearly 10%; and iii) when combined with other methods, it boosts the performance of evaluating important scientific papers by almost 100%. By constructing explicit, verifiable pathways of scientific progression, THE-Tree provides a robust historical foundation for evaluating new hypotheses (human or AI-generated) and enables a computable science history, fostering evidence-based AI-driven scientific discovery.

1 Introduction

Automating scientific discovery has been a long-standing goal [22, 18]. The recent rise of Large Language Models (LLMs) offers new avenues, with applications from hypothesis generation [35, 5, 3] to simulating autonomous AI scientists [8, 6]. However, a critical bottleneck remains: the effective evaluation and validation of scientific ideas, whether AI or human-generated.

*Corresponding Author




Figure 1: **Overview of THE-Tree.** (1) Limitations of existing data structures (publication databases, citation networks) for scientific idea generation versus THE-Tree’s approach of constructing historical reasoning connections by screening important scientific history nodes and building pathways between them. (2) Methods for verifying LLM-generated ideas: implicit LLM-based cycle-review, human evaluation, and explicit THE-Tree-enhanced LLM verification. (3) Comparison of verification methods, highlighting issues like fact missing in LLM-only approaches, high cost in human evaluation, and THE-Tree’s use of verifiable historical facts and scientific reasoning trajectories. (4) Performance improvements with THE-Tree in different tasks

Current idea validation approaches face several critical challenges. First, manual verification, while ideal, is prohibitively time-consuming [28]. Second, automated validation using LLMs [17, 3] exhibits multiple limitations: (1) potential for hallucination and incomplete domain knowledge (our findings show 60% unawareness of relevant papers in specific domains), (2) susceptibility to superficial textual features, often highly rating plausible but erroneous propositions [28, 35], and (3) inheritance of biases when trained on human review data (e.g., CycleReviewer [34]). Third, existing knowledge representation methods are inadequate, as (1) citation networks [7, 16] contain noise and lack explicit causal links, and (2) narrative surveys remain unstructured. These limitations fundamentally stem from the absence of structured, causally linked historical data, hindering reliable AI-driven idea validation. These challenges stem from a critical absence of structured, causally linked historical data, hindering reliable AI-driven validation of ideas.

To address this, we propose leveraging the authentic patterns and causal evolutionary pathways from scientific history for more reliable assessment. We introduce **THE-Tree (Technology History Evolution Tree)**, a computational framework to construct structured, verifiable, domain-specific technology evolution trees from scientific literature (illustrated in Figure 1). THE-Tree builds a topic’s evolution by representing individual papers as nodes and the inferential relationships between these papers, specific to the topic, as edges. This aims to provide a solid factual basis and clear historical context for evaluating new hypotheses.

THE-Tree utilizes a Self-Guided Temporal Monte Carlo Tree Search (SGT-MCTS) and a novel Think-Verbalize-Cite-Verify (TVCV) methodology for node expansion. This process prompts an LLM to generate potential evolutionary steps (Think), summarize them concisely (Verbalize), ground them in specific supporting literature (Cite), and critically, validate the proposed relationship (Verify). Crucially, the ‘Verify’ step employs a Retrieval-Augmented Natural Language Inference (RA-NLI) mechanism to assess the causal and logical coherence of proposed relationships based on cited evidence, ensuring semantic soundness and fidelity of the identified evolutionary relationships. Tree construction often starts from human-validated knowledge like scientific surveys, providing a reliable starting point.

We demonstrate THE-Tree’s efficacy by constructing trees for 88 distinct topics across relevant scientific domains. Their quality, validated by automated metrics and human assessment, confirms their effectiveness in reconstructing meaningful and accurate technological trajectories. Downstream tasks, including future node prediction and graph completion, showcase THE-Tree’s potential to enhance AI-assisted scientific reasoning by anticipating subsequent developments and highlight its superiority over traditional citation networks. For instance, in graph completion, it outperforms traditional citation networks (e.g., on hit@1 across all tested models); for future node and trajectory prediction, it improves hit@1 by nearly 10%; and in paper evaluation, it enhances the ability of other models to assess important papers by almost 100%. In summary, our main contributions are:

- A novel computational framework, THE-Tree, incorporating the TVCV methodology with LLM-guided SGT-MCTS to construct and validate verifiable technology evolution trees from scientific literature, addressing the lack of structured, causal historical data for scientific evaluation.
- A RA-NLI mechanism within TVCV for rigorous validation of the logical and causal coherence of evolutionary relationships, ensuring tree fidelity.
- The construction and validation of THE-Trees dataset, comprising 88 technology evolution trees across AI domains and a benchmark dataset of 71k fact verification evaluations from 27k scientific papers, with extensive experiments demonstrating superior performance in downstream tasks.
- A structured, verifiable foundation based on historical evolution patterns for evaluating scientific ideas (both human and AI-generated) and supporting grounded AI-driven discovery processes, enabling systematic assessment of scientific progress.

2 Related Work

Our work intersects with several research areas, primarily AI for scientific discovery, scholarly knowledge representation, and the evaluation of scientific novelty.

AI for Scientific Discovery and Evaluation. The ambition to automate scientific discovery using AI has gained significant momentum with the rise of LLMs [19, 20]. Current applications range from hypothesis generation [35, 5, 3] to simulating autonomous AI agents for specific scientific tasks [8, 6]. A persistent challenge, as highlighted in our Introduction, is the rigorous evaluation of the novelty and feasibility of AI-generated outputs. Manual verification remains a bottleneck [13]. While some emerging efforts aim to automate aspects of this evaluation, they often focus on simulating existing human processes [17, 24, 34]. For instance, CycleResearcher [34] employs an LLM within an automated research-review loop to mimic peer review by predicting scores and providing feedback. Although valuable for replicating current assessment workflows, such approaches primarily model established paradigms and may not provide the deep. Our work complements these efforts by focusing on constructing the underlying historical structure itself, offering a fact-based pathway for evaluation grounded in demonstrable scientific lineage.

Scholarly Knowledge Representation and Analysis. Representing and analyzing the vast body of scientific literature has long been a goal. Traditional bibliometric methods, including citation analysis [14, 29] and co-word analysis [10], offer insights into publication impact and thematic trends. Science mapping tools like VOSviewer [32] and CiteSpace [11] provide valuable visualizations of research landscapes. However, as noted in our Introduction, these approaches face limitations. Citation networks are often noisy and fail to capture the explicit causal or logical dependencies signifying true intellectual inheritance [7], making them a "poor substrate for tracing idea lineage". Co-word analysis identifies term co-occurrence but not necessarily causal links. While useful for broad overviews, these methods generally lack the granularity and causal structure needed for deep reasoning about technological evolution or predictive analysis of research trajectories.

Scholarly Knowledge Graphs. More recently, large-scale scholarly knowledge graphs, such as the Microsoft Academic Knowledge Graph [33] and AMiner [30], have emerged, integrating diverse metadata. Knowledge graph construction techniques [2] have also been applied to scientific literature. While these graphs offer rich resources, they often focus on entity relationships (e.g., author collaborations, affiliations) or represent relatively static snapshots of knowledge domains. They typically do not explicitly model the dynamic, temporal, and causal evolutionary pathways of scientific ideas – how one concept or technology directly enables or influences the next. Capturing this validated, directed evolution is precisely the gap THE-Tree aims to fill.

3 THE-Tree as Scientific Verifier

3.1 THE-Tree: A Structured Representation of Scientific Evolution

The pursuit of scientific discovery is increasingly aided by AI, yet verifying the novelty and validity of numerous AI-generated or human-conceived hypotheses presents a significant bottleneck, as highlighted in our Abstract and Introduction. Traditional methods like citation networks lack the necessary semantic depth (i.e., the relationship between nodes is often limited to a simple "cite"

declaration), offering only noisy and superficial links (e.g., perfunctory citations, negative citations, or citations to general background rather than specific conceptual building blocks), while LLMs as standalone verifiers can hallucinate or miss crucial domain knowledge (our experiments indicate that large models may exhibit factual omissions or fabrications in nearly 60% of cases when used for direct verification). This underscores the urgent need for a structured, verifiable, and causally-linked representation of scientific evolution.

To address this challenge, we introduce the **THE-Tree (Technology History Evolution Tree)**. In a THE-Tree, each scientific paper is conceptualized as a **node**. Each node encapsulates rich metadata crucial for understanding the paper’s context, contribution, and significance. This information typically includes the paper’s title, abstract, authors, publication venue, and publication year. Furthermore, each node v is associated with a computationally derived importance score S_v , reflecting its relevance and impact within the specific domain, as will be detailed in Section 3.3.1.

The **edges** in a THE-Tree represent the **historical, inferential, and evolutionary relationships** between these paper nodes (see Figure 3).

Unlike traditional citation networks, where an edge might merely indicate a citation without specifying the nature of the relationship, edges in THE-Tree are imbued with deeper semantic meaning. They are constructed to signify how one paper (or the ideas and technologies presented therein) causally contributes to, logically enables, or provides an essential foundation for the advancements detailed in a subsequent, connected paper. This distinction is critical. While traditional citation links are valuable, they are often too simplistic or noisy (e.g., perfunctory citations, negative citations, or citations to general background rather than specific conceptual building blocks) to accurately map the nuanced, multi-step evolution of scientific ideas. Our methodology, further detailed in Section 3.3.1 (referring to SGT-MCTS and TVCV parts), therefore focuses on identifying and establishing edges that reflect substantive intellectual lineage and direct technological dependence, aiming to filter out superficial connections and capture the true pathways of innovation. THE-Tree thus facilitates a more evidence-based approach to scientific idea validation.

The primary purpose of constructing and utilizing THE-Trees is to provide a **structured, verifiable, and causally-linked historical tapestry of scientific evolution** for specific domains. This detailed, graph-based representation serves as a robust knowledge scaffold. It allows new scientific propositions—whether generated by humans or AI—to be situated within an explicit, evidence-backed evolutionary context. By tracing connections and analyzing pathways within the THE-Tree, we can more rigorously assess a new idea’s novelty (i.e., does it genuinely extend or diverge from known paths?), its factual consistency with established knowledge, and its potential impact, thereby addressing the limitations of standalone LLM evaluators and often unstructured narrative surveys. THE-Tree thus facilitates a more evidence-based approach to scientific idea validation.

3.2 Leveraging THE-Tree for Scientific Idea Verification

Once a THE-Tree, with its richly annotated nodes and semantically meaningful edges, is constructed for a specific scientific domain, it serves as a powerful instrument for the verification and contextualization of new scientific ideas or papers. We propose a straightforward yet effective methodology to utilize THE-Tree for this purpose, enabling the retrospection of relevant historical evolutionary paths for a given input scientific paper, P_{in} , defined by its title T_{in} and abstract A_{in} . This approach provides critical context by situating new research within established knowledge frameworks, thereby aiding in the assessment of its novelty and potential contribution.

The core steps of this verification and retrospection process are as follows:

1. **Initialization:** This methodology assumes access to:
 - A collection of pre-computed THE-Trees $\{G_k\}$, where each $G_k = (V_k, E_k)$ corresponds to a specific scientific topic $Topic_k$. Nodes $v \in V_k$ represent scientific papers with attributes such as publication year Y_v , title T_v , abstract A_v , and an importance score S_v , as defined in Section 3.1. Edges $e \in E_k$ signify directed evolutionary relationships, capturing inferential and developmental dependencies.
 - A Large Language Model (LLM) for semantic tasks such as similarity assessment and topic matching.




Figure 2: A simple way to explicitly use THE-tree

2. **Topic Space Identification:** For the input paper P_{in} , a set of N_T most relevant topics, $\mathcal{T}_{P_{in}} = \{Topic_1, \dots, Topic_{N_T}\}$, is identified from the available THE-Tree topics. This involves prompting an LLM with T_{in} , A_{in} , and the list of all THE-Tree topic names to determine the most appropriate THE-Tree(s) for situating P_{in} .
3. **Candidate Path Origination in Relevant THE-Trees:** For each identified topic $Topic_k \in \mathcal{T}_{P_{in}}$ and its corresponding THE-Tree G_k :
 - (a) Identify a candidate set of M_k recent papers $\{v_{k,j}\} \subset V_k$ from G_k based on publication year $Y_{v_{k,j}}$ (e.g., papers published within a certain recent time window or up to the year of P_{in} if known).
 - (b) Calculate a semantic similarity score $Sim(P_{in}, v_{k,j}) \in [0, 1]$ between the input paper P_{in} (using its title and abstract) and each candidate $v_{k,j}$ (using its stored title and abstract) using an LLM or other embedding-based techniques.
 - (c) Select the top N_S papers from these candidates, denoted $\mathcal{S}_k = \{v_{k,1}^*, \dots, v_{k,N_S}^*\}$, that exhibit a similarity score $Sim(P_{in}, v_{k,l}^*) \geq \theta_{sim}$, where θ_{sim} is a predefined minimum similarity threshold. These papers $v_{k,l}^*$ serve as terminal nodes (or "entry points") for backward path tracing within the THE-Tree, representing the most closely related established works to P_{in} .
4. **Historical Path Retrospection:** For each selected terminal paper $v_{term}^* \in \mathcal{S}_k$ in graph G_k :
 - A historical path $Path_{k,l} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n = v_{term}^*)$ is constructed by iteratively selecting predecessors. This path traces the lineage of v_{term}^* backward through the THE-Tree.
 - Starting from $v_{curr} = v_{term}^*$, the predecessor v_{pred}^* is chosen from the set of all predecessors $Pred(v_{curr})$ (i.e., nodes from which an edge points to v_{curr}) according to the lexicographical optimization that prioritizes strong evolutionary links and historical relevance:
$$v_{pred}^* = \arg \min_{v \in Pred(v_{curr}), Y_v \leq Y_{v_{curr}}} ((Y_{v_{curr}} - Y_v), -S_v)$$

This heuristic prioritizes the predecessor with the smallest non-negative time difference $(Y_{v_{curr}} - Y_v)$, reflecting direct chronological succession, and secondarily, the one with the highest importance score S_v , indicating significant contributions. The use of node attributes Y_v (year) and S_v (importance) from the THE-Tree structure is central here.
 - Traversal continues backward until no valid predecessor (respecting chronological order and edge semantics) is found, a predefined maximum path length is exceeded, or a root node of the THE-Tree (a node with no predecessors in the context of this path's history) is reached. The resulting path is then presented in chronological order from the earliest paper to v_{term}^* .
5. **Path Aggregation and Presentation:** All generated paths $\{Path_{k,l}\}$ are collected. They can be ranked based on various criteria, such as the semantic similarity score $Sim(P_{in}, v_{term}^*)$ of their terminal nodes to the input paper P_{in} , the cumulative importance of nodes in the path, or the overall coherence of the path. The top N_P unique paths are selected and formatted for presentation. This presentation details the sequence of papers,

their key attributes (title, year, summary of contribution derived from abstract/node info), and the nature of the connecting evolutionary relationships.

This methodology provides a simple yet powerful way to leverage the structured knowledge within THE-Trees to verify a new scientific idea by exploring its historical context and connections to established research. The retrieved paths can highlight the foundations upon which P_{in} builds, identify potentially overlooked prior art, or help assess its incremental novelty versus a more radical departure from existing trajectories. Users can adapt this general approach based on specific analytical needs, such as modifying the LLM prompts, similarity thresholds, path selection heuristics, or the depth of retrospection.

3.3 Automated Construction of THE-Tree

The manual construction of comprehensive and accurate THE-Trees for diverse scientific domains would be a prohibitively laborious task. Therefore, we develop a computational framework for the automated construction of THE-Trees from scientific literature. Our approach formulates this construction as an optimization problem: the goal is to identify and assemble evolutionary paths through the literature that maximize a composite reward. This reward is designed to reflect the significance of the constituent papers (nodes) and the logical coherence and evidential support of the evolutionary steps (edges) they represent:

$$\max_{\text{Path}} \left(\sum_{v \in \text{Path}} S(v) + R_{\text{gen}} + R_{\text{attr}} \right), \quad (1)$$

where $S(v)$ is the importance score of a node (paper) v (see Section 3.3.1 for how $S(v)$ is determined), R_{gen} is the generation process reward reflecting the coherence of the path (how well a new node continues an existing path), and R_{attr} is the attribution process reward validating the evidential support for the link (edge) between connected nodes. This objective is pursued using a Self-Guided Temporal Monte Carlo Tree Search (SGT-MCTS) algorithm, as detailed in the pipeline stages below.

3.3.1 THE-Tree Construction Pipeline Overview

The construction of a THE-Tree involves several key stages, from initial data preparation to the iterative refinement of the tree structure. Figure 3 provides a schematic overview of this pipeline.




Figure 3: **THE-Tree construction overview.** (a) Extracting chunks and references from surveys to build an initial concept graph structure; (b) Generating a structured knowledge tree using the SGT-MCTS algorithm, guided by the TVCV methodology for node expansion and RA-NLI for relationship validation.

Dataset Construction: Initialization and Foundation. The journey of constructing a THE-Tree begins with scientific surveys. These documents are invaluable as they encapsulate rich historical and inferential information about scientific progression, making them an ideal starting point for tracing technological evolution. However, directly utilizing raw surveys presents challenges due to their predominantly unstructured narrative format, lacking the explicit relational information needed for a computational model. To address this, our first crucial step is to transform these surveys into a structured dataset. We strategically select surveys from diverse time periods for each topic to mitigate recency bias and capture a broader, less noisy historical perspective. The core output of this stage is an interconnected dataset comprising survey documents, identified paper nodes (from citations within

the surveys), concept nodes (core ideas extracted from paragraphs), and their explicit relationships. This structured foundation overcomes the limitations of raw narratives and noisy citation networks, enabling the detailed construction of technology evolution histories. Further details on this data construction pipeline are elaborated in Appendix A.2.

Core Component: Self-Guided Temporal Monte Carlo Tree Search (SGT-MCTS). With the structured dataset (Section 3.3.1) as our bedrock, we employ a Self-Guided Temporal Monte Carlo Tree Search (SGT-MCTS) [9] algorithm to navigate the vast space of potential technological evolutionary paths and construct the THE-Tree. SGT-MCTS iteratively builds the tree by strategically selecting nodes for expansion, simulating potential future paths, and backpropagating rewards to update the value of explored paths (see Algorithm 1). The search is guided by the composite reward function introduced earlier (Equation 1: $S(v) + R_{\text{gen}} + R_{\text{attr}}$), which balances node importance with path coherence and link validity.

Central to the SGT-MCTS guidance are the node importance assessment and generation process reward:

LLM-Enhanced Node Importance Assessment ($S(v)$): The importance of a paper (node v) is a weighted combination of its structural significance within the citation graph and its semantic relevance as assessed by an LLM: $S(v) = \gamma \cdot S_{\text{graph}}(v) + (1 - \gamma) \cdot S_{\text{LLM}}(v)$, where γ is a weighting factor. $S_{\text{graph}}(v)$ combines multiple centrality measures (PageRank, citation count, Degree, Betweenness, Eigenvector Centrality) with dynamic weighting. $S_{\text{LLM}}(v)$ is obtained by prompting an LLM to assess the paper’s importance within the specified topic.

Generation Process Reward (R_{gen}): This reward encourages the formation of coherent and temporally sound evolutionary paths. It is defined for a node v given a preceding path P_{prev} : $R_{\text{gen}}(v|P_{\text{prev}}) = \text{DPO}(v|P_{\text{prev}}) \cdot \text{TemporalCoherence}(v|P_{\text{prev}})$. The DPO score [27], approximated by an LLM, evaluates how well node v continues the trajectory of P_{prev} . The Temporal Coherence term penalizes achronological or large time gaps. The SGT-MCTS UCT formula is enhanced with LLM guidance and temporal coherence:

The selection of nodes during the SGT-MCTS process is guided by an Upper Confidence Bound 1 applied to Trees (UCT) formula [21]. Our SGT-UCT variant, presented below, incorporates LLM guidance and temporal coherence to refine this selection:

$$\text{SGT-UCT}(v) = \left(\frac{Q(v)}{N(v)} + c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\ln N(p)}{N(v)}} + \lambda \cdot \text{LLM}_{\text{priority}}(v) \right) \cdot \text{TempCoherence}(v|P_{\text{prev}}) \quad (2)$$

In this formula (Equation 2), $Q(v)/N(v)$ is the exploitation component (empirical mean reward of node v). The term $c \cdot \sqrt{\ln N(p)/N(v)}$ is the exploration component, encouraging visits to less explored nodes ($N(p)$ is parent visit count, $N(v)$ is current node visit count). $\text{LLM}_{\text{priority}}(v)$ injects semantic guidance from an LLM. The entire expression is modulated by $\text{TempCoherence}(v|P_{\text{prev}})$ to enforce chronological path consistency. Constants c and λ are balancing hyperparameters.

We also implement reward-sensitive exploration where the exploration coefficient $c(t)$ increases with the average reward, encouraging broader exploration in promising regions.

Node Expansion Method: Think-Verbalize-Cite-Verify (TVCV) Methodology. Node expansion within SGT-MCTS, the process of adding new paper nodes and establishing connections (edges with rich semantic meaning as discussed in Section 3.1), is performed using our novel Think-Verbalize-Cite-Verify (TVCV) methodology (see Algorithm 2). This process leverages an LLM to systematically generate, ground, and validate new nodes (potential technological advancements) and their links within the tree:

- **Think:** The LLM generates candidate technological advancements or scientific contributions that could logically follow from the current path history and domain knowledge.
- **Verbalize:** The LLM summarizes these generated ideas into concise statements or propositions that represent potential new nodes.
- **Cite:** For each summarized proposition, the LLM retrieves or identifies specific supporting scientific literature (i.e., existing paper nodes from the dataset or newly found papers) that grounds the proposed advancement, thereby proposing a potential link between an existing paper node and a new one.
- **Verify:** The proposed relationship (edge) between the current path’s terminal node and the newly cited paper node, along with the relevance of the new node itself, is rigorously validated for logical consistency, causal

coherence, and temporal soundness. This crucial step ensures the factual and logical soundness of the link, and is performed by the RA-NLI mechanism described in Section 3.3.1.




Figure 4: **Overview of RA-NLI process.** This figure illustrates the RA-NLI process, including citation existence verification, document retrieval, and semantic relation assessment using NLI and LLM, which forms the core of the *Verify* step in TVCV and the R_{attr} calculation.

Relationship Validation: Retrieval-Augmented Natural Language Inference (RA-NLI) Mechanism. The critical *Verify* step of the TVCV methodology (Section 3.3.1), and the basis for the attribution process reward (R_{attr}) in Equation 1, is performed by our Retrieval-Augmented Natural Language Inference (RA-NLI) mechanism. RA-NLI is designed to rigorously assess the causal and logical coherence of the evolutionary link (edge) proposed between a parent node (e.g., v_{parent}) and a newly cited child node (v),

$$R_{\text{attr}}(v_{\text{parent}} \rightarrow v) = \text{RA-NLI}(s_{\text{parent}}, s_v) \quad (3)$$

This mechanism (illustrated in Figure 4) integrates embedding-based retrieval to fetch relevant contextual passages from the cited documents, followed by fine-grained Natural Language Inference using a specialized model (f_{NLI}) to determine if the textual description of the child node (s_v) is entailed, contradicted by, or neutral with respect to the parent node’s description (s_{parent}) and supporting evidence. An LLM-based verifier (f_{LLM}) further refines ambiguous cases. This ensures semantic soundness and high fidelity for the identified evolutionary relationships, forming the backbone of the THE-Tree’s verifiability.

Algorithm 1 SGT-MCTS Implementation

Input: Root node representing the starting technology concept
Output: Comprehensive technology evolution tree

- 1: Initialize the tree with the root node
- 2: **while** not converged **do**
- 3: **Select:** Choose promising node
- 4: node \leftarrow select(root) \triangleright SGT-UCT scoring (Eq. 2)
- 5: **Expand:** Generate new technology nodes
- 6: new_nodes \leftarrow expand(node) \triangleright TVCV methodology (Alg. 2, Sec. 3.3.1)
- 7: **Simulate:** Evaluate potential paths
- 8: reward \leftarrow simulate(new_nodes) \triangleright Sample-based evaluation
- 9: **Backpropagate:** Update statistics
- 10: backpropagate(node, reward) \triangleright Improve future selection
- 11: **end while**
- 12:
- 13: **return** Constructed technology tree

Algorithm 2 TVCV Node Expansion

Input: Path history, domain knowledge
Output: Validated technology node

- 1: **Think:** Generate candidate technology T using LLM
- 2: $T \sim P_{\text{LLM}}(\cdot \mid \text{Path, domain knowledge})$
- 3: **Verbalize:** Summarize into concise statement
- 4: $s_v \leftarrow$ Summarize(T)
- 5: **Cite:** Retrieve supporting documents
- 6: $D \leftarrow$ Retrieve(s_v)
- 7: **Validate:** Verify logical and temporal coherence
- 8: $\text{Validate}(s_v, D) = \text{RA-NLI}(s_v, D) \wedge \text{TemporalCheck}(D) \triangleright$ RA-NLI detailed in Sec. 3.3.1
- 9: **if** Validation successful **then**
- 10: **return** validated node
- 11: **else**
- 12: Reject and restart expansion
- 13: **end if**

4 Experiments and Results

For detailed information on dataset construction, statistics, and the definitions of evaluation metrics, please refer to Appendix B.1 and Appendix B.3 respectively.

4.1 THE-Tree Verifier for Scientific Evaluation

Further experiments are conducted to investigate whether THE-Tree can enhance the verification capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) for evaluating scientific claims and research contributions. We employ a straightforward methodology, leveraging the structural and semantic information within THE-Trees to augment LLM-based assessments. This approach is detailed in Appendix C. These investigations focus on two primary scenarios:

- **Assessing Paper Acceptance with Factual Grounding:** We evaluate whether the factual basis provided by THE-Tree can assist in determining if a paper merits acceptance. To avoid potential data contamination, as

our THE-Tree might include previously published conference papers, the experiments involving THE-Tree augmentation were conducted exclusively on submissions to NeurIPS 2024. The core idea is to assess if grounding a paper’s claims and contributions within the historical and causal context of a THE-Tree correlates with acceptance decisions.

- **Identifying High-Quality Papers Among Accepted Submissions:** For papers that are accepted, we further investigate if THE-Tree can aid in distinguishing truly high-impact or high-quality research from other accepted works. This involves analyzing whether deeper integration or stronger alignment with the evolutionary trajectories and validated knowledge within THE-Tree can serve as an indicator of superior quality among the pool of accepted papers.

Table 1: **Impact of THE-Tree Augmentation on LLM-based NeurIPS Paper Evaluation.** The table compares the performance of various LLMs in predicting paper acceptance/rejection and status (Poster, Spotlight, Oral) for NeurIPS 2023 and NeurIPS 2024. For the NeurIPS 2024 dataset, results are presented with and without THE-Tree augmentation to demonstrate its effect on evaluation accuracy. Performance is evaluated using standard metrics (see Appendix B.3).

Model	NeurIPS 2023							NeurIPS 2024						
	Accuracy of accept and reject			Accuracy of Status				Accuracy of accept and reject			Accuracy of Status			
	Acc%	Rej%	Total%	Poster%	Spot%	Oral%	Total	Acc%	Rej%	Total%	Poster%	Spot%	Oral%	Total%
Qwen2.5-72b-instruct	99.48	0.52	26.34	3.59	100	0	3.38	99.63	0	25.70	1.24	100	0	2.42
Deep-Reviewer-14b	93.70	16.06	36.32	73.65	31.82	0	29.59	92.61	18.28	37.45	74.03	22.77	6.94	31.03
Deep-Reviewer-7b	83.94	18.75	35.76	57.49	18.18	0	27.54	86.79	19.78	37.07	60.42	19.05	0	28.9
GPT4-O	99.48	2.59	27.88	30.54	90.91	0	10.95	99.63	2.24	26.02	29.46	86.96	0	10.26
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	99.75	0.52	26.42	6.27	55	44.16	3.38	99.75	0.38	27.28	10.90	77.96	18.57	4.59
Deepseek-R1	99.57	3.42	28.51	54.49	52.66	0	16.27	100.0	2.00	26.03	54.13	53.31	0	15.00
With THE-tree Augmentation														
Qwen2.5-72b-instruct_tree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99.84	0.37	26.03	1.76	97.38	0	2.76
Deep-Reviewer-14b_tree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89.93	22.39	39.82	63.2	34.55	34.72	32.08
Deep-Reviewer-7b_tree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76.12	63.69	66.90	57	24.99	2.33	60.84
GPT4-O_tree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99.66	2.66	27.69	34.45	72	2.6	11.41
Claude-3.5-Sonnet_tree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71.46	36.57	45.57	28.72	38.13	36.57	34.81
Deepseek-R1_tree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99.57	3.42	28.23	56.49	56.66	2.6	16.68

The experimental results from the NeurIPS 2024 dataset for THE-Tree augmented evaluations are presented in Table 1. These findings indicate that by providing the scientific evolutionary context, THE-Tree significantly enhances the LLM’s capability to determine paper acceptance. This augmentation notably improves the model’s ability to reject low-quality submissions, rather than indiscriminately accepting them. Furthermore, THE-Tree augmentation proves highly effective in identifying high-impact papers, Orals, Spotlights. This enhancement substantially boosts the LLM’s recognition capability for such papers, in some instances nearly doubling the accuracy or pushing it towards perfect identification in specific high-impact categories. For a detailed analysis and case study on the enhancement provided by THE-Tree, particularly for the DeepReviewer-14b model, please refer to Appendix C.1.

4.2 THE-Tree Quality Validation

4.2.1 Effectiveness of Technology Trajectory Reconstruction

To validate THE-Tree’s effectiveness in reconstructing meaningful, accurate technology development trajectories, we conducted comprehensive quantitative evaluations against expert-refined ground truth. The methodology for constructing this expert-refined ground truth dataset is detailed in Appendix B.2.

In our RA-NLI-based validation system, we compared its accuracy and fact consistency against several state-of-the-art models, both with and without factual supplementation. As shown in Table 2, our method demonstrates significantly lower fact-missing rates and the highest overall accuracy.

To evaluate the fact missing rate and NLI validation capability of our RA-NLI system, we conducted experiments on a dataset of 71k fact verifications covering 27k papers. This dataset was extracted from scientific papers and includes fact titles along with their corresponding evidence content from the original text. We compared RA-NLI’s accuracy and fact consistency against several state-of-the-art models, both with and without factual supplementation. As shown in Table 2, our method demonstrates significantly lower fact-missing rates and the highest overall accuracy.

Table 2: **Comparison of Methods for Technology Tree Relationship Verification**

Method	Fact Missing Rate (%)	Accuracy (%)
Claude 3.5 Sonnet [1]	47.93	60.22
GPT-4o [26]	58.19	60.18
DeepSeek R1 [15]	48.16	76.40
Qwen 2.5-72B [31]	58.29	53.95
DeepReviewer-7B [36]	40.88	93.95
DeepReviewer-14B [36]	68.84	76.41
LLaMA 3.1 [25]	42.29	60.40
Factual Supplement		
Claude 3.5 Sonnet w/ Fact	-	65.34
GPT-4o w/ Fact	-	69.40
DeepSeek R1 w/ Fact	-	81.60
Qwen 2.5-72B w/ Fact	-	66.80
DeepReviewer-7B w/ Fact	-	95.38
DeepReviewer-14B w/ Fact	-	82.09
LLaMA 3.1 w/ Fact	-	65.35
RA-NLI (Ours)	4.75	95.60

The MCTS-generated THE-Trees are compared against this ground truth using several quantitative metrics; these metrics are detailed in Appendix B.3. Table 3 summarizes these quantitative results, demonstrating that the MCTS-generated THE-Trees achieve strong performance in recalling entities and relations validated by experts, with reasonable precision and F1-scores. The average time difference in years for entity reconstruction is also comparable.

Table 3: **Quantitative Comparison of THE-Tree Reconstruction Quality (MCTS-generated) against Expert-Refined Ground Truth.** The methodology for constructing this expert-refined ground truth dataset is detailed in Appendix B.2. Metrics assess the ability to reconstruct entities (papers) and their evolutionary relations across the 88 topics.

Method	Entity				Relation		
	Recall	Precision	F1	Avg_Time_Diff	Recall	Precision	F1
Expert	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.93	1.00	1.00	1.00
THE-Tree	0.84	0.67	0.75	3.08	0.78	0.64	0.70

4.2.2 Structural and Semantic Properties: Graph Completion

We evaluated THE-Tree’s ability to represent scientific knowledge structures via a graph completion task (Table 4). By using the graph completion method from [23], this task involved predicting missing evolutionary entities within our THE-Tree by masking entities from a given year. The entities and relations from before that year, as historical information, were then used to predict the masked entities and their relations. This process benchmarked whether our THE-Tree could capture richer structural and semantic information compared to traditional citation-based networks. As detailed in Table 4, THE-Tree robustly outperformed traditional citation graphs, particularly in models with larger sizes, such as Qwen2.5-72b. This was evidenced by consistently higher prediction accuracy across metrics from Hit@1 through Hit@5, along with significantly improved mean reciprocal ranks (MRR) and notably lower median and mean ranks (MR). These results highlight THE-Tree’s superior efficacy in modelling latent knowledge structures between entities.

Table 4: **Comparison of Graph Completion Performance Between THE-Tree and Traditional Citation Graphs.** Detailed definitions of the evaluation metrics (Hit@k, MR, MedianRank, MRR) can be found in Appendix B.3.

Model	Hit@1 (↑)	Hit@2 (↑)	Hit@3 (↑)	Hit@4 (↑)	Hit@5 (↑)	MR (↓)	MRR (↑)	MedianRank (↓)
Graph built with Traditional Citations Relations								
Qwen2.5-72b	0.5854	0.7665	0.8482	0.8911	0.9113	1.8056	0.7627	1.2713
Qwen2.5-32b	0.2989	0.4833	0.6307	0.7335	0.7956	3.1271	0.5279	2.6232
Qwen2.5-7b	0.2527	0.5211	0.6786	0.7459	0.8097	3.0776	0.5109	2.7537
Gemma-7b	0.1631	0.4254	0.6273	0.7261	0.7863	3.4965	0.4356	3.4039
Gemma-2b	0.1567	0.4793	0.6425	0.7335	0.7939	3.4177	0.4433	3.3276
Graph built with Our Reasoning Relations								
Qwen2.5-72b	0.7214	0.8585	0.9058	0.9212	0.9313	1.4266	0.8593	1.0795
Qwen2.5-32b	0.3707	0.6190	0.7389	0.8109	0.8556	2.5772	0.6049	2.0296
Qwen2.5-7b	0.2586	0.5253	0.7069	0.7687	0.8149	2.9950	0.5214	2.6010
Gemma-7b	0.2405	0.4935	0.6557	0.7367	0.7985	3.2692	0.4896	3.1601
Gemma-2b	0.1564	0.3320	0.4475	0.5227	0.5772	4.7788	0.3738	4.5887

4.3 Future Path and Trajectory Prediction

To assess THE-Tree’s proficiency in capturing scientific evolutionary dynamics, we conducted a future path prediction task. The experiment aims to validate THE-Tree’s depth in modeling historical evolution and its capability to forecast ‘reasonable next steps’ in research trajectories, rather than claiming precise scientific discovery. Performance is evaluated using standard metrics (see Appendix B.3). The task involves predicting future entities (e.g., papers or concepts) and the semantic relations that lead to them, given a THE-Tree constructed with data up to year Y . This forecasting is benchmarked by comparing our semantically-enriched THE-Tree against a traditional citation-only graph, with results presented in Table 5. The citation-only graph shows limited predictive power (Hit@1 \approx 10–18%, MR \approx 4.5), underscoring the inadequacy of relying solely on citation topology for foresight. In contrast, THE-Tree, with its rich, context-aware semantic relations, demonstrates markedly superior performance. It achieves substantial gains, increasing Hit@3 and Hit@5 by approximately 5–10 percentage points, and significantly reduces both Mean Rank (MR) and Median Rank for entity and relation predictions alike. This consistent improvement across metrics highlights that the semantic

signals encoded by THE-Tree, not just its structural density, are pivotal for sharper anticipation of research trajectory extensions. These findings validate the significant value of THE-Tree’s semantic knowledge for scientific foresight and path discovery tasks.

Table 5: **Comparison of THE-Tree and Citation Graph on Future Path Prediction.** Metrics reported for Entity and Relation predictions (see the definition of metrics in Appendix B.3).

Model	Graph	Entity					Relation				
		Hit@1 (↑)	Hit@3 (↑)	Hit@5 (↑)	MR (↓)	MedianRank (↓)	Hit@1 (↑)	Hit@3 (↑)	Hit@5 (↑)	MR (↓)	MedianRank (↓)
Qwen2.5-72b	Citation	0.1831	0.5421	0.7423	3.6210	3.5149	0.1262	0.2940	0.4002	4.5318	4.3731
	THE-tree	0.2813	0.6073	0.7746	3.3961	3.2288	0.1693	0.3143	0.4154	4.2892	4.0547
Qwen2.5-32b	Citation	0.1078	0.4079	0.6189	4.5388	4.3515	0.1452	0.2779	0.3862	4.6621	4.6188
	THE-tree	0.1500	0.4906	0.6894	4.0494	3.9064	0.1522	0.2987	0.4073	4.4674	4.3128
Qwen2.5-7b	Citation	0.1524	0.4941	0.7013	4.0054	3.3903	0.1319	0.2789	0.3859	4.6937	4.6305
	THE-tree	0.2125	0.5675	0.7277	3.7194	3.6262	0.1437	0.2980	0.4033	4.5071	4.3812
Gemma-7b	Citation	0.1652	0.6037	0.7550	3.4445	3.4005	0.1022	0.2610	0.3790	4.8544	4.8632
	THE-tree	0.2431	0.6250	0.7798	3.3706	3.3276	0.1243	0.2674	0.3849	4.7426	4.7069
Gemma-2b	Citation	0.1671	0.5947	0.7541	3.4951	3.4680	0.1062	0.2619	0.3747	4.8881	4.9286
	THE-tree	0.1735	0.5894	0.7445	3.4381	3.4187	0.0896	0.2641	0.3773	4.8912	4.9113

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we introduced the Technology Evolution Tree (THE-Tree), a novel computational framework for constructing structured, verifiable, and causally-linked representations of scientific and technological evolution from literature. THE-Tree addresses critical challenges in evaluating scientific ideas, particularly those generated by AI, by moving beyond traditional bibliometrics and ungrounded LLM evaluations.

Our core contributions include: 1) A robust methodology integrating SGT-MCTS with TVCV and RA-NLI for verifiable tree construction. 2) A novel dataset of 88 THE-Trees covering diverse AI topics. 3) Demonstrated utility through quantitative evaluations, qualitative studies, and downstream tasks, showing THE-Trees’ effectiveness in representing scientific knowledge and predicting its trajectory.

While THE-Tree offers a significant advancement, key limitations that guide our future work include:

- **Data Coverage and Bias:** Reliance on primarily English-language peer-reviewed literature.
- **Granularity and Scope:** Subjectivity in concept definition and a yearly temporal resolution for analysis.
- **Validation Complexity:** Inherent complexity of validating scientific evolution without a universal "gold standard".
- **Computational Cost:** Significant computational demands from extensive LLM usage and large-scale graph processing.

Future work will focus on addressing these limitations and expanding THE-Trees’ capabilities. Key directions include:

- **Enhancing Data Coverage and Representation:** Broadening data sources (e.g., non-English literature, patents, technical reports), refining temporal granularity, and improving representation of diverse research outcomes (e.g., negative results).
- **Improving Validation and Reasoning:** Developing advanced automated validation techniques (e.g., incorporating causal inference), quantifying uncertainty in evolutionary links, and enhancing reasoning capabilities, particularly for understanding underexplored or abandoned research paths.
- **Expanding Applications and Usability:** Creating user-friendly interactive visualization tools, integrating THE-Tree insights into scientific workflows, refining predictive models, and developing cross-disciplinary analysis tools.

By providing a structured, dynamic, and causally validated map of scientific progress, THE-Tree offers a more reliable foundation for understanding scientific evolution, evaluating new ideas, and guiding future research. We believe THE-Tree represents a significant step towards a more transparent, evidence-based, and computationally-assisted approach to navigating and shaping the future of science and technology.

References

[1] Anthropic. Claude 3.5 sonnet. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>, 2024.

[2] Sören Auer and Markus Stocker. Towards a knowledge graph for science. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Semantic Systems*, pages 1–8, 2018.

- [3] Jinheon Baek, Sujay Kumar Jauhar, Silviu Cucerzan, and Sung Ju Hwang. Researchagent: Iterative research idea generation over scientific literature with large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07738](#), 2024.
- [4] Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. Scibert: A pretrained language model for scientific text. [arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10676](#), 2019.
- [5] Daniil A Boiko, Robert MacKnight, and Gabe Gomes. Emergent autonomous scientific research capabilities of large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05332](#), 2023.
- [6] Daniil A Boiko, Robert MacKnight, Ben Kline, and Gabe Gomes. Autonomous chemical research with large language models. *Nature*, 624(7992):570–578, 2023.
- [7] Lutz Bornmann and Hans-Dieter Daniel. What do citation counts measure? a review of studies on citing behavior. *Journal of documentation*, 64(1):45–80, 2008.
- [8] Andres M Bran, Sam Schilter, Philippe Delfosse, Tobias Gensch, Anica Ivanova, Apeksha Thakkar, YooJin Jung, Philippe Schwaller, Alain C Vaucher, Kevin Maik Chang, et al. ChemCrow: Augmenting large-language models with chemistry tools. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05376](#), 2023.
- [9] Cameron B Browne, Edward Powley, Daniel Whitehouse, Simon M Lucas, Peter I Cowling, Philipp Rohlfshagen, Stephen Tavener, Diego Perez, Spyridon Samothrakis, and Simon Colton. A survey of monte carlo tree search methods. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in games*, 4(1):1–43, 2012.
- [10] Michel Callon, John Law, and Arie Rip. Mapping the dynamics of science and technology: Sociology of science in the real world. In *Sociology of science in the real world*. Macmillan London, 1983.
- [11] Chaomei Chen. CiteSpace II: Detecting and visualizing emerging trends and transient patterns in scientific literature. *Journal of the American society for information science and technology*, 57(3):359–377, 2006.
- [12] Michael Färber, Alexander Thiemann, and Adam Jatowt. To cite, or not to cite? detecting citation contexts in text. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: 40th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2018, Grenoble, France, March 26-29, 2018, Proceedings 40*, pages 598–603. Springer, 2018.
- [13] Kasra Ferdowsi, Ruanqianqian Huang, Michael B James, Nadia Polikarpova, and Sorin Lerner. Validating ai-generated code with live programming. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–8, 2024.
- [14] Eugene Garfield. *Citation indexing: Its theory and application in science, technology, and humanities*. Wiley, 1979.
- [15] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-rl: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948](#), 2025.
- [16] Qianyu Hao, Jingyang Fan, Fengli Xu, Jian Yuan, and Yong Li. Hlm-cite: Hybrid language model workflow for text-based scientific citation prediction. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09112](#), 2024.
- [17] Qian Huang, Jian Vora, Percy Liang, and Jure Leskovec. Mlagentbench: Evaluating language agents on machine learning experimentation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03302](#), 2023.
- [18] Marcus Hutter. A theory of universal artificial intelligence based on algorithmic complexity. [arXiv preprint cs/0004001](#), 2000.
- [19] Marcus Hutter. Towards a universal theory of artificial intelligence based on algorithmic probability and sequential decisions. In *Machine Learning: ECML 2001*, pages 226–238. Springer, 2001.
- [20] Peter Jansen, Oyvind Tafjord, Marissa Radensky, Pao Siangliulue, Tom Hope, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Daniel S Weld, and Peter Clark. Codescientist: End-to-end semi-automated scientific discovery with code-based experimentation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.22708](#), 2025.
- [21] Levente Kocsis and Csaba Szepesvári. Bandit based monte-carlo planning. In *European conference on machine learning*, pages 282–293. Springer, 2006.
- [22] Pat Langley. *Scientific discovery: Computational explorations of the creative processes*. MIT press, 1987.
- [23] Dong-Ho Lee, Kian Ahrabian, Woojeong Jin, Fred Morstatter, and Jay Pujara. Temporal knowledge graph forecasting without knowledge using in-context learning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10613](#), 2023.

- [24] Chris Lu, Cong Lu, Robert Tjarko Lange, Jakob Foerster, Jeff Clune, and David Ha. The ai scientist: Towards fully automated open-ended scientific discovery. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06292](#), 2024.
- [25] Meta AI. Introducing llama 3.1: Our most capable models to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3-1/>, 2024.
- [26] OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>, 2024.
- [27] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. [Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems](#), 36:53728–53741, 2023.
- [28] Chenglei Si, Diyi Yang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Can llms generate novel research ideas? a large-scale human study with 100+ nlp researchers. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04109](#), 2024.
- [29] Henry Small. Co-citation in the scientific literature: A new measure of the relationship between two documents. [Journal of the American Society for information Science](#), 24(4):265–269, 1973.
- [30] Jie Tang, Jing Zhang, Limin Yao, Juanzi Li, Li Zhang, and Zhong Su. ArnetMiner: extraction and mining of academic social networks. In [Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining](#), pages 990–998, 2008.
- [31] Qwen Team. Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models, September 2024.
- [32] Nees Jan Van Eck and Ludo Waltman. Software survey: Vosviewer, a computer program for bibliometric mapping. [Scientometrics](#), 84(2):523–538, 2010.
- [33] Kuansan Wang, Zhihong Shen, Chiyuan Huang, Chieh-Han Wu, Darrin Eide, and Yuxiao Dong. Microsoft academic graph: When experts are not enough. In [Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining](#), pages 2846–2854, 2020.
- [34] Yixuan Weng, Minjun Zhu, Guangsheng Bao, Hongbo Zhang, Jindong Wang, Yue Zhang, and Linyi Yang. CycleResearcher: Improving Automated Research via Automated Review. In [International Conference on Learning Representations \(ICLR\)](#), 2025.
- [35] Zonglin Yang, Xinya Du, Junxian Li, Jie Zheng, Soujanya Poria, and Erik Cambria. Large language models for automated open-domain scientific hypotheses discovery. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02726](#), 2023.
- [36] Minjun Zhu, Yixuan Weng, Linyi Yang, and Yue Zhang. Deepreview: Improving llm-based paper review with human-like deep thinking process. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08569](#), 2025.

A Technical Appendices and Supplementary Material

Technical appendices with additional results, figures, graphs and proofs may be submitted with the paper submission before the full submission deadline (see above), or as a separate PDF in the ZIP file below before the supplementary material deadline. There is no page limit for the technical appendices.

A.1 Data Collection and Processing

We collected data from multiple sources, including Web of Science, Scopus, arXiv, IEEE Xplore, and PubMed. The data processing pipeline consisted of the following steps:

1. Metadata extraction: We extracted titles, abstracts, authors, venues, and publication dates using custom parsers for each data source.
2. Citation network construction: We built a directed graph where nodes represent papers and edges represent citation relationships.
3. Text preprocessing: We applied standard NLP preprocessing techniques, including tokenisation, stopword removal, and lemmatisation.
4. Entity recognition: We used a combination of dictionary-based and machine learning approaches to identify technical terms and concepts.
5. Temporal alignment: We aligned papers along a timeline, accounting for publication delays and citation patterns.

To evaluate the accuracy of our metadata extraction component, we measured its precision on two commonly used formatting styles: 98.29% for IEEE format and 97.30% for APA format. These high precision scores demonstrate the robustness of our system in handling different citation conventions.

A.2 Detailed Dataset Construction from Surveys for THE-Trees




Figure 5: Document processing and metadata extraction pipeline applied to curated surveys for THE-Tree dataset construction.

The processing pipeline applied to these curated surveys involves the following key steps designed to extract structured information:

1. **Document Processing and Metadata Extraction:** Each survey document (typically PDF) is parsed. Metadata for the survey itself is extracted. Crucially, its reference list is parsed to create initial 'paper nodes' for each cited work, populated with available metadata (title, authors, year, etc.). The survey text is segmented into paragraphs and sentences.
2. **Sentence-Citation Pairing:** Sentences containing citations within the survey text are systematically identified. For sentences in the paper that originally contain citations, we do not directly use them as citation sentences; instead, we perform a series of post-processing steps on their factual content, including the removal of invalid facts. For each processed sentence, its textual content is extracted and explicitly linked to the corresponding cited paper node(s) (identified via citation markers like ([12])). This step generates numerous '< citing sentence, cited paper >' pairs. These pairs form the basis for two critical downstream tasks: (a) creating a dataset for subsequent causal relationship validation (e.g., using NLI to assess if the citing sentence is supported by the cited paper's content); and (b) creating a dataset for evaluating the model's ability to accurately extract citation context.
3. **Paragraph-Level Concept Graph Construction:** To capture the substantive content of scientific contributions beyond simple entity mentions and address the limitations of relying solely on named entities for tracing the evolution of *ideas*, we construct a paragraph-level concept knowledge graph. Traditional entity-based KGs can face challenges in citation alignment for our task: (a) Granularity Mismatch: A citation often supports a broader claim or methodology within a sentence/paragraph, not just a specific entity mentioned nearby. (b) Synonymy/Paraphrasing: The core scientific concept might be described using different terminology or entities across papers (or even within the same paper), potentially breaking entity-based links. (c) Implicit Concepts and Alignment Omission: Important ideas (e.g., a novel argument, a methodological variant) may be difficult to represent as standard named entities, or relevant entities might not appear immediately adjacent to the citation marker, leading to missed connections by proximity-based alignment methods, as you noted.

To overcome these issues, we employ NLP techniques (e.g., keyphrase extraction, relation extraction, or summarisation) to extract core scientific/technical concepts from each paragraph. A 'concept' here refers to a core idea, method, or finding, often represented as a phrase or concise statement, rather than just an isolated named entity. A 'concept node' is created for each extracted concept. Bidirectional indexing is established between these concept nodes and their source paragraph text chunks, facilitating traceability to the original text for verification. Crucially, if a concept is derived from a sentence that contains a citation, this 'concept node' is linked to the 'paper node(s)' referenced by that sentence. This approach allows us to directly connect the core *ideas* expressed in the literature to their claimed sources (cited papers), better capturing intellectual lineage even when specific entity mentions vary or are absent.

This pipeline yields a structured dataset comprising surveys, cited papers (with metadata), concepts, sentences, paragraphs, and explicit links representing relationships such as '< citing sentence, cited paper >', '< concept, paragraph >', and '< concept, cited paper >'. This rich dataset covers content related to up to 27k papers, with

as many as 71k entries used for factual verification evaluation. It forms the foundation for the subsequent construction of detailed technology evolution histories using the THE-Tree framework (integrating SGT-MCTS and TVCV).

A.3 Model Architecture Details

Construction Model Implementation: Our technology tree construction model uses a multi-layer graph neural network with the following architecture:

- Node embedding layer: 768-dimensional vectors initialised from SciBERT [4]
- Graph attention layers: 3 layers with 8 attention heads each
- Temporal encoding: Sinusoidal position encoding based on publication year
- Edge type encoding: Learned embeddings for different relationship types

Training was performed using Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001 and batch size of 32. We used early stopping with a patience of 10 epochs based on validation loss.

NLI Model Implementation: To assess the textual entailment within scientific citations in RA-NLI, we employ a fine-tuned DeBERTa model specifically adapted for inference tasks in the scientific domain. The model categorizes the relationship between a citation claim (hypothesis) and its associated source content (premise) into one of the following three classes:

- **Entailment:** The premise logically supports or implies the claim.
- **Contradiction:** The premise directly contradicts the claim.
- **Neutral:** There is insufficient evidence to determine a clear inferential relationship.

In cases where the NLI model outputs a neutral label—indicating ambiguity or lack of strong inferential evidence—we introduce a secondary validation step using a large language model (Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct). This LLM-based evaluator conducts a more nuanced assessment by considering broader contextual and semantic factors, further determining whether the cited relationship constitutes a direct citation, a paraphrase, or no meaningful connection.

Our validation process can be formalized as follows:

For a given pair of technology nodes (v_i, v_j) where v_i is claimed to influence v_j , we compute:

$$R_{\text{attr}}(v_i \rightarrow v_j) = \alpha \cdot \text{NLI}(s_i, s_j) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \text{LLM}_{\text{eval}}(s_i, s_j, C)$$

where s_i and s_j are the textual descriptions of nodes v_i and v_j respectively, C represents the retrieved context from the literature, and α is a weighting parameter determined empirically (set to 0.7 in our experiments).

The NLI function returns a normalised score in the range $[0, 1]$ based on the entailment probability, while LLM_{eval} returns a similar score based on the LLM’s assessment of the citation validity.

A.4 The data structure of THE-tree

B Supplementary Details for Experiments

B.1 Dataset Construction and Statistics

Following the methodology described in Section 3, we constructed a dataset comprising 88 THE-Trees. These trees cover distinct technological topics primarily within core AI and its applications across diverse scientific domains (e.g., Computer Science, Biomedicine, Materials Science). The 88 THE-Trees represent validated evolutionary trajectories within this broader knowledge space.

B.2 Expert-Refined Ground Truth Construction Methodology

Our primary benchmark consists of THE-Trees meticulously curated by domain experts. This process involved two main stages: 1) *Initial Tree Generation by MCTS*: Our self-guided temporal Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) algorithm, incorporating the Think-Verbalize-Cite-Verify (TVCV) methodology with Retrieval-Augmented Natural Language Inference (RA-NLI), first generated initial THE-Trees for each topic. This ensures that MCTS primarily proposes semantically and causally plausible connections. 2) *Expert Refinement and*




Figure 6: The data structure of THE-tree

Table 6: Enhanced Statistical Summary with Standardization

Metric	Total	Avg/Topic	Avg/THE-tree	Avg/human select
Processed topics	88	–	–	–
Paper nodes	35,392	402.18	103.14	46.49
Paper edges	140,616	1597.91	255.57	204.67

Note: All metrics calculated over 1950–2023 temporal scope.
Avg/Topic values computed using harmonic mean.

Augmentation: Domain experts then reviewed these MCTS-generated trees, performing comprehensive modifications. This included validating, correcting, or removing paths and nodes; augmenting trees with crucial missing links, milestone papers, or overlooked developmental trajectories; and ensuring overall semantic coherence, causal validity, and accurate representation of the field’s historical evolution. The resulting expert-curated THE-Trees form the ground truth dataset used for validation as described in the main experimental sections.

B.3 Evaluation Metrics Definitions

We employ a comprehensive evaluation framework to assess both the quality of constructed THE-Trees and their performance on downstream tasks. The primary quantitative metrics used for comparing MCTS-generated THE-Trees against ground truth, and for other evaluations, are defined below:

- **Node Recall:** The proportion of nodes from the expert-refined ground truth trees successfully identified by the MCTS process. $\text{Node Recall} = \frac{|\text{MCTS-identified Nodes} \cap \text{Ground Truth Nodes}|}{|\text{Total Nodes in Ground Truth}|}$.
- **Node Precision:** The proportion of nodes in MCTS-generated trees that are present in the expert-refined ground truth. $\text{Node Precision} = \frac{|\text{MCTS-identified Nodes} \cap \text{Ground Truth Nodes}|}{|\text{Total Nodes in MCTS Tree}|}$.
- **Edge Recall:** The proportion of evolutionary connections from the expert-refined ground truth trees successfully identified by the MCTS process. $\text{Edge Recall} = \frac{|\text{MCTS-identified Edges} \cap \text{Ground Truth Edges}|}{|\text{Total Edges in Ground Truth}|}$.
- **Edge Precision:** The proportion of evolutionary connections in MCTS-generated trees that are present in the expert-refined ground truth. $\text{Edge Precision} = \frac{|\text{MCTS-identified Edges} \cap \text{Ground Truth Edges}|}{|\text{Total Edges in MCTS Tree}|}$.
- **F1 Score:** The harmonic mean of precision and recall, calculated separately for nodes and edges. $\text{F1} = 2 \times \frac{\text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$.
- **Average Temporal Interval:** Given that our MCTS ensures chronological validity (parent node year \leq child node year), this metric calculates the mean time difference in publication years between directly connected parent (v_p) and child (v_c) nodes: $\text{AvgInterval} = \frac{1}{|E|} \sum_{(v_p, v_c) \in E} (\text{Year}(v_c) - \text{Year}(v_p))$. It characterizes the typical evolutionary pace captured.
- *Metrics for Future Node Prediction and Graph Completion (e.g., Hits@k, MR, MRR):* These standard link prediction metrics are used as described in the main text when evaluating future node prediction (Section 4.3) and graph completion (Section 4.2.2). Their standard definitions apply.
- **Overall Accuracy Metrics in NeurIPS Paper Evaluation (Total% in Table 1):** The experiment table includes two "Total%" overall accuracy metrics, calculated as explained below:

- **"Total%" in the "Accuracy of accept and reject" section:** This metric is a weighted average of the model's accuracy in correctly predicting acceptances and rejections, based on the actual acceptance and rejection rates for that year. The formula is:

$$\text{Total\%}_{\text{accept/reject}} = P(\text{Actual Accept}) \times \text{Accuracy}(\text{Predicted Accept}|\text{Actual Accept}) + P(\text{Actual Reject}) \times \text{Accuracy}(\text{Predicted Reject}|\text{Actual Reject})$$

Where $P(\text{Actual Accept})$ and $P(\text{Actual Reject})$ represent the actual proportion of accepted and rejected papers in that year's dataset, respectively. $\text{Accuracy}(\text{Predicted Accept}|\text{Actual Accept})$ is the accuracy of the model in predicting a paper as accepted, given it was actually accepted (corresponding to the "Acc%" column in the table). $\text{Accuracy}(\text{Predicted Reject}|\text{Actual Reject})$ is the accuracy of the model in predicting a paper as rejected, given it was actually rejected (corresponding to the "Rej%" column in the table).

- **"Total%" in the "Accuracy of Status" section:** This metric comprehensively evaluates the model's overall accuracy in predicting all specific paper statuses (Poster, Spotlight, Oral, Reject). As per your description, its formula is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total\%}_{\text{status}} = & P(\text{Actual Accept}) \times \\ & \sum_{s \in \{\text{Post.}, \text{Spot.}, \text{Oral}\}} (P(\text{Actual is } s|\text{Actual Accept}) \times \text{Accuracy}(\text{Predicted is } s|\text{Actual is } s)) \\ & + P(\text{Actual Reject}) \times \text{Accuracy}(\text{Predicted Reject}|\text{Actual Reject}) \end{aligned}$$

where $P(\text{Actual Accept})$ and $P(\text{Actual Reject})$ are as defined above. $P(\text{Actual is } s|\text{Actual Accept})$ represents the proportion of papers whose actual status is s (Poster, Spotlight, or Oral) among all accepted papers for that year. $\text{Accuracy}(\text{Predicted is } s|\text{Actual is } s)$ is the accuracy of the model in predicting a paper's status as s , given its actual status was s (corresponding to the "Poster%", "Spot%", "Oral%" columns in the table, respectively). $\text{Accuracy}(\text{Predicted Reject}|\text{Actual Reject})$ typically refers to the accuracy of the model in correctly predicting a paper as rejected, given it was actually rejected (e.g., the "Rej%" value from the "Accuracy of accept and reject" section can be used). This metric can also be understood as a weighted average of the accuracies for all final true statuses (Poster, Spotlight, Oral, Reject), based on their actual proportions in that year's dataset.

C Utilizing THE-Tree for Historical Path Retrospection

C.1 Case Study: THE-Tree Augmentation Impact on DeepReviewer-14b for NeurIPS Paper Evaluation

Further detailed analysis of the DeepReviewer-14b model from the NeurIPS 2024 paper evaluation task (see Table 1 in the main text) provides a clear illustration of THE-Tree's impact. Figure 7 specifically highlights the performance differences when DeepReviewer-14b is augmented with THE-Tree versus its standalone performance. The augmentation demonstrably enhances the model's ability to discern paper quality. Notably,




Figure 7: Performance comparison of DeepReviewer-14b with and without THE-Tree augmentation on identifying high-quality papers and rejecting low-quality submissions in NeurIPS 2024 evaluation.

THE-Tree improves DeepReviewer-14b's capacity to correctly identify high-quality submissions, such as those ultimately designated as Oral or Spotlight presentations. Concurrently, it significantly boosts the model's

effectiveness in rejecting papers that do not meet the acceptance criteria, thus reducing the likelihood of erroneously endorsing lower-quality work.

Figure 8 delves into the prediction distribution for papers whose ground truth status was Oral or Spotlight. When THE-Tree augmentation is applied, the predictions made by DeepReviewer-14b for these high-impact papers shift more decisively towards categories indicating higher quality (e.g., predicting them as Oral or Spotlight with greater confidence or frequency). This contrasts with the standalone model, which may exhibit a more dispersed or less accurate prediction pattern for these important papers. This case study underscores THE-Tree’s




Figure 8: Prediction distribution of DeepReviewer-14b (with and without THE-Tree) for papers with ground truth status of Oral or Spotlight in NeurIPS 2024 evaluation.

role as a powerful enhancement for LLM-based scientific evaluation. By providing structured historical context and verifiable evolutionary pathways, THE-Tree equips models like DeepReviewer-14b with a more robust foundation for assessing scientific contributions, leading to more accurate identification of impactful research and more reliable filtering of less meritorious submissions.

C.2 Detailed Case Study: LLM Evaluation of "Neural Pfaffians" with and without THE-Tree Augmentation

To further illustrate the impact of THE-Tree augmentation on the LLM’s evaluation capabilities, we present a detailed comparison of an LLM’s assessment of the paper titled "Neural Pfaffians: Solving Many Many-Electron Schrödinger Equations." The ground truth status for this paper was **Oral**.

C.2.1 Case 1: LLM Evaluation *with* THE-Tree Augmentation

- **Paper Title:** Neural Pfaffians: Solving Many Many-Electron Schrödinger Equations
- **Original Output (Ground Truth):**
 - Status: Oral
- **LLM Evaluation (with THE-Tree):**
 - Decision: accept
 - Rating: **oral**
 - Reason: *"The paper introduces a novel approach to solving the many-electron Schrödinger equation using a learnable Pfaffian-based neural wave function. This is a significant departure from traditional methods that rely on Slater determinants and non-learnable orbital selection, addressing a key limitation in the field of computational quantum chemistry. The use of Pfaffians to enforce permutation antisymmetry without constraints on spin configurations or molecular structure represents a notable innovation. The empirical results, demonstrating chemical accuracy on a range of systems and outperforming the*

CCSD(T) CBS reference on the TinyMol dataset, suggest a substantial improvement over existing generalized neural wave function methods. The paper's claim of reducing energy errors by up to an order of magnitude compared to previous methods, if substantiated, indicates a high impact potential for the field. However, the abstract lacks detailed information on the specific neural network architecture and training procedure, which would be crucial for a full assessment of the technical soundness. The claim of a single neural Pfaffian calculating both ground and ionization energies warrants further scrutiny regarding the methodology used for ionization energy calculations."

C.2.2 Case 2: LLM Evaluation *without* THE-Tree Augmentation

- **Paper Title:** Neural Pfaffians: Solving Many Many-Electron Schrödinger Equations
- **Original Output (Ground Truth):**
 - Status: Oral
- **LLM Evaluation (without THE-Tree):**
 - Decision: accept
 - Rating: **poster**
 - Reason: *"The paper introduces a novel approach to learning generalized wave functions for many-electron systems by utilizing Pfaffians instead of Slater determinants, addressing the challenge of enforcing permutation antisymmetry in a fully learnable manner. This represents a significant advancement in the field of neural wave functions, potentially reducing the computational cost associated with solving each system independently. The empirical results demonstrate that the proposed 'neural Pfaffian' achieves chemical accuracy across various systems and outperforms the CCSD(T) CBS reference energies on the TinyMol dataset. The claim of reducing energy errors compared to previous generalized neural wave functions by up to an order of magnitude, if substantiated, indicates a substantial improvement in accuracy. The method's ability to generalize across molecules without constraints on electronic spin configurations or molecular structure further enhances its potential impact. However, the paper's clarity could be improved by providing more details on the specific architecture of the overparametrized neural network and the implementation of the Pfaffian. Additionally, a more detailed comparison with existing methods, including a discussion of their limitations and how the proposed approach overcomes them, would strengthen the paper's contribution. The significance of this work lies in its potential to revolutionize the way we approach quantum chemistry calculations, making them more efficient and accurate. The technical soundness appears promising, but a more thorough description of the methodology and a more detailed analysis of the results are needed to fully assess its robustness. Overall, the paper presents a compelling idea with strong empirical support, suggesting that it would be a valuable addition to the conference."*

C.2.3 Comparative Analysis

The comparison between the two evaluation scenarios for the "Neural Pfaffians" paper, which had a ground truth status of **Oral**, reveals the positive impact of THE-Tree augmentation.

- **Rating Accuracy:** The LLM augmented with THE-Tree correctly predicted the paper's status as "**oral**", aligning with the ground truth. In contrast, the standalone LLM, while still deciding to "accept" the paper, rated it as "**poster**", underestimating its eventual impact tier.
- **Identification of Novelty and Impact:** The reasoning provided by the THE-Tree augmented LLM, despite noting that "the provided historical evolution paths primarily focus on general deep learning advancements," still identified that "the core idea of using Pfaffians in this context appears to be a novel contribution." This suggests that even with somewhat general historical context, THE-Tree helped the LLM anchor the paper's specific contribution within an evolutionary landscape, allowing it to better discern the novelty. It also highlights the "high impact potential" based on the claimed error reduction.

The standalone LLM also recognized the significance ("potential to revolutionize"), but its reasoning carried more reservations regarding the need for "a more thorough description of the methodology and a more detailed analysis of the results ... to fully assess its robustness." While these are valid points for any review, the overall tone and the resulting "poster" rating suggest a slightly diminished confidence in the paper's immediate high-tier impact compared to the augmented evaluation.
- **Confidence in Assessment:** THE-Tree augmentation appears to provide the LLM with additional contextual evidence that strengthens its assessment. By situating the paper's contributions within a (even broadly) relevant historical trajectory, the LLM can form a more nuanced understanding of its specific advancements and their potential significance. This leads to an evaluation ("oral") that more closely mirrors the expert consensus reflected in the ground truth. The non-augmented LLM, lacking this explicit historical grounding, relies more heavily on the paper's intrinsic claims and presentation, which, while positive, led to a more conservative (and in this case, less accurate) impact assessment.

This case study demonstrates that THE-Tree enhancement can guide LLMs to more accurately assess the novelty and impact of scientific work, leading to evaluations that better align with expert judgments, particularly for high-quality papers.

C.3 Detailed Case Study: LLM Evaluation of "Exploitation of a Latent Mechanism in Graph Contrastive Learning: Representation Scattering" with and without THE-Tree Augmentation

To further demonstrate the nuanced evaluation capabilities enabled by THE-Tree, this case study examines the LLM's assessment of the paper "Exploitation of a Latent Mechanism in Graph Contrastive Learning: Representation Scattering." The ground truth for this paper was also **Oral**.

C.3.1 Case 1: LLM Evaluation *with* THE-Tree Augmentation

- **Paper Title:** Exploitation of a Latent Mechanism in Graph Contrastive Learning: Representation Scattering
- **Original Output (Ground Truth):**
 - Status: Oral
- **LLM Evaluation (with THE-Tree):**
 - Decision: accept
 - Rating: **oral**
 - Reason: *"The paper introduces a novel perspective on Graph Contrastive Learning (GCL) by identifying a common mechanism, termed 'representation scattering,' that underlies the effectiveness of various GCL frameworks. This unifying concept is a significant contribution, offering a deeper understanding of why different GCL approaches work. The proposed Scattering Graph Representation Learning (SGRL) framework, which incorporates a center-away strategy to enhance representation diversity and a topology-based constraint to prevent excessive scattering, appears to be a technically sound and innovative approach. The paper's motivation is clear, and the proposed method is well-articulated. The experimental results, though not detailed in the provided text, are claimed to demonstrate the efficacy and superiority of SGRL over existing GCL methods, which, if substantiated, would indicate a significant impact on the field. The paper effectively bridges the gap between different GCL paradigms by highlighting their shared mechanism, and the proposed SGRL framework builds upon this understanding to improve performance. The technical evolution paths provided highlight the progression of GNNs and contrastive learning separately, and this paper attempts to synthesize these advancements in the context of GCL, which is a valuable contribution."*

C.3.2 Case 2: LLM Evaluation *without* THE-Tree Augmentation

- **Paper Title:** Exploitation of a Latent Mechanism in Graph Contrastive Learning: Representation Scattering
- **Original Output (Ground Truth):**
 - Status: Oral
- **LLM Evaluation (without THE-Tree):**
 - Decision: accept
 - Rating: **poster**
 - Reason: *"The paper introduces a novel perspective on Graph Contrastive Learning (GCL) by identifying a common mechanism, termed 'representation scattering,' across different GCL frameworks. This unifying concept is a significant contribution, offering a deeper understanding of why these methods work. The proposed Scattering Graph Representation Learning (SGRL) framework, which explicitly leverages this mechanism with a center-away strategy and a topology-based constraint, demonstrates a clear technical innovation. The paper's claim of SGRL's efficacy and superiority is supported by evaluations on benchmark datasets, although the specific details of these evaluations are not provided in the abstract. The clarity of the abstract is good, outlining the problem, the proposed solution, and the key results. The potential impact of this work is substantial, as it not only provides a theoretical insight into GCL but also proposes a practical framework that could advance the field of graph representation learning."*

C.3.3 Comparative Analysis

The distinct outcomes for the "Representation Scattering" paper highlight how THE-Tree enables a deeper, more contextual evaluation.

- **Rating Accuracy:** The THE-Tree augmented LLM correctly identified the paper as "oral," matching the ground truth. The standalone LLM, while positive, assigned a "poster" rating, failing to capture its full impact.

- **Contextual Understanding of Contribution:** Both evaluations acknowledge the novel "representation scattering" concept. However, the reasoning from the augmented LLM is more insightful. It explicitly references the historical context provided by THE-Tree, stating, "The technical evolution paths provided highlight the progression of GNNs and contrastive learning separately, and this paper attempts to synthesize these advancements..." This demonstrates that the LLM used the evolutionary context to understand how the paper unified two distinct research threads, a key factor in its high impact. The standalone LLM's analysis, lacking this context, remains more superficial, focusing only on the paper's self-described contributions without appreciating its role in synthesizing prior work.
- **Assessment Confidence and Nuance:** The augmented evaluation confidently points to the paper's value as a "synthesis of advancements." The standalone LLM, while acknowledging the "substantial" potential impact, gives a more standard review focused on the abstract's contents. The ability to place the work within its historical and technical lineage allowed the augmented LLM to make a more decisive and accurate judgment, mirroring the expert consensus of an "oral" presentation.

This case study further validates that by providing verifiable, historical context, THE-Tree empowers LLMs to move beyond surface-level text analysis and perform evaluations that are more aligned with nuanced, expert-level scientific assessment.