

---

# Can LLMs Learn by Teaching? A Preliminary Study

---

Xuefei Ning<sup>\*1</sup>, Zifu Wang<sup>\*2</sup>, Shiyao Li<sup>\*1,3</sup>, Zinan Lin<sup>\*4</sup>, Peiran Yao<sup>\*5</sup>,  
Tianyu Fu<sup>1,3</sup>, Matthew B. Blaschko<sup>2</sup>, Guohao Dai<sup>3,6</sup>, Huazhong Yang<sup>1</sup>, Yu Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tsinghua University <sup>2</sup>KU Leuven <sup>3</sup>Infinigence-AI  
<sup>4</sup>Microsoft Research <sup>5</sup>University of Alberta <sup>6</sup>Shanghai Jiao Tong University

## Abstract

Teaching to improve student models (e.g., knowledge distillation) is an extensively studied methodology in LLMs. However, for humans, teaching not only improves students but also improves teachers. We ask: *Can LLMs also learn by teaching (LbT)?* If yes, we can potentially unlock the possibility of continuously advancing the models without solely relying on human-produced data or stronger models. In this paper, we provide a preliminary exploration of this ambitious agenda. We show that LbT ideas can be incorporated into existing LLM training/prompting pipelines and provide noticeable improvements. Specifically, we design three methods, each mimicking one of the three levels of LbT in humans: observing students’ feedback, learning from the feedback, and learning iteratively, with the goals of improving answer accuracy without training and improving models’ inherent capability with fine-tuning. The findings are encouraging. For example, similar to LbT in human, we see that: (1) *LbT can induce weak-to-strong generalization*: strong models can improve themselves by teaching other weak models; (2) *Diversity in students might help*: teaching multiple students could be better than teaching one student or the teacher itself. We hope that this early promise can inspire future research on LbT and more broadly adopting the advanced techniques in education to improve LLMs. The code is available at <https://github.com/imagination-research/lbt>.

## 1 Introduction

*I couldn’t reduce it to the freshman level. That means we really don’t understand it.*

– Richard Feynman

“*Learning from teachers (LfT)*” is a common pipeline in machine learning, especially in the realm of Large Language Models (LLMs). For example, knowledge distillation [10, 24, 44] and distillation via synthetic data [12, 21, 1] focus on transferring the knowledge from teacher LLMs to student LLMs by letting teacher models *teach* student models through token logits, features, and synthetic data [51]. They become the go-to methods for closing the performance gap between open-source and proprietary LLMs, as well as for maintaining performance during model compression.

In fact, in the human learning process, *teaching not only benefits students but can also improve the teachers themselves*. “*Learning by teaching (LbT)*”, also known as the Feynman method of learning, is proven to facilitate human learning by helping to build more rigorous and clear knowledge [9, 35, 34, 36, 37, 15]. Fig. 1 illustrates the conceptual comparison of the LfT and LbT pipelines.

Motivated by this insight, we want to ask: *Can LLMs also learn by teaching?* As one can imagine, LbT could offer exciting opportunities for the models to *continuously evolve* by teaching other

---

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution.

Corresponding to: foxdoraame@gmail.com (Xuefei Ning), zinanlin@microsoft.com (Zinan Lin), yu-wang@tsinghua.edu.cn (Yu Wang)




Figure 1: **Left:** *Learning from teacher* aims at improving student LLMs with knowledge from the teacher LLMs. It is the essential idea behind common approaches including knowledge distillation and distillation via synthetic data. **Right:** In contrast, *Learning by teaching* aims at improving *teacher LLMs* through the teaching process using feedback from student LLMs.

Table 1: The explored **M1**, **M2**, **M3** methods.

LbT Level	Objective	Pipeline	LbT Implementation	Method Abbrev.
L1	Improve the answer quality without training	Search-based output generation	Scoring based on students' performance	<b>M1</b> (§ 3)
L2	Improve the inherent model ability with training	Generation-scoring-finetuning		<b>M2</b> (§ 4)
L3	Improve the answer quality without training	Input prompt optimization	Analyzing feedback from multiple students	<b>M3</b> (§ 5)

(potentially weaker) models, rather than solely relying on human-produced data or stronger teacher models. More broadly, we hope that this exploration could provide insights into the possibility of using advanced techniques in education to improve LLMs.

To explore this question, we first summarize LbT in human learning into three *levels*:


- **L1: Observing students' feedback.** The teacher instructs the students, who then provide feedback (e.g., taking exams and reporting the score, asking questions about unclear logic).
- **L2: Learning from the feedback.** Based on the feedback, the teachers can analyze which logic and concepts the students might have (mis)understood. This information is useful for the teachers to improve the teaching strategy, and further enhance teachers' own understanding of the concepts.
- **L3: Learning from the feedback iteratively.** The teachers can teach the students (L1) and learn from the feedback (L2) *iteratively*.

In this paper, we study the viability of instantiating these LbT ideas in LLMs. There is a range of possibilities in terms of the objective, the pipeline, and the implementation (§ 2 and Tab. 1). As an initial exploration, we study three methods, each for one of the three LbT levels.


- **M1** aims at improving LLMs' answer quality by directly utilizing students' feedback (L1). More specially, given a set of generated answers, we *score each rationale based on its ability to teach student models (using in-context learning) to correctly answer similar problems*. We show that aggregating multiple rationales [47] with LbT-based scores can improve the answer accuracy.
- **M2** aims at improving LLMs' inherent ability by learning from students' feedback (L2). We use the approach in **M1** to score teacher-generated rationales. Then, we apply direct preference optimization (DPO) [32] to fine-tune the teacher model with the rationale-score pairs. We show that **M2** can be better than using DPO with correctness scores.
- **M3** aims at improving LLMs' answer quality by iteratively learning from students' feedback (L3). Specifically, we prompt the LLM to *reflect on the failure cases from multiple students and devise new positive and negative exemplars*. We show that the LLM can improve the exemplars based on feedback from multiple students. These improved exemplars used in prompts not only improve the learning outcomes for multiple students but also enhance the teacher's performance.

We find that LbT in LLMs interestingly shares some similar phenomena as in humans:

- **Weak-to-strong generalization:** Strong teachers can improve even when teaching weaker students. This suggests the promise of using LbT to improve superhuman models as envisioned in [45].



(a) The “search-based output generation pipeline” for improving the answer quality.



(b) The “generating-scoring-finetuning pipeline” for improving model capability.

Figure 2: Two general pipelines for improving the answer quality and model ability. “ $P$ ” stands for “Problem”; “ $R$ ” stands for “Rationale”; “ $A$ ” stands for “Answer”.

- **Diversity in Students might help:** Rather than teaching the teacher itself, teaching *other* students and *multiple* students might help. This suggests the feasibility of using LbT to synergize the capability and knowledge from multiple models.

To summarize, with appropriate pipelines and teacher-student settings, LbT can help improve LLMs’ answer quality and inherent capability. We believe that these preliminary case studies are only scratching the surface of the potential of LbT. As LLMs are becoming increasingly powerful, more advanced approaches in education can potentially help with the inference and training of LLMs.

## 2 Learning by Teaching (LbT) and Related Work

As shown in [Tab. 1](#), we study two types of objectives: *improving answer quality without training* and *improving the inherent ability of the model with training*. [§ 2.1](#) and [§ 2.2](#) describe how **M1**, **M2**, and **M3** relate to prior work on these two objectives, respectively.

### 2.1 Improving the Answer Quality without Training

Existing literature has incorporated various insights from the human reasoning process to develop prompting-based methods, including the explication of the thinking process [49, 18], subproblem decomposition [29, 58], fetching the abstract principles and answering based on them [57], self-reflection-based answer refinement [27, 39], and so on. We explore two ways of incorporating the LbT insight to implement two prompting-based methods:

- **M1** relates to the popular “search-based output generation pipeline” shown in [Fig. 2a](#) [47, 52, 2, 50, 27, 25, 22, 39]. This pipeline iteratively samples and evaluates new rationales or rationale steps for searching the optimal output, and ultimately derives the final rationale or answer from the search history. One essential component in this pipeline is an *evaluator* who evaluates the quality of each rationale or rationale step. We design an LbT evaluator that *scores each generated rationale based on its ability to teach student models to correctly answer similar problems*.
- **M3** relates to existing prompt optimization methods [30, 59, 40] that iteratively improve the prompts based on their performance (e.g., accuracy, failure cases). The key innovation in **M3** is how it evaluates the “performance”: instead of evaluating with the same model that produced the prompts (i.e., the teacher model), we test how the prompt works with *other* student models and show that this change benefits the prompt tuning outcome.

### 2.2 Improving the Inherent Model Capability with Training

To improve the inherent model capability, **M2** incorporates the LbT insight into the “generating-scoring-finetuning pipeline”. [Fig. 2b](#) illustrates the three steps in the pipeline: (1) Letting the target LLM or another teacher LLM generate multiple rationales for a given problem; (2) Scoring the rationales using an evaluator; (3) Utilizing the rationales and scores to (optionally) train a verifier [7, 25, 45], and finetune the target LLM by reinforcement learning [45], DPO [32, 53], filtering and supervised finetuning (SFT) [55, 14, 54], or score-conditioned SFT [23, 26].




Figure 3: **M1**. The goal is to derive the best TA from the TR-TA pairs generated by the teacher LLM.

In these works, the rationale scoring is usually achieved through manual labeling [61, 25, 26], ground-truth (GT) answer matching [55, 54], agreement-based scoring [14], or self-evaluation [53]. In contrast, **M2** scores the rationale based on its ability to teach student models to correctly answer similar problems. In this way, **M2** can provide *automatic* and *fine-grained* quality evaluation for rationales, which helps automate and improve the continual evolution of models’ ability.

A recent work [45] also proposes an automatic scoring method for the generating-scoring-finetuning pipeline. It evaluates each partial rationale based on the frequency with which another “completer” model arrives at the correct answer by continuing from the partial rationale. This method can be seen as an LbT-based scoring method, where the examination of students (i.e., the completer) involves continuing the partial teaching rationale for the same problem. In contrast, in **M2**, students are examined on similar problems using the teaching problem and the full rationale as the exemplar.

### 3 Method (M1) for LbT Level 1: Observing Students’ Feedback

#### 3.1 Method

One common teaching strategy in education is that the teacher first teaches students how to solve a class of problems by giving them the example rationale (named *Teaching Rationale*, or *TR* in short) and the answer (named *Teaching Answer*, or *TA* in short) to a particular question (named *Teaching Problem*, or *TP* in short). Then, the teacher asks students to solve other similar problems (named *Exam Problem*, or *EP* in short) to test if the students understand the concepts. The teacher can also learn from this process by observing the feedback (i.e., *LbT level 1*): if the students can answer EPs well, then it likely means that the TR-TA pair is of high-quality.

Our idea is to implement this strategy in LLMs to select high-quality TR-TA pairs. As depicted in Fig. 3 and Alg. 1, we first instruct the teacher model to solve a given TP multiple times, resulting in multiple TR-TA pairs. Then, each TR-TA pair is used as an in-context learning (ICL) example to guide the student model in solving a series of EPs. With the produced Exam Rationale (ER) and Exam Answers (EAs), each student will then receive an exam score (e.g., the accuracy of EAs), denoted as the LbT score. The LbT score can be used as a quality assessment of the corresponding TR-TA pair. We consider two ways to select the final TA [47]: (1) We select the TR-TA pair with the highest LbT score. We denote this approach as “**M1 (MAX)**”. (2) For TAs that can be aggregated via exact matching, such as mathematical reasoning, we can take the sum of the LbT scores for each TA separately, and find the TA with the maximum sum. We denote this approach as “**M1 (SUM)**”.

#### 3.2 Evaluation on Mathematical Reasoning

##### 3.2.1 Experimental Setups

We use the extension MATH() [41] of the MATH dataset [11] where each problem has variants with different values, following the train-test split specified by [25]. Among the 500 test problems, 181 problems are provided with 3 functional variants each. We use these 181 problems as TPs. For each TP, we sample 256 TR-TA pairs. Then, using each TR-TA pair as the ICL exemplar, we utilize the 3 functional variants of TP as EPs. Each exam is repeated 3 times with randomized student decoding, resulting in 9 ER-EA pairs. Each TA is scored based on the correctness of the 9 EAs.

##### 3.2.2 Results

We show the results in Tab. 2 and provide analyses as follows. More results are in App. A.

Table 2: Results on 181 MATH test problems with 256 TR-TA pairs. The best results of each row are highlighted in green.

Teacher	Student	Greedy	SC	M1 (MAX)	M1 (SUM)
LLaMA3-70B	LLaMA3-8B	70.16	81.77	86.74	87.85
GPT-3.5	LLaMA3-8B	59.11	77.90	83.43	83.43
GPT-3.5	Mistral-7B	59.11	77.90	81.22	83.43
GPT-3.5	LLaMA3-8B & Mistral-7B	59.11	77.90	84.53	84.53
LLaMA3-8B	LLaMA3-8B	45.85	64.64	77.90	82.87
Mistral-7B	LLaMA3-8B	19.88	40.88	51.93	53.59




Figure 4: Relative improvements of **M1** over **SC** using LLaMA3-8B as the teacher and the student on 181 MATH test problems with different (**Left**) number of TR-TA pairs where error bars are computed over 10 repeated runs, (**Middle**) difficulty levels, and (**Right**) the fraction of TPs when sorted by the cosine distance to the 2 closest problems from the training set.

**M1 is effective with various model settings and surpasses baselines significantly.** **M1** exceeds self-consistency (**SC**) [47] with various model settings: strong-teach-weak (e.g. LLaMA3-70B teaches LLaMA3-8B), weak-teach-strong (e.g. Mistral-7B teaches LLaMA3-8B) and self-teaching (e.g. LLaMA3-8B teaches itself). **M1** (SUM) outperforms **M1** (MAX) in most cases. We also show that LbT-based scoring surpasses self-evaluation scoring [53, 50, 43, 17] in Tab. 8.

**M1 can further benefit from multiple students.** Using GPT-3.5 to teach both LLaMA3-8B and Mistral-7B achieves a significant improvement than teaching LLaMA3-8B or Mistral-7B separately.

**M1 can identify infrequent but correct TAs.** **M1** can efficiently discover the correct answer from many teacher samples, whereas **SC** requires the correct answer to be in the majority to derive it. Fig. 4(left, middle) shows the improvements of **M1** over **SC** across different numbers of TR-TA pairs and difficulty levels. The improvements do not saturate as the number of TR-TA pairs increases, and **M1** is much better than **SC** on harder problems.

**The TP and the corresponding EPs should be similar.** It is crucial to choose EPs similar to a TP such that the student can apply the logic from TR to solve EPs. We use the functional variants as EPs, which are very similar to TPs. To verify the necessity of TP-EPs similarity, we conduct an experiment that selects similar EPs from the original MATH training set. We calculate the embedding of each TP using the “all-mpnet-base-v2” sentence embedding model [33], and select the 2 closest problems from the training set as EPs. We sort TPs by the cosine distance to the corresponding EPs and calculate the relative improvements over **SC** on a fraction of TPs. Fig. 4(right) shows that **M1** only provides improvements for TPs that have similar problems in the training set.

### 3.3 Evaluation on Competition-Level Code Synthesis

#### 3.3.1 Experimental Setups

We use the Grandmaster Dynamic Programming (DP) study plan on Leetcode<sup>1</sup>. Each dataset in the study plan has 5~10 problems, and each problem has 2~3 visible test cases and many hidden test cases. We assign a visible score (**V-score**) of 1 and 0 to the code that *passes all* or *fails any* visible cases [23]. To evaluate the actual correctness of a code, we submit the code to Leetcode, and record the pass rate on the hidden cases as the submit score (**S-score**). For a TP, we sample 8 TR-TA pairs from the teacher, where TR is a rationale in natural language, and TA is a Python code (See Ex. 1 for an example). Each TR-TA pair is assigned an LbT score by teaching a student to solve

<sup>1</sup><https://leetcode.com/studyplan/dynamic-programming-grandmaster/>

the remaining problems in the dataset. **M1** calculates the exam **V-score** as the LbT score to avoid additional Leetcode submissions. Check [App. A.2.2](#) for additional setups.

### 3.3.2 Results

Here, we analyze the results on the Game Theory dataset. Check [App. A.2](#) for additional results.

**M1 can be more general than agreement-based methods such as SC** in the sense that **M1** (MAX) does *not* require an oracle to assess the equivalence of two answers, which is challenging for codes. Therefore, we only use the average pass rate (with or without V-score=1 filtering) as the baseline. Nevertheless, when such an oracle is provided [23, 38, 4], we can use **M1** (SUM) which was shown to be better than **M1** (MAX) in § 3.2. We defer this exploration to future work.

**M1 selects better TR-TA than the baseline in most cases.** If the student closely follows the strategies in TR-TA to solve EPs, the student exam score can indicate the quality of TR-TA. (1) When the TR-TA has high quality (Ex. 1), the student mimics the teacher’s strategy to solve the EP with a correct DP code. (2) When the TR-TA is logically incorrect, e.g. DP code with wrong recurrences (Ex. 2) or a non-DP wrong code (Ex. 3), the student also follows the wrong TR-TA with a wrong ER and EA. (3) When the TR-TA is logically correct but has high complexity, e.g. recursive re-computation instead of DP (Ex. 4), the student also writes a recursion with high complexity.

As shown in [Tab. 3](#), using the **V-score** on the few visible test cases can filter out some low-quality code, but **M1** can identify better TA in most cases. This is because LbT-based scoring can leverage student scores on similar EPs, providing a more informative evaluation of TA. Note that **M1** shows the largest improvements on TPs with medium difficulty. For very simple (e.g., SG-4 for GPT-3.5) or challenging (e.g., SG-2) problems, **M1** shows marginal or no improvements.

**Self-Debugging (SD) is both complementary to and beneficial for M1.** We experiment with applying one-iteration SD [5] using [Prompt 5](#). Applying SD on TAs can provide **S-score** benefits complementary to **M1**, since SD fixes simple non-logical bugs, such as missing imports, miswritten variable names, and incorrect usage of library functions (an example is shown in [Ex. 6](#)), whereas **M1** mainly assess the quality of the logic. In addition, applying SD on EAs leads to more informative LbT score, as fixing non-logical bugs can make the students’ exam **V-score** more indicative of quality of the TR-TA. [Tab. 3](#) shows that after incorporating SD for both **M1** and the baselines, **M1** achieves consistent improvements.

**For competition-level code synthesis task, M1 is more effective when the teacher and student come from the same family**, as shown by [Tabs. 3](#) and [10](#). We find that this is because the student can follow a teacher from the same model family better, making the feedback more informative. A failure case of student-following when GPT-3.5 teaches LLaMA3-8B is shown in [Ex. 5](#).

**TPs and EPs should be similar.** Most failure cases in [Tabs. 3](#) and [10](#) occur when solving the “PW” TP. We find that this is because the solving of “PW” involves 2D DP, which differs from other problems that can be solved with 1D DP. Consequently, the student cannot follow TA to solve EPs.

## 4 Method (M2) for LbT Level 2: Learning from the Feedback

### 4.1 Method

In education, after identifying which teaching materials (e.g., TR-TA pairs) can enhance student performance (§ 3.1), teachers can use this information to improve their knowledge or teaching strategies. For example, if students perform poorly due to unclear or inaccurate teaching materials, teachers can correct their knowledge and avoid generating similar TR-TA pairs in the future.

We use this idea to improve the inherent ability of LLMs. As depicted in [Fig. 5](#), since the LbT-based scoring provides informative feedback on the quality of a TR-TA pair (verified in § 3), we collect the LbT scores of many TR-TA pairs and use them to finetune the teacher with DPO [32].

### 4.2 Experimental Setups

We use 1564 training problems from MATH() [41] as TPs. For each TP, we sample 32 TR-TA pairs from the teacher. For each TR-TA pair, we calculate  $0.5 \times \text{correctness} + 0.5 \times \text{LbT score}$  as its score, where correctness is 1 or 0 when the corresponding TA is correct or wrong, respectively. For running DPO, we select pairs from the 32 TR-TA pairs whose score difference exceeds a threshold of 0.3, and keep at most 8 pairs of TR-TA pairs for each TP.

Table 3: **S-score** results on *Game Theory* dataset in Leetcode Grandmaster DP study plan. “SG-1”-“SG-4” and “PW” are abbreviations of question categories; see Tab. 9 for details. The results of **M1** that improve (degrade) by more than 0.01 are highlighted in green (red).

Models	Metrics	SG-1	SG-2	SG-3	SG-4	PW
T=LLaMA3-8B S=LLaMA3-8B	Avg.	0.215	0.004	0.216	0.604	0.609
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	0.630	0.004	0.228	1	0.508
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	-	-	0.755	0.851
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	-	-	1	1
T=LLaMA3-8B S=LLaMA3-8B (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.348	0.004	0.319	0.608	0.694
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	0.348	0.011	0.570	0.771	0.746
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.797	-	-	0.722	0.851
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	-	-	1	0.935
T=GPT-3.5 S=GPT-3.5	Avg.	0.582	0.007	0.428	1	0.645
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	1	0.011	0.681	1	1
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.994	-	0.714	1	0.894
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	-	0.135	1	1
T=GPT-3.5 S=GPT-3.5 (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.701	0.133	0.592	1	0.853
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	1	0.337	0.714	1	0.968
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.996	1	0.714	1	0.911
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	0.714	1	0.968
T=LLaMA3-70B S=LLaMA3-8B	Avg.	0.875	0.008	0.679	1	0.601
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	1	0.007	1	1	1
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	-	1	1	0.883
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	-	1	1	1




Figure 5: Baseline vs. **M2**. Both approaches use *scores* of TRs to craft preference data and finetune the teacher LLM with DPO. **Left**: The correctness score of TA. **Right**: The LbT score of TR and TA.

### 4.3 Results

Tab. 4 shows that **M2** achieves better results compared to solely using the correctness scores in DPO. This improvement is because LbT provides more informative scores than those purely based on correctness. One example is shown in Ex. 7. Although both TRs produce a correct TA, the losing TR is unnecessarily verbose and cannot be generalized to other similar problems. Another example is in Ex. 8. Although both TRs produce a wrong TA, the winning TR is logically better than the loser. LbT can discern the correct preference between these TR-TA pairs, thereby improving DPO results.

Table 4: Results on 500 MATH test problems with greedy decoding.

Teacher/Student	Original	Correctness-DPO	<b>M2</b>
LLaMA3-8B	29.0	30.4	32.2




Figure 6: Overview of **M3**. The teacher teaches the students through a set of positive and negative in-context learning examples. These examples are iteratively refined by the teacher according to students’ feedback.

## 5 Method (M3) for LbT Level 3: Learning from the Feedback Iteratively

### 5.1 Method

We have shown that the performance of students could provide an indication of the teaching material’s quality and the teacher could improve based on that indication. Such a process could be done *iteratively*. Furthermore, we are curious whether having *multiple* LLMs with roles of teacher and student benefits iterative improvements as in human education: learning from the diverse feedback from multiple students might help the teacher create more effective teaching materials.

We guide the teacher to iteratively improve teaching materials in the form of a set of positive and negative exemplars, based on the performance of students when the set is used as the ICL examples. As depicted in Fig. 6 and Alg. 2, given a task, we sample  $K = 8$  TP-TAs from the teacher, and then use them as the ICL examples for the students to answer a sampled set of EPs. Then, we select EPs that the students incorrectly answered, and let the teacher write a reflection of possible reasons why the TPs could have misled students on these failure cases. The teacher generates multiple updated exemplar sets based on the reflection and the ones performing the best on the training data when used as teacher’s ICL examples are kept. The process repeats for a fixed number of iterations. An example round of iteration is shown in Ex. 9.

### 5.2 Experimental Setups

We evaluate **M3** on two binary text classification tasks: Liar [46] and Logical Fallacy [16]. Liar is a dataset for false statement detection in political media, with 4,574 statements with speaker and context information. Logical Fallacy is a dataset of 2,449 samples of 13 logical fallacy types, which we adapt to classify the most common type *faulty generalization* against the rest of the types. We report the teacher’s  $F_1$  score on the dev and test splits combined. Within an iteration, we choose the exemplar set with the highest  $F_1$  score on the training set. Across 14 random experiments, we report the mean  $F_1$  and the standard error. We run a total of five iterations of teaching material improvements.

### 5.3 Results

Table 5: Teacher’s  $F_1$  score of **M3** on combined Liar dev and test set at the end of iteration  $T$ , where LLaMa3-70B is used as the teacher for all settings. The best results are in **bold**.

Student(s)	$T = 1$	$T = 2$	$T = 3$	$T = 4$	$T = 5$
LLaMa3-70B	61.08±1.29	62.01±1.12	64.48±1.20	65.40±0.67	63.96±1.19
LLaMa3-8B	62.24±1.30	<b>66.15±0.56</b>	<b>65.66±0.72</b>	64.78±0.89	65.41±0.75
LLaMa3-{70,8}B + Mistral-7B	<b>63.66±1.48</b>	64.47±0.90	65.47±1.01	<b>66.24±0.56</b>	<b>67.09±0.56</b>

Table 6: Teacher’s  $F_1$  score of **M3** on Logical Fallacy test set at the end of iteration  $T$ , where LLaMa3-70B is used as the teacher for all settings. The best results are in **bold**.

Student(s)	$T = 1$	$T = 2$	$T = 3$	$T = 4$	$T = 5$
LLaMa3-70B	81.39±0.34	81.81±0.32	82.10±0.26	82.00±0.26	82.34±0.22
LLaMa3-8B	<b>82.44±0.26</b>	<b>82.49±0.27</b>	<b>82.62±0.24</b>	82.72±0.23	<b>82.72±0.22</b>
LLaMa3-{70,8}B + Mistral-7B	82.38±0.28	82.48±0.27	82.59±0.26	<b>82.73±0.24</b>	82.29±0.22

As Tabs. 5 and 6 shows, it is feasible to apply LbT on iterative prompt optimization: LLMs are able to reflect on the failure cases of students and propose revised exemplars that improve the teacher’s performance, similar to the case of iteratively optimizing task descriptions as in previous work [30].



More importantly, we observe a performance gain brought by having *dedicated* students (as opposed to using a single LLM in prompt optimization as in previous work). Comparing to the scenario where the teacher and student are the same, having one or multiple LLMs different to the teacher as the student improves the quality of the teaching material faster. This demonstrates LbT as a case of *weak-to-strong* generalization. We speculate that the benefits are brought by more diverse error types made by a different (weaker) student model, and we leave the verification as a future work.

## 6 Broader Discussion

### 6.1 Limitations and Near-Term Extensions

LbT-based scoring in **M1** and **M2** can help select high-quality TR-TA pairs but require a TP and EPs having similar problem-solving strategies. In our experiments, suitable EPs are selected according to human-provided information in the dataset. One extension is to let a model automatically identify EPs similar to a TP from a large pool (Fig. 4). Another possible direction is to synthesize similar problems based on a group of problems and some predefined problem mutation strategies. For example, as a “self-instruct” [48] extension to **M2**, we can generate a new problem  $P$  based on a group of problems  $S = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$  that are already known to be similar. The generating-scoring pipeline can then be applied to  $P$  to obtain rationale-score pairs, where the LbT score is obtained using  $S$  as the EPs.

Another limitation of LbT-based scoring is the additional LLM inference cost. For **M2**, this cost remains significantly lower than human annotation. However, to further reduce it, we need to improve the method or use efficient inference systems [60] is necessary.

Based on the framework presented in § 1 and 2, we can explore many other possibilities to incorporate LbT insights into the inference and training pipelines of LLMs. For example, to improve answer quality for a TP, we can incorporate the idea of having the teacher reflect on multiple students’ feedback into the search-based output generation pipeline, as follows: for each student, the teacher iteratively reflects on the student’s feedback and updates its TR. The final answer is then derived by aggregating the updated TR for each student. Intuitively, different students might require distinct teaching materials, so generating TR for multiple students can encourage TR diversity. Increasing diversity has been shown to benefit the accuracy of agreement-based aggregation methods [47]. Compared to increasing the sampling temperature of TR, this LbT-based sampling is guided towards high-quality TRs and might yield better results.

### 6.2 Weak-to-Strong Generalization

Improving models with human-generated/annotated data or knowledge/synthetic data from stronger models is the dominant paradigm. However, an intriguing question arises: for future superhuman models, how can we continuously improve the strongest model without relying on human-generated and annotated data? A recent work [3] conducts an exploration on using weak model supervision to train a larger model. This study employs a smaller model to generate labels and then use them to fine-tune the larger model. The findings suggest that, although not as effective as training with human annotations, weak supervision can still improve the performance of large models to some extent.

Our work further explores the weak-to-strong generalization prospect by drawing from how humans continuously acquire new knowledge without direct instruction. We demonstrate that stronger models can further improve themselves by teaching weaker models. We hope this preliminary investigation will inspire further research on using advanced educational strategies to continuously improve LLMs.

### 6.3 Borrowing Education Strategies to Improve LLMs

**Borrowing the design strategies of teaching materials.** We show an LbT pipeline in Fig. 7. Each iteration involves six steps: (1) The teacher generates the Teaching Material (TM). (2) The student learns from the TM. Our work uses in-context learning for all student learning, but exploring other learning strategies is an interesting future direction. (3) The student provides feedback. The feedback can take many forms as listed in the figure. Our work mainly explored feedback in the form of exam details and scores. (4) The teacher reflects on the feedback and identifies the knowledge gaps in the TM or in the teacher’s own knowledge. (5) The teacher can optionally refer to some external data source to address its own knowledge gaps. (6) The teacher improves the rigorousness, clarity, and completeness of their knowledge and updates the TM for the next iteration.

On one hand, updating TM can improve the teacher’s own knowledge. For example, **M3** saves the updated exemplars as the teacher’s prompt to improve the teacher’s reasoning. On the other hand,




Figure 7: LbT pipeline and the type summary of knowledge, TM design strategies, and feedback.

a high-quality TM helps students learn better, so that the students can provide more meaningful feedback for the teacher. To create high-quality TM, it might be beneficial to borrow from TM design strategies in human education. Fig. 7 summarizes various TM design strategies, among which our work has explicitly explored three types (marked in black).

**Borrowing the pipelines.** We can also borrow insights from the education pipelines to design inference and training pipelines for LLMs. Here are two examples: (1) Task-oriented collaborative learning: Multiple LLM agents can form a collaborative study group to learn a difficult topic in a task-oriented manner. Similar multi-role collaboration ideas have been leveraged by LLM agent researches [6, 56, 8, 13, 31, 20]. (2) Progressive learning: A junior model  $\mathcal{M}$  can teach a “student” that is stronger than itself, who can understand and critique mistakes and ambiguity. As  $\mathcal{M}$  becomes more capable, it might become better in evolving its knowledge by teaching weaker students.

## Acknowledgement

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62325405, 62104128, U19B2019, U21B2031, 61832007, 62204164), Tsinghua EE Xilinx AI Research Fund, and Beijing National Research Center for Information Science and Technology (BNRist). We thank for all the supports from Infinigence-AI. Z.W. and M.B.B. acknowledge support from the Research Foundation - Flanders (FWO) through project numbers G0A1319N and S001421N, and funding from the Flemish Government under the Onderzoeksprogramma Artificiële Intelligentie (AI) Vlaanderen programme. Z.W. and M.B.B. acknowledge LUMI-BE for awarding this project access to the LUMI supercomputer, owned by the EuroHPC JU, hosted by CSC (Finland) and the LUMI consortium, and EuroHPC JU for awarding this project access to the Leonardo supercomputer, hosted by CINECA. We thank Zixuan Zhou, Chao Yu, Boxun Li for the helpful discussions.

## Author Contributions

The concrete contributions of equally contributed authors are summarized as following:

- Xuefei Ning: Project leader; Idea; Story; Field survey; Method design & experiment design of M1&M2&M3; Implementation & oracle experiments of M1; Method figures
- Zifu Wang: Experiment design & implementation & experiments of M1-math & M2
- Shiyao Li: Experiment design & implementation & experiments of M1-code; Method figures
- Zinan Lin: Project leader; Story; Method design & experiment design of M1&M3; Oracle experiments of M1
- Peiran Yao: Method design & experiment design & implementation & experiments of M3

Besides, all authors participate in the analysis of the experimental results and the writing of corresponding sections. Xuefei and Zinan lead the analysis and writing.

## References

- [1] Marah Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat Behl, et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*, 2024.
- [2] Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Michal Podstawski, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, et al. Graph of thoughts: Solving elaborate problems with large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 17682–17690, 2024.
- [3] Collin Burns, Pavel Izmailov, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Bowen Baker, Leo Gao, Leopold Aschenbrenner, Yining Chen, Adrien Ecoffet, Manas Joglekar, Jan Leike, et al. Weak-to-strong generalization: Eliciting strong capabilities with weak supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09390*, 2023.
- [4] Bei Chen, Fengji Zhang, Anh Nguyen, Daoguang Zan, Zeqi Lin, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. Codet: Code generation with generated tests. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [5] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching large language models to self-debug. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [6] Yuheng Cheng, Ceyao Zhang, Zhengwen Zhang, Xiangrui Meng, Sirui Hong, Wenhao Li, Zihao Wang, Zekai Wang, Feng Yin, Junhua Zhao, et al. Exploring large language model based intelligent agents: Definitions, methods, and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03428*, 2024.
- [7] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [8] Yihong Dong, Xue Jiang, Zhi Jin, and Ge Li. Self-collaboration code generation via chatgpt. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, jun 2024.
- [9] David Duran. Learning-by-teaching. evidence and implications as a pedagogical mechanism. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 54(5):476–484, 2017.
- [10] Yuxian Gu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, and Minlie Huang. Minillm: Knowledge distillation of large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [11] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, volume 1, 2021.
- [12] Namgyu Ho, Laura Schmid, and Se-Young Yun. Large language models are reasoning teachers. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14852–14882, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [13] Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jonathan Chen, Xiawu Zheng, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, Chenglin Wu, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. MetaGPT: Meta programming for a multi-agent collaborative framework. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [14] Jiaxin Huang, Shixiang Gu, Le Hou, Yuexin Wu, Xuezhi Wang, Hongkun Yu, and Jiawei Han. Large language models can self-improve. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1051–1068, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [15] Hyoungwook Jin, Seonghee Lee, Hyungyu Shin, and Juho Kim. Teach ai how to code: Using large language models as teachable agents for programming education. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '24*, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [16] Zhijing Jin, Abhinav Lalwani, Tejas Vaidhya, Xiaoyu Shen, Yiwen Ding, Zhiheng Lyu, Mrinmaya Sachan, Rada Mihalcea, and Bernhard Schoelkopf. Logical fallacy detection. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 7180–7198, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [17] Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, et al. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221*, 2022.
- [18] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213, 2022.
- [19] Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Andreassen, David Dohan, Ethan Dyer, Henryk Michalewski, Vinay Ramasesh, Ambrose Slone, Cem Anil, Imanol Schlag, Theo Gutman-Solo, et al. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3843–3857, 2022.
- [20] Guohao Li, Hasan Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. Camel: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- [21] Shiyang Li, Jianshu Chen, yelong shen, Zhiyu Chen, Xinlu Zhang, Zekun Li, Hong Wang, Jing Qian, Baolin Peng, Yi Mao, Wenhua Chen, and Xifeng Yan. Explanations from large language models make small reasoners better. In *2nd Workshop on Sustainable AI*, 2024.
- [22] Yifei Li, Zeqi Lin, Shizhuo Zhang, Qiang Fu, Bei Chen, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. Making language models better reasoners with step-aware verifier. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5315–5333, 2023.
- [23] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097, 2022.
- [24] Chen Liang, Simiao Zuo, Qingru Zhang, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, and Tuo Zhao. Less is more: Task-aware layer-wise distillation for language model compression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 20852–20867. PMLR, 2023.
- [25] Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*, 2023.
- [26] Hao Liu, Carmelo Sferrazza, and Pieter Abbeel. Chain of hindsight aligns language models with feedback. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [27] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegreffe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [28] Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, Kyunghyun Cho, He He, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason Weston. Iterative reasoning preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19733*, 2024.
- [29] Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah Smith, and Mike Lewis. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5687–5711, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [30] Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. Automatic prompt optimization with “gradient descent” and beam search. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7957–7968, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [31] Chen Qian, Xin Cong, Cheng Yang, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Juyuan Xu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Communicative agents for software development. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07924*, 2023.

- [32] 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, 2024.
- [33] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [34] Rod D Roscoe and Michelene TH Chi. The influence of the tutee in learning by peer tutoring. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, volume 26, 2004.
- [35] Rod D Roscoe and Michelene TH Chi. Understanding tutor learning: Knowledge-building and knowledge-telling in peer tutors’ explanations and questions. *Review of educational research*, 77(4):534–574, 2007.
- [36] Rod D Roscoe and Michelene TH Chi. Tutor learning: The role of explaining and responding to questions. *Instructional science*, 36:321–350, 2008.
- [37] Tasmia Shahriar and Noboru Matsuda. “can you clarify what you said?”: Studying the impact of tutee agents’ follow-up questions on tutors’ learning. In *Artificial Intelligence in Education: 22nd International Conference, AIED 2021, Utrecht, The Netherlands, June 14–18, 2021, Proceedings, Part I 22*, pages 395–407. Springer, 2021.
- [38] Freda Shi, Daniel Fried, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Sida I. Wang. Natural language to code translation with execution. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3533–3546, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [39] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [40] Alessandro Sordoni, Eric Yuan, Marc-Alexandre Côté, Matheus Pereira, Adam Trischler, Ziang Xiao, Arian Hosseini, Friederike Niedtner, and Nicolas Le Roux. Joint prompt optimization of stacked llms using variational inference. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 58128–58151. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023.
- [41] Saurabh Srivastava, Anto PV, Shashank Menon, Ajay Sukumar, Alan Philipose, Stevin Prince, Sooraj Thomas, et al. Functional benchmarks for robust evaluation of reasoning performance, and the reasoning gap. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19450*, 2024.
- [42] Zhiqing Sun, Longhui Yu, Yikang Shen, Weiyang Liu, Yiming Yang, Sean Welleck, and Chuang Gan. Easy-to-hard generalization: Scalable alignment beyond human supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09472*, 2024.
- [43] Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Allan Zhou, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Huaxiu Yao, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher Manning. Just ask for calibration: Strategies for eliciting calibrated confidence scores from language models fine-tuned with human feedback. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5433–5442, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [44] Inar Timiryasov and Jean-Loup Tastet. Baby llama: knowledge distillation from an ensemble of teachers trained on a small dataset with no performance penalty. In *Proceedings of the BabyLM Challenge at the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 279–289, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [45] Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Zhihong Shao, RX Xu, Damai Dai, Yifei Li, Deli Chen, Y Wu, and Zhifang Sui. Math-shepherd: A label-free step-by-step verifier for llms in mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08935*, 2023.
- [46] William Yang Wang. “liar, liar pants on fire”: A new benchmark dataset for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 422–426, Vancouver, Canada, July 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [47] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

- [48] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13484–13508, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [49] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [50] Yuxi Xie, Kenji Kawaguchi, Yiran Zhao, James Xu Zhao, Min-Yen Kan, Junxian He, and Michael Xie. Self-evaluation guided beam search for reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [51] Xiaohan Xu, Ming Li, Chongyang Tao, Tao Shen, Reynold Cheng, Jinyang Li, Can Xu, Dacheng Tao, and Tianyi Zhou. A survey on knowledge distillation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13116*, 2024.
- [52] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik R Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [53] Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. Self-rewarding language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10020*, 2024.
- [54] Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chengpeng Li, Guanting Dong, Chuanqi Tan, and Chang Zhou. Scaling relationship on learning mathematical reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01825*, 2023.
- [55] Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah Goodman. Star: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15476–15488, 2022.
- [56] Hongxin Zhang, Weihua Du, Jiaming Shan, Qinhong Zhou, Yilun Du, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, Tianmin Shu, and Chuang Gan. Building cooperative embodied agents modularly with large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [57] Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Swaroop Mishra, Xinyun Chen, Heng-Tze Cheng, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Take a step back: Evoking reasoning via abstraction in large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [58] Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc V Le, and Ed H. Chi. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [59] Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwon Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [60] Zixuan Zhou, Xuefei Ning, Ke Hong, Tianyu Fu, Jiaming Xu, Shiyao Li, Yuming Lou, Luning Wang, Zhihang Yuan, Xiuhong Li, et al. A survey on efficient inference for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14294*, 2024.
- [61] Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*, 2019.

## A M1

The pseudo-code for M1 is illustrated in [Alg. 1](#). In each iteration of the for loop, we calculate the LbT score of one TA in the following three steps:

1. Use teacher LLM to sample TR-TA pairs: As shown in line 4 of the [Alg. 1](#), given a TP, the teacher LLM samples diverse TR-TA pairs as the teaching materials. The prompts of the teacher are shown in [Prompt 1](#) (MATH) and [Prompt 3](#) (Coding).
2. Use student LLM to take the exam: As shown in lines 7-11 in [Alg. 1](#), the sampled TP-TR-TA pair serves as an in-context demonstration and we prompt the student LLM to solve related EPs. The prompts of the student LLM are shown in [Prompt 2](#) (MATH) and [Prompt 4](#) (Coding). Finally, we evaluate each EA and store its exam score to calculate the LbT score.
3. Calculate the LbT score for TA: As illustrated in lines 14-18 in [Alg. 1](#), we use the exam scores of EPs to calculate the LbT score for each TA. For MATH, we employ both the MAX and SUM modes, while for Coding, we use only the MAX mode.

Finally, after getting the LbT score for all TAs, we select the TA with the largest LbT score.

---

### Algorithm 1 The Workflow of M1

---

#### Require:

```
Teacher and Student LLM: T, S
Teaching Problem: TP
Exam Problems: EPs
Ground-truth of Exam Problems: EPs_GT
Number of TRs: n
LbT Mode: mode
1: lbt = defaultdict(float)
2: for i = 1 to n do
3:   # Teacher LLM samples TR and TA
4:   TR, TA = T(TP)
5:
6:   # Student LLM performs exams
7:   exam_scores = []
8:   for EP, EP_GT in zip(EPs, EPs_GT) do
9:     ER, EA = S(TP, TR, TA, EP)
10:    exam_scores.append(Eval(EA, EP_GT))
11:  end for
12:
13:  # Calculate the MAX/SUM LbT score of each TA
14:  if mode == "MAX" then
15:    lbt[TA] = max(lbt[TA], average(exam_scores))
16:  else
17:    lbt[TA] += average(exam_scores)
18:  end if
19: end for
20:
21: return max(lbt, key=lbt.get)
```

---

## A.1 Mathematical Reasoning

### A.1.1 Prompt Design

For MATH, we use 4-shot examples from Minerva [19]. The prompt for the student is the same as the teacher, except that an additional shot from the teacher (i.e. a TP-TR-TA pair) is appended after the original 4-shot examples.

### Prompt 1. Teacher Prompt (MATH)

```
[User:]
Your task is to answer the last question below. Give step by step reasoning before you answer. When you're ready to
answer, please wrap your answer and conclude using the format
""
[[Final Answer]]:
$ANSWER$
""

{4-shot examples}

[[Question]]:

{TP}

[Assistant:]
[[Solution]]:
Let's think step by step.
```

### Prompt 2. Student Prompt (MATH)

```
[User:]
Your task is to answer the last question below. Give step by step reasoning before you answer. When you're ready to
answer, please wrap your answer and conclude using the format
""
[[Final Answer]]:
$ANSWER$
""

{4-shot examples}

[[Question]]:

{TP}

[[Solution]]:

{TR}

[[Final Answer]]:

{TA}

[[Question]]:

{EP}

[Assistant:]
[[Solution]]:
Let's think step by step.
```

## A.1.2 Additional Experimental Setups

In § 3.2.1, both the teacher and the student use the same sampling parameters. Following [42], we use top-K sampling with  $K=20$  and a temperature of 0.7.

In Tab. 8, we provide additional results in small-scale experiments. Specifically, for each of the 7 categories in MATH, we select 10 problems, resulting in a total of 70 TPs. We then sample 16 TR-TA pairs for each TP. The rest of the procedure follows § 3.2.1.

## A.1.3 Additional Results

**M1** requires additional inference costs for the student, raising concerns about whether **M1** can surpass the baseline within the same budget. We provide additional results in Tab. 7. Notably, using only 24 TR-TA pairs in **M1** still outperforms SC with 256 TR-TA pairs, especially on the most recent LLaMA3 models. Under this setting, **M1** has a lower inference cost than SC, particularly when comparing **M1** and SC on LLaMA3-70B and using LLaMA3-8B as the student (the first row of the table).



Furthermore, as shown in § 3.2.2, the improvement over the baseline does not saturate and actually increases, indicating that **M1** could achieve a higher upper-bound performance.

In Tab. 8, we compare LbT-based scoring with self-evaluation scoring [53, 50, 43, 17]. Our method consistently outperforms the self-evaluation baseline. Additionally, the table reveals that the performance gap between the strong-teach-strong and strong-teach-weak settings is relatively small.

Table 7: Results on 181 MATH test problems. SC is with 256 TR-TA pairs, while **M1** is with 24 TR-TA pairs. The standard deviation is computed over 10 repeated runs.

Teacher	Student	Greedy	SC	<b>M1 (MAX)</b>	<b>M1 (SUM)</b>
LLaMA3-70B	LLaMA3-8B	70.16	81.77	84.97 ± 1.73	85.69 ± 1.49
GPT-3.5	LLaMA3-8B	59.11	77.90	78.34 ± 1.86	79.50 ± 2.13
GPT-3.5	Mistral-7B	59.11	77.90	77.85 ± 1.34	78.07 ± 1.19
GPT-3.5	LLaMA3-8B & Mistral-7B	59.11	77.90	80.94 ± 1.51	80.61 ± 1.72
LLaMA3-8B	LLaMA3-8B	45.85	64.64	70.83 ± 1.91	72.93 ± 2.15
Mistral-7B	LLaMA3-8B	19.88	40.88	40.55 ± 1.82	42.43 ± 1.78

Table 8: Results on 70 MATH problems with 16 TR-TA pairs.

Teacher	Student	SC	Self-Eval	<b>M1 (MAX)</b>	<b>M1 (SUM)</b>
GPT-4	GPT-4	67.14	68.57	70.00	72.86
GPT-4	GPT-3.5	67.14	68.57	71.43	72.86
GPT-3.5	GPT-3.5	52.86	52.86	57.14	58.57
GPT-3.5	Mistral-7B	52.86	52.86	54.29	57.14

## A.2 Competition-Level Code Synthesis

### A.2.1 Prompt Design

Prompt 3. Teacher Prompt (Coding)
<p><b>[User:]</b> [[Question]]:</p> <p>{TP}</p> <p>First, let's think step by step to find a complete problem-solving strategy. Then, write a Python code based on the problem-solving strategy.</p> <p><b>[Assistant:]</b> [[RATIONALE]]:</p>
Prompt 4. Student Prompt (Coding)
<p><b>[User:]</b> [[Question]]:</p> <p>Here is an example question, please understand it very carefully:</p> <p>{TP}</p> <p>First, let's think step by step to find a complete problem-solving strategy. Then, write a Python code based on the problem-solving strategy.</p> <p>[[RATIONALE]]:</p> <p>{TR}</p> <p>[[Final Code]]:</p> <p>{TA}</p>

[[Question]]:

Please first understand the problem-solving approach in the rationale of the aforementioned example, and then follow the example to solve the following similar type of problem:

{EP}

First, let's think step by step to find a complete problem-solving strategy.  
Then, write a Python code based on the problem-solving strategy.

[Assistant:]

[[RATIONALE]]:

### Prompt 5. Self-Debugging Prompt (Coding)

[User:]

[[Question]]:

{TP or EP}

[[RATIONALE]]:

{TR or ER}

[[Final Code]]:

{TA or EA}

You need to debug this code with the following rules:

- (1) If you think the provided code is correct, you must retrieve the original correct code.
- (2) If you think the provided code is incorrect, you debug the code and write the final bug-free code.
- (3) If there is no complete code, you must write a complete code based on the rationale.

Let's think step by step and remember you **must** give me a complete Python code finally.

[Assistant:]

## A.2.2 Additional Experimental Setups

To get the problems from Leetcode, we follow the approach of Reflexion [39] to use Leetcode's official API to obtain all datasets from the Grandmaster dynamic programming study plan. We also employ GPT-3.5 to extract all visible examples for offline evaluation. Additionally, we use the Leetcode Python API to submit the Python code and evaluate the code on invisible examples.

As shown in [Alg. 1](#), within the for loop, we first have the teacher LLM sample TR and TA. To validate LbT, we introduce randomness at this step to generate a variety of TR-TA pairs. For GPT-3.5-0613, we set the temperature and top-P to 1, while for the LLaMA3 family, we set the temperature to 0.6 and top-P to 0.9 (default setting). Next, we prompt the student LLM with the sampled TR-TA as in-context examples to solve EPs. In this step, we use greedy sampling.

Table 9: The question IDs and the question title names of problems in Game Theory, Bitmasking, and General-1D study plan.

Leetcode Study Plan	Question ID	Question Title	Question Title Abbr.
Game Theory	486	Predict the Winner	PW
	877	Stone Game	SG-1
	1140	Stone Game II	SG-2
	1406	Stone Game III	SG-3
	1510	Stone Game IV	SG-4
Bitmasking	698	Partition to K Equal Sum Subsets	PKE
	465	Optimal Account Balancing	OAB
	847	Shortest Path Visiting All Nodes	SPV
	1125	Smallest Sufficient Team	SST
	1434	Number of Ways to Wear Different Hats to Each Other	NWW
	1799	Maximize Score After N Operations	MSA
General-1D	1048	Longest String Chain	LSC
	376	Wiggle Subsequence	WS
	651	4 Keys Keyboard	4KK
	32	Longest Valid Parentheses	LVP
	1416	Restore The Array	RTA
	1259	Handshakes That Don't Cross	HTD
	639	Decode Ways II	DW-2

### A.2.3 Additional Results

Table 10: Ablation of model settings on *Game Theory* dataset in Leetcode Grandmaster DP study plan.

Models	Metrics	SG-1	SG-2	SG-3	SG-4	PW
T=LLaMA3-8B S=GPT-3.5	Avg.	0.215	0.004	0.216	0.604	0.609
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	0.101	0.005	0.524	0.611	0.462
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	-	-	0.755	0.851
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	-	-	1	0.871
T=LLaMA3-8B S=GPT-3.5 (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.348	0.004	0.319	0.608	0.694
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	0.370	0	0.565	1	1
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.797	-	-	0.722	0.851
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.391	-	-	1	1
T=GPT-3.5 S=LLaMA3-8B	Avg.	0.582	0.007	0.428	1	0.645
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	0.652	0.011	0.681	1	0.766
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.994	-	0.712	1	0.867
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.989	-	0.712	1	0.766
T=GPT-3.5 S=LLaMA3-8B (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.701	0.133	0.591	1	0.853
	<b>M1</b> (MAX)	1	0.204	0.668	1	0.867
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.996	1	0.712	1	0.911
	<b>M1</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.867

Table 11: **S-score** results on *Bitmasking* dataset in Leetcode Grandmaster DP study plan. Here, the teacher and student are the same. This dataset is too difficult for LLaMA3-8B, which can hardly solve these coding problems.

Models	Metrics	PKE	OAB	SPV	SST	NWW	MSA
T=LLaMA3-8B S=LLaMA3-8B	Avg.	0.458	0.132	0.009	0.016	0.006	0.110
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.458	0.278	0.005	0	0.007	0.110
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.628	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.628	-	-	-	-	-
T=LLaMA3-8B S=LLaMA3-8B (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.463	0.135	0.005	0.039	0.006	0.109
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.908	0.135	0.006	0.045	0	0.108
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.642	0.472	-	-	-	-
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.908	0.472	-	-	-	-
T=GPT-3.5 S=GPT-3.5	Avg.	0.788	0.024	0.880	0.148	0.369	0.258
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.936	0	1	1	0.923	0.584
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.901	0.111	1	0.526	0.949	0.584
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.936	0.111	1	1	0.923	0.584
T=GPT-3.5 S=GPT-3.5 (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.788	0.024	0.880	0.148	0.369	0.256
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.943	0	1	1	1	0.481
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.901	0.111	1	0.526	0.949	0.578
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.943	0.111	1	1	1	0.578

Table 12: **S-score** results on *Bitmasking* dataset in Leetcode Grandmaster DP study plan. Here, the teacher and student are different.

Models	Metrics	PKE	OAB	SPV	SST	NWW	MSA
T=LLaMA3-8B S=GPT-3.5	Avg.	0.458	0.132	0.009	0.016	0.006	0.110
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.551	0.014	0	0	0	0.162
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.628	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.488	-	-	-	-	-
T=LLaMA3-8B S=GPT-3.5 (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.463	0.135	0.005	0.039	0.006	0.109
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.537	0	0	0.039	0	0.130
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.642	0.472	-	-	-	-
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.908	0.472	-	-	-	-
T=GPT-3.5 S=LLaMA3-8B	Avg.	0.788	0.024	0.880	0.148	0.369	0.258
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.788	0.039	1	0.037	0	0.203
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.901	0.111	1	0.526	0.949	0.584
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.901	0.111	1	0.053	0.949	0.584
T=GPT-3.5 S=LLaMA3-8B (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.788	0.024	0.880	0.148	0.369	0.256
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.926	0.024	1	0.197	1	0.286
	Avg. (V-score=1)	0.901	0.111	1	0.526	0.949	0.578
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	0.926	0.111	1	0.526	1	0.578

Table 13: **S-score** results on *General-ID* dataset in Leetcode Grandmaster DP study plan. Here, the teacher and student are the same.

Models	Metrics	LSC	WS	4KK	LVP	RTA	HTD	DW-2
T=LLaMA3-8B S=LLaMA3-8B	Avg.	0.326	0.819	0.062	0.563	0.108	0.013	0.507
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.244	1	0.090	1	0.151	0.027	0.679
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	1	-	0.671	-	-	-
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	-	1	-	-	-
T=LLaMA3-8B S=LLaMA3-8B (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.273	0.399	0.085	0.567	0.106	0.013	0.507
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.288	0.500	0.120	0.719	0.151	0.020	0.679
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	1	-	0.607	-	-	-
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	-	0.719	-	-	-
T=GPT-3.5 S=GPT-3.5	Avg.	1	1	0.542	0.818	0.089	0.653	0.565
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	1	1	1	1	0.128	1	0.697
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.128	0.867	0.719
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.128	1	0.697
T=GPT-3.5 S=GPT-3.5 (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	1	1	0.547	0.818	0.089	0.653	0.549
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	1	1	1	1	0.126	1	0.587
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.128	0.867	0.719
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.198	1	0.697

Table 14: **S-score** results on *General-ID* dataset in Leetcode Grandmaster DP study plan. Here, the teacher and student are different.

Models	Metrics	LSC	WS	4KK	LVP	RTA	HTD	DW-2
T=LLaMA3-8B S=GPT-3.5	Avg.	0.326	0.819	0.062	0.563	0.108	0.013	0.507
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.253	0.774	0.080	0.573	0.081	0.007	0.342
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	1	-	0.671	-	-	-
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	-	0.719	-	-	-
T=LLaMA3-8B S=GPT-3.5 (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	0.273	0.399	0.073	0.567	0.106	0.013	0.507
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	0.485	0.661	0.030	1	0.151	0.016	0.561
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	1	-	0.607	-	-	-
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	-	1	-	-	-
T=GPT-3.5 S=LLaMA3-8B	Avg.	1	1	0.542	0.818	0.089	0.653	0.565
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	1	1	0.520	1	0.058	0.013	0.697
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.128	0.867	0.719
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.128	0.867	0.697
T=GPT-3.5 S=LLaMA3-8B (w. Self-Debugging)	Avg.	1	1	0.547	0.818	0.089	0.653	0.549
	<b>MI</b> (MAX)	1	1	0.560	1	0.052	1	0.697
	Avg. (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.128	0.867	0.719
	<b>MI</b> (MAX) (V-score=1)	1	1	1	1	0.128	1	0.697

**Example 1. MI on Code Synthesis 1 (Teacher=Student=GPT-3.5-turbo-0613)**

**TP:**

(Leetcode Question ID: 877) Write a python code `"""class Solution(): def stoneGame(self, piles: List[int]) -> bool: """` to solve the following problem:  
Alice and Bob play a game with piles of stones. There are an even number of piles arranged in a row,  
...

**TR and TA:**

To determine the winner of the game, Alice or Bob, you can use a dynamic programming approach. Let's think step by step:

1. Create a 2D array: Create a 2D array of size 'n' by 'n', where 'n' is the length of the 'piles' list. This array will store the maximum number of stones a player can collect from piles 'i' to 'j'.
2. Base case: Initialize the diagonal elements of the 2D array with the values of the piles themselves, as Alice and Bob can only choose from one pile each.

3. Dynamic programming iteration: Iterate over the 2D array diagonally, dynamically computing the maximum number of stones a player can collect from piles 'i' to 'j'. The maximum number of stones a player can collect is the maximum of two options:

- Taking the pile at index 'i' and the maximum number of stones from piles 'i+1' to 'j' (Alice's turn), or
- Taking the pile at index 'j' and the maximum number of stones from piles 'i' to 'j-1' (Bob's turn).

4. Return the winner: After the dynamic programming iteration, check if the maximum number of stones Alice can collect (from piles '[0, n-1]') is greater than the maximum number of stones Bob can collect. If so, return True; otherwise, return False.

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution:
4     def stoneGame(self, piles: List[int]) -> bool:
5         n = len(piles)
6         dp = [[0] * n for _ in range(n)]
7
8         # Base case: diagonal elements
9         for i in range(n):
10            dp[i][i] = piles[i]
11
12        # Dynamic programming iteration
13        for length in range(2, n+1):
14            for i in range(n - length + 1):
15                j = i + length - 1
16                dp[i][j] = max(piles[i] - dp[i+1][j], piles[j] - dp[i][j-1])
17
18        # Return the winner
19        return dp[0][n-1] > 0
```

#### EP:

(Leetcode Question ID: 486) Write a python code `class Solution(): def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool:` to solve the following problem:

You are given an integer array 'nums'. Two players are playing a game with this array: player 1 and player 2.

...

#### ER and EA:

To determine if Player 1 can win the game, you can use a dynamic programming approach. Let's think step by step:

1. Create a 2D array: Create a 2D array of size 'n' by 'n', where 'n' is the length of the 'nums' list. This array will store the maximum score difference between Player 1 and Player 2 when considering the subarray from index 'i' to index 'j'.

2. Base case: Initialize the diagonal elements of the 2D array with the values of the numbers in the 'nums' list, as Player 1 and Player 2 can only choose one number each.

3. Dynamic programming iteration: Iterate over the 2D array diagonally, dynamically computing the maximum score difference between Player 1 and Player 2 when considering the subarray from index 'i' to index 'j'. The maximum score difference is the maximum of two options:

- The number at index 'i' minus the maximum score difference between Player 1 and Player 2 when considering the subarray from index 'i+1' to index 'j' (Player 1's turn), or
- The number at index 'j' minus the maximum score difference between Player 1 and Player 2 when considering the subarray from index 'i' to index 'j-1' (Player 2's turn).

4. Return the result: After the dynamic programming iteration, check if the maximum score difference between Player 1 and Player 2 when considering the entire array (from index '0' to index 'n-1') is greater than or equal to '0'. If so, return True; otherwise, return False.

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution:
4     def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool:
5         n = len(nums)
6         dp = [[0] * n for _ in range(n)]
7
8         # Base case: diagonal elements
9         for i in range(n):
10            dp[i][i] = nums[i]
11
12        # Dynamic programming iteration
13        for length in range(2, n+1):
14            for i in range(n - length + 1):
15                j = i + length - 1
16                dp[i][j] = max(nums[i] - dp[i+1][j], nums[j] - dp[i][j-1])
17
```

```

18     # Return the result
19     return dp[0][n-1] >= 0

```

### Example 2. M1 on Code Synthesis 2 (Teacher=Student=GPT-3.5-turbo-0613)

#### TP:

**(Leetcode Question ID: 877)** Write a python code `"""class Solution(): def stoneGame(self, piles: List[int]) -> bool: """` to solve the following problem:  
 Alice and Bob play a game with piles of stones. There are an even number of piles arranged in a row,  
 ...

#### TR and TA:

To solve this problem, we can use a dynamic programming approach. Let's break down the problem-solving strategy step by step:

1. Initialize Variables: The code initializes two variables 'n' and 'm' to keep track of the total number of piles and an empty cache dictionary.
2. Recursive Function: The code defines a recursive function called 'aliceWins' which takes two parameters: 'start' and 'end'. This function represents the state of the game - the range of piles currently available.
3. Base Case: The base case of the recursive function is when there are no more piles left, i.e., when 'start > end'. In this case, we return True if Alice's total number of stones is greater than Bob's total number of stones, otherwise return False.
4. Memoization: Before calculating the result for the current state, we check if the result is already present in the cache dictionary. If so, we return the cached result instead of recalculating it.
5. Maximum Stones Calculation: We calculate the maximum number of stones Alice can obtain if she starts from the 'start' pile and Bob plays optimally. We have two options:
  - Alice takes the 'start' pile: In this case, Alice's total number of stones will be the 'start' pile minus the maximum number of stones Bob can obtain from the remaining piles. Bob's maximum number of stones can be obtained using the 'aliceWins' function recursively by changing the 'start' index to 'start+1' and keeping the 'end' index the same.
  - Alice takes the 'end' pile: In this case, Alice's total number of stones will be the 'end' pile minus the maximum number of stones Bob can obtain from the remaining piles. Bob's maximum number of stones can be obtained using the 'aliceWins' function recursively by changing the 'end' index to 'end-1' and keeping the 'start' index the same.
6. Update Cache and Return Result: After calculating the maximum number of stones Alice can obtain, we update the cache dictionary with the result for the current state '(start, end)' and return the result.
7. Main Function: The code defines the main 'stoneGame' function that calls the 'aliceWins' function with the initial state '(0, n-1)' and returns the result.

```

1  from typing import List
2
3  class Solution():
4      def stoneGame(self, piles: List[int]) -> bool:
5          n = len(piles)
6          cache = {} # Cache dictionary to store results
7
8          def aliceWins(start: int, end: int) -> bool:
9              # Base case - no more piles left
10             if start > end:
11                 return sum(piles) %
12
13             # Check if result is already cached
14             if (start, end) in cache:
15                 return cache[(start, end)]
16
17             # Option 1: Alice takes the start pile
18             option1 = piles[start] - aliceWins(start + 1, end)
19
20             # Option 2: Alice takes the end pile
21             option2 = piles[end] - aliceWins(start, end - 1)
22
23             # Update cache with the result and return
24             cache[(start, end)] = max(option1, option2) > 0
25             return cache[(start, end)]
26
27         # Call the recursive function with initial state (0, n-1)
28         return aliceWins(0, n-1)

```

**EP:**

**(Leetcode Question ID: 486)** Write a python code `"""class Solution(): def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool: """` to solve the following problem:

You are given an integer array 'nums'. Two players are playing a game with this array: player 1 and player 2.

...

**ER and EA:**

To solve this problem, we can use a dynamic programming approach. Let's break down the problem-solving strategy step by step:

1. Initialize Variables: The code initializes two variables 'n' and 'm' to keep track of the total number of elements in the array and an empty cache dictionary.
2. Recursive Function: The code defines a recursive function called 'player1Wins' which takes two parameters: 'start' and 'end'. This function represents the state of the game - the range of elements currently available.
3. Base Case: The base case of the recursive function is when there are no more elements left, i.e., when 'start > end'. In this case, we return True if Player 1's score is greater than or equal to Player 2's score, otherwise return False.
4. Memoization: Before calculating the result for the current state, we check if the result is already present in the cache dictionary. If so, we return the cached result instead of recalculating it.
5. Maximum Score Calculation: We calculate the maximum score Player 1 can obtain if they start from the 'start' element and both players play optimally. We have two options:
  - Player 1 takes the 'start' element: In this case, Player 1's score will be the 'start' element plus the minimum score Player 2 can obtain from the remaining elements. Player 2's minimum score can be obtained using the 'player1Wins' function recursively by changing the 'start' index to 'start+1' and keeping the 'end' index the same.
  - Player 1 takes the 'end' element: In this case, Player 1's score will be the 'end' element plus the minimum score Player 2 can obtain from the remaining elements. Player 2's minimum score can be obtained using the 'player1Wins' function recursively by changing the 'end' index to 'end-1' and keeping the 'start' index the same.
6. Update Cache and Return Result: After calculating the maximum score Player 1 can obtain, we update the cache dictionary with the result for the current state '(start, end)' and return the result.
7. Main Function: The code defines the main 'predictTheWinner' function that calls the 'player1Wins' function with the initial state '(0, n-1)' and returns the result.

```

1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution():
4     def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool:
5         n = len(nums)
6         cache = {} # Cache dictionary to store results
7
8         def player1Wins(start: int, end: int) -> bool:
9             # Base case - no more elements left
10            if start > end:
11                return True
12
13            # Check if result is already cached
14            if (start, end) in cache:
15                return cache[(start, end)]
16
17            # Option 1: Player 1 takes the start element
18            option1 = nums[start] + min(player1Wins(start + 1, end),
19                                       player1Wins(start, end - 1))
20
21            # Option 2: Player 1 takes the end element
22            option2 = nums[end] + min(player1Wins(start + 1, end),
23                                      player1Wins(start, end - 1))
24
25            # Update cache with the result and return
26            cache[(start, end)] = option1 >= option2
27            return cache[(start, end)]
28
29        # Call the recursive function with initial state (0, n-1)
30        return player1Wins(0, n-1)

```

**Example 3. M1 on Code Synthesis 3 (Teacher=Student=GPT-3.5-turbo-0613)****TP:**

**(Leetcode Question ID: 877)** Write a python code `"""class Solution(): def stoneGame(self, piles: List[int]) -> bool: """` to solve the following problem:



Alice and Bob play a game with piles of stones. There are an even number of piles arranged in a row,  
...

### TR and TA:

The problem is asking to determine if Alice can win the game given a list of piles of stones. Here's a step-by-step strategy to solve the problem:

1. Determine Alice's optimal strategy:

- Since Alice starts first, she has the advantage of making the first move.
- Alice's goal is to end with the most stones, so she will try to maximize her score.
- In each turn, Alice can choose to take the entire pile from either the beginning or the end of the row.

2. Determine the total number of stones:

- The total number of stones is odd, which means there will be no ties.
- Alice can always take the largest pile in each turn.
- Calculate the total number of stones by summing all the elements in the piles list.

3. Check if Alice can always win:

- If Alice takes all the piles from either the beginning or the end in each turn, she will always end up with more stones than Bob.
- Check if the total number of stones is greater than half of the total stones.

4. Return the result:

- If Alice can always win, return True. Otherwise, return False.

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution():
4     def stoneGame(self, piles: List[int]) -> bool:
5         total_stones = sum(piles)
6         half_total = total_stones // 2
7
8         if half_total <= max(piles):
9             return True
10        else:
11            return False
```

### EP:

(Leetcode Question ID: 486) Write a python code `class Solution(): def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool:` to solve the following problem:

You are given an integer array 'nums'. Two players are playing a game with this array: player 1 and player 2.

...

### ER and EA:

The problem is asking to determine if Player 1 can win the game given an array of numbers. Here's a step-by-step strategy to solve the problem:

1. Determine Player 1's optimal strategy:

- Player 1 starts first and wants to maximize their score.
- In each turn, Player 1 can choose a number from either end of the array.

2. Determine the total number of elements:

- Calculate the total number of elements in the array.

3. Check if Player 1 can always win:

- If the total number of elements is odd, Player 1 can always win by choosing the numbers alternately.
- If the total number of elements is even, Player 1 can still win if their score is greater than or equal to Player 2's score.

4. Return the result:

- If Player 1 can always win or has a higher score than Player 2, return True. Otherwise, return False.

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution():
4     def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool:
5         total_elements = len(nums)
6
7         if total_elements %
8             return True
9         else:
10            return sum(nums) >= sum(nums) // 2
```

#### Example 4. M1 on Code Synthesis 4 (Teacher=Student=GPT-3.5-turbo-0613)

##### TP:

(Leetcode Question ID: 1406) Write a python code `"""class Solution(): def stoneGameIII(self, stoneValue: List[int]) -> str: """` to solve the following problem:

Alice and Bob continue their games with piles of stones. There are several stones arranged in a row, and each stone has an associated value which is an integer given in the array 'stoneValue'.

...

##### TR and TA:

To solve this problem, we can use dynamic programming to determine the optimal strategy for each player. Let's think step by step:

1. Create a helper function called 'dfs', which takes in the current position 'i' and the list of stone values. This function will recursively calculate the maximum score that can be achieved starting from position 'i' and returning the difference of Alice's score and Bob's score.
2. In the 'dfs' function, we need a base case for the end of the game. If the current position 'i' is greater than or equal to the length of the stone values list, we've reached the end of the game, and the difference in scores is 0.
3. If the base case is not met, we need to calculate the maximum score difference achievable starting from the current position. We can iterate through the next 3 positions, taking 1, 2, or 3 stones each time, and recursively calculate the score difference for the opponent. We take the maximum score difference among the opponent's choices and subtract the current stone value to get the score difference for the current player.
4. We return the maximum score difference calculated from the previous step. If the current player is Alice (starting player), a positive score difference means Alice wins. If the current player is Bob, a negative score difference means Bob wins. If the score difference is 0, it's a tie.
5. Finally, in the 'stoneGameIII' function, we can call the 'dfs' function with the initial position 0 and the stone values list. We compare the result of 'dfs' with 0 to determine the winner.

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution():
4     def stoneGameIII(self, stoneValue: List[int]) -> str:
5         def dfs(i: int, stoneValues: List[int]) -> int:
6             if i >= len(stoneValues):
7                 return 0
8
9             maxScore = float('-inf')
10            for j in range(i, min(i+3, len(stoneValues))):
11                currScore = sum(stoneValues[i:j+1])
12                opponentScoreDiff = dfs(j + 1, stoneValues)
13                maxScore = max(maxScore, currScore - opponentScoreDiff)
14
15            return maxScore
16
17        scoreDiff = dfs(0, stoneValue)
18        if scoreDiff > 0:
19            return 'Alice'
20        elif scoreDiff < 0:
21            return 'Bob'
22        else:
23            return 'Tie'
```

##### EP:

(Leetcode Question ID: 486) Write a python code `"""class Solution(): def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool: """` to solve the following problem:

You are given an integer array 'nums'. Two players are playing a game with this array: player 1 and player 2.

...

##### ER and EA:

To solve this problem, we can use dynamic programming to determine the optimal strategy for each player. Let's think step by step:

1. Create a helper function called 'dfs', which takes in the current start and end indices of the array. This function will recursively calculate the maximum score that can be achieved starting from the current indices and returning the difference of Player 1's score and Player 2's score.
2. In the 'dfs' function, we need a base case for the end of the game. If the start index is greater than the end index, we've reached the end of the game, and the difference in scores is 0.

3. If the base case is not met, we need to calculate the maximum score difference achievable starting from the current indices. We have two options: either Player 1 chooses the number at the start index or Player 1 chooses the number at the end index. We recursively calculate the score difference for the opponent for both options and take the maximum score difference among the opponent's choices. We subtract the opponent's score difference from the current player's chosen number to get the score difference for the current player.

4. We return the maximum score difference calculated from the previous step. If the score difference is positive or equal to 0, it means Player 1 wins.

5. Finally, in the 'predictTheWinner' function, we can call the 'dfs' function with the initial start and end indices (0 and len(nums)-1) of the array. We compare the result of 'dfs' with 0 to determine if Player 1 can win.

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution():
4     def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool:
5         def dfs(start: int, end: int) -> int:
6             if start > end:
7                 return 0
8
9             chooseStart = nums[start] - dfs(start + 1, end)
10            chooseEnd = nums[end] - dfs(start, end - 1)
11
12            return max(chooseStart, chooseEnd)
13
14            scoreDiff = dfs(0, len(nums) - 1)
15            return scoreDiff >= 0
```

### Example 5. M1 on Code Synthesis 5 (Teacher=GPT-3.5-turbo-0613 Student=LLaMA3-8B)

#### TP:

(Leetcode Question ID: 486) Write a python code `class Solution(): def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool:` to solve the following problem:

You are given an integer array 'nums'. Two players are playing a game with this array: player 1 and player 2.

...

#### TR and TA:

To solve this problem, we can use the concept of dynamic programming. Let's think step by step:

1. Define a function to determine the winner:

- The function should take the array of integers 'nums' as input and return a boolean value indicating whether Player 1 can win the game.

- We will create a 2D memoization table, 'dp', to store the scores difference between Player 1 and Player 2 at each subgame. 'dp[i][j]' represents the maximum score difference when considering the subarray 'nums[i:j+1]'.

- The function will call a helper function 'calculateScores' to calculate the maximum scores at each subgame.

2. Define the 'calculateScores' function:

- The 'calculateScores' function will take the start and end indices, 'start' and 'end', as input and return the maximum score difference between Player 1 and Player 2 for the subarray 'nums[start:end+1]'.

- We will use a recursive approach to consider all possible moves that Player 1 can make.

- Within the recursive function, we will check if the score difference for the current subarray has already been calculated and stored in the memoization table 'dp'. If so, we will return the stored value.

- If the start index is greater than the end index, it means that all elements in the subarray have been chosen, and we will return a score difference of 0.

- Otherwise, we will consider two options:

- If Player 1 chooses the first element ('nums[start]'), the score difference will be the value of 'nums[start]' minus the maximum score difference that Player 2 can obtain in the remaining subarray, calculated recursively.

- If Player 1 chooses the last element ('nums[end]'), the score difference will be the value of 'nums[end]' minus the maximum score difference that Player 2 can obtain in the remaining subarray, calculated recursively.

- We will take the maximum of these two options and store the result in the memoization table 'dp'.

- Finally, we will return the calculated score difference.

3. In the main function 'predictTheWinner', we will initialize the memoization table 'dp' with zeros and call the helper function 'calculateScores' to determine the maximum score difference between Player 1 and Player 2 for the entire array 'nums'.

- If the score difference is greater than or equal to 0, it means that Player 1 can win the game, and we will return 'True'.

- Otherwise, we will return 'False'.

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution():
4     def predictTheWinner(self, nums: List[int]) -> bool:
5         n = len(nums)
```

```

6         dp = [[0] * n for _ in range(n)]
7
8         def calculateScores(start: int, end: int) -> int:
9             if start > end:
10                return 0
11                if dp[start][end] != 0:
12                    return dp[start][end]
13
14                chooseStart = nums[start] - calculateScores(start + 1, end)
15                chooseEnd = nums[end] - calculateScores(start, end - 1)
16
17                dp[start][end] = max(chooseStart, chooseEnd)
18
19                return dp[start][end]
20
21    return calculateScores(0, n - 1) >= 0

```

### EP:

**(Leetcode Question ID: 1510)** Write a python code `"""class Solution(): def winnerSquareGame(self, n: int) -> bool: """` to solve the following problem:  
 Alice and Bob take turns playing a game, with Alice starting first.  
 ...

### ER and EA:

To solve this problem, we can use a similar approach as before. Let's think step by step:

1. Define a function to determine the winner:

- The function should take the integer 'n' as input and return a boolean value indicating whether Alice wins the game.
- We will create a set 'squares' to store all the square numbers less than or equal to 'n'.
- The function will call a helper function 'canWin' to determine if Alice can win the game.

2. Define the 'canWin' function:

- The 'canWin' function will take the current number of stones 'n' as input and return a boolean value indicating whether Alice can win the game.
- We will use a recursive approach to consider all possible moves that Alice can make.
- Within the recursive function, we will check if the current number of stones is less than or equal to 0. If so, it means that Alice has lost the game, and we will return 'False'.
- Otherwise, we will consider all the square numbers in the set 'squares' that are less than or equal to 'n'. For each square number, we will recursively call the 'canWin' function with the updated number of stones.
- If any of the recursive calls return 'True', it means that Alice can win the game, and we will return 'True'.
- If none of the recursive calls return 'True', it means that Alice cannot win the game, and we will return 'False'.

3. In the main function 'winnerSquareGame', we will create the set 'squares' and call the helper function 'canWin' to determine if Alice can win the game.

- If the result is 'True', we will return 'True'.
- Otherwise, we will return 'False'.

```

1 class Solution():
2     def winnerSquareGame(self, n: int) -> bool:
3         squares = set(i * i for i in range(int(math.sqrt(n)) + 1))
4         memo = {}
5
6         def canWin(n: int) -> bool:
7             if n <= 0:
8                 return False
9             if n in memo:
10                return memo[n]
11                for square in squares:
12                    if square > n:
13                        break
14                    if not canWin(n - square):
15                        memo[n] = True
16                        return True
17                memo[n] = False
18                return False
19
20    return canWin(n)

```

## Example 6. Code Synthesis with Self-Debugging (Debugger=GPT-3.5-turbo-0613)

### Problem:

(Leetcode Question ID: 1406) Write a python code """class Solution(): def stoneGameIII(self, stoneValue: List[int]) -> str: """ to solve the following problem:

Alice and Bob continue their games with piles of stones. There are several stones arranged in a row, and each stone has an associated value which is an integer given in the array 'stoneValue'.

...

### Rationale and Answer:

To solve this problem, we can use dynamic programming. Let's think step by step:

1. Initialize the scores array: We initialize an array 'scores' with a length of 'len(stoneValue) + 1'. The 'scores' array will store the maximum score that can be obtained from each starting index.
2. Iterate from the end: We iterate backwards through the 'stoneValue' array, starting from the last element. For each index 'i', we calculate the maximum score that can be obtained from that index by considering all possible moves: taking '1', '2', or '3' stones.
3. Determine the maximum score: For each possible move, we consider the sum of the stones taken and subtract the maximum score that can be obtained from the next index ('scores[i+1]', 'scores[i+2]', and 'scores[i+3]'). We take the maximum of these values as the maximum score from index 'i' and store it in the 'scores' array.
4. Determine the winner: After calculating the maximum scores for all indices, we compare 'scores[0]' with the sum of all the stone values ('sum(stoneValue)') to determine the winner. If 'scores[0]' is greater, Alice wins. If 'scores[0]' is smaller, Bob wins. Otherwise, it's a tie.
5. Return the result: We return the appropriate string based on the winner determination.

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution():
4     def stoneGameIII(self, stoneValue: List[int]) -> str:
5         n = len(stoneValue)
6         scores = [0] * (n + 1)
7
8         for i in range(n-1, -1, -1):
9             take1 = stoneValue[i] - scores[i+1]
10            take2 = sum(stoneValue[i:i+2]) - scores[i+2]
11            take3 = sum(stoneValue[i:i+3]) - scores[i+3]
12            scores[i] = max(take1, take2, take3)
13
14            if scores[0] > sum(stoneValue) - scores[0]:
15                return "Alice"
16            elif scores[0] < sum(stoneValue) - scores[0]:
17                return "Bob"
18            else:
19                return "Tie"
```

### Debug Output:

Based on the provided rationale, here is the final bug-free code:

```
1 from typing import List
2
3 class Solution():
4     def stoneGameIII(self, stoneValue: List[int]) -> str:
5         n = len(stoneValue)
6         scores = [0] * (n + 1)
7
8         for i in range(n-1, -1, -1):
9             take1 = stoneValue[i] - scores[i+1]
10            take2 = sum(stoneValue[i:i+2]) - scores[i+2] if i+2 <= n else
11                    float('-inf')
12            take3 = sum(stoneValue[i:i+3]) - scores[i+3] if i+3 <= n else
13                    float('-inf')
14            scores[i] = max(take1, take2, take3)
15
16            if scores[0] > sum(stoneValue) - scores[0]:
17                return "Alice"
18            elif scores[0] < sum(stoneValue) - scores[0]:
19                return "Bob"
20            else:
21                return "Tie"
```

This code fixes the bug where the index was going out of range when calculating 'take2' and 'take3' by adding conditions to check if 'i+2' and 'i+3' are within the range of the 'stoneValue' list. If they are not, we set the value to 'float('-inf')' to ensure that it is not considered in the maximum calculation.

## B M2

### B.1 More Experimental Setups

We use a learning rate of  $5e-7$ , a batch size of 16 and 1 training epoch. We set  $\beta = 0.1$  and add an additional NLL term [28] weighted by 50.

### B.2 Additional Results

#### Example 7. A DPO Pair of Correct Answers

##### TP and TP-GT:

Compute  $(-49) \div 7$ .

When  $y$  is nonzero, we have  $(-x) \div y = -(x \div y)$ , so  $(-49) \div 7 = -(49 \div 7) = \boxed{-7}$ .

##### Winning TR-TA:

Let's think step by step.

The division operation is the inverse operation of multiplication, so we need to find the number that 7 multiplied by gives  $-49$ . This number is  $-7$ .

Therefore,  $(-49) \div 7 = \boxed{-7}$ .

##### Losing TR-TA:

Let's think step by step.

To compute division, we can compute the quotient and remainder. We can do this by performing repeated subtraction:

$$49 - 7 = 42$$

$$42 - 7 = 35$$

$$35 - 7 = 28$$

$$28 - 7 = 21$$

$$21 - 7 = 14$$

$$14 - 7 = 7$$

$$7 - 7 = 0$$

At this point, the remainder is 0, so we are done.

The quotient is the number of times we subtracted 7, which is 7. Therefore,  $(-49) \div 7 = \boxed{-7}$ .

#### Example 8. A DPO Pair of Wrong Answers

##### TP and TP-GT:

A positive integer  $X$  is 2 more than a multiple of 3. Its units digit is the same as the units digit of a number that is 4 more than a multiple of 5. What is the smallest possible value of  $X$ ?

If a positive integer is 4 more than a multiple of 5, then its units digit must be 4 or 9. We check positive integers ending in 4 or 9 until we find one which is 2 more than a multiple of 3: 4 is 1 more than a multiple of 3, 9 is a multiple of 3, and

$\boxed{14}$  is 2 more than a multiple of 3.

##### Winning TR-TA:

Let's think step by step.

We know that  $X$  is 2 more than a multiple of 3, so  $X = 3k + 2$  for some integer  $k$ .

The units digit of  $X$  is the same as the units digit of a number that is 4 more than a multiple of 5. The numbers that are 4 more than a multiple of 5 are 4, 9, 14, 19, ..., so the units digit of such a number is either 4 or 9. Since  $X$  has units digit 4, we have that  $X$  has units digit 4.

Therefore, we can write  $X = 3k + 2 = 4$ , or  $k = 1$ . The smallest possible value of  $X$  is  $\boxed{5}$ .

##### Losing TR-TA:

Let's think step by step.

The units digit of  $X$  is the same as the units digit of a number that is 4 more than a multiple of 5. Since the units digit of a multiple of 5 is either 0 or 5, the units digit of  $X$  is either 6 or 1.  
 Also,  $X$  is 2 more than a multiple of 3, so  $X$  is either 2 more than a multiple of 3, or 1 more than a multiple of 3.  
 If the units digit of  $X$  is 6, then  $X$  must be 8 or 11 or... and so on. However, if  $X$  is 2 more than a multiple of 3, then  $X$  cannot be 8 or 11 or... because the units digit of 8 or 11 or... is not the same as the units digit of a number that is 4 more than a multiple of 5.  
 Therefore, the units digit of  $X$  must be 1. In this case,  $X$  must be 1 or 4 or 7 or... and so on. Since  $X$  is 2 more than a multiple of 3, the smallest possible value of  $X$  is  $\boxed{4}$ .

## C M3

---

### Algorithm 2 The Workflow of M3

---

**Require:**

Teacher and (one or multiple) Student LLM:  $T, S_i$   
 Teaching Problem: TP  
 Exam Problems: EPs  
 Ground-truth of Exam Problems:  $EPs\_GT$   
 Number of iterations:  $T$

- 1: # Generate initial exemplars.
- 2:  $TP', TA' = T_{init}(TP)$
- 3: # Iteratively search for better exemplars.
- 4: **for**  $t = 1$  to  $T$  **do**
- 5: failures = []
- 6: # Find student failures when using current exemplars.
- 7: **for** EP, EP\_GT in zip(EPs, EPs\_GT) **do**
- 8: **for**  $S_i$  in  $S$  **do**
- 9: EA =  $S_i(EP)$
- 10: **if** EA  $\neq$  EP\_GT **then**
- 11: failures.append((EP, EA, EP\_GT))
- 12: **end if**
- 13: **end for**
- 14: **end for**
- 15:
- 16: # Reflect on student failures
- 17: reflections =  $T_{reflect}(TP', TA', failures)$
- 18: # Generate new exemplars based on reflections
- 19: **for**  $i = 1$  to  $N$  **do**
- 20:  $TP_i, TA_i = T_{improve}(TP', TA', failures)$
- 21: # Evaluate new exemplars
- 22:  $score_i = EVALUATE(EPs\_GT, T(TP_i, TA_i, EPs))$
- 23: **end for**
- 24: # Update exemplars
- 25: best =  $ArgMax(score_i)$
- 26:  $TP', TA' = TP_{best}, TA_{best}$
- 27: **end for**
- 28: # Teacher uses the optimized exemplar to solve Teaching Problem.
- 29: **return**  $T(TP', TA', TPs)$

---

#### Prompt 6. Teacher Prompt (*init*): Generate Initial Exemplars

[User:]  
 I'm trying to write  $\{k\}$  in-context learning examples for a few-shot classifier. The classifier will answer this question:  
 "{task}"

Based on the above information, I need a list of  $\{k\}$  positive and negative learning examples.

The list of  $\{k\}$  positive and negative learning examples are: \${exemplars}\$

[Assistant:]

### Prompt 7. Teacher Prompt (*reflect*): Reflect on Student Failures

[User:]

I'm trying to write  $\{k\}$  in-context learning examples for a few-shot classifier. The classifier will answer this question: "{task}"

But with these examples, the classifier got the following cases wrong: {failure\_cases}

Give {num\_feedbacks} reasons why these examples could have gotten these cases wrong.

[Assistant:]

### Prompt 8. Teacher Prompt (*improve*): Improve Exemplars Based on Reflections

[User:]

I'm trying to write  $\{k\}$  in-context learning examples for a few-shot classifier. The classifier will answer this question: "{task}"

But with these examples, the classifier got the following cases wrong: {failure\_cases}

Based on these failure cases, the problem with the current in-context examples is that {reflection}.

Based on the above information, I need a new list of  $\{k\}$  improved positive and negative learning examples.

[Assistant:]

### Example 9. An Example Round of Exemplar Revision

#### Problem:

Is this text an instance of the logical fallacy of faulty generalization?

Example 1: My father told me that the sky is green. So it must be the truth. [No]

Example 2: Which rhetorical fallacy is a broad statement about people on the basis of gender, ethnicity, race, or political, social, professional, or religious group? [Yes]

Example 3: But, Dad, I know you had no curfew when you were my age, so how can you give me a curfew? [No]

Example 4: Some tall people recently vandalized the park, tall people are irresponsible. [Yes]  
(some examples omitted)

#### Student Failures:

Failure Case 4:

**Input:** We haven't proven aliens didn't create life on earth, so aliens created life on earth.

**Label:** No

**Prediction:** Yes

(some cases omitted)

#### Reflection:

The classifier might be having trouble with texts that involve negation or indirect reasoning. In Failure Case 4, the text presents a classic example of an argument from ignorance, but the classifier might have been thrown off by the double negation ("haven't proven...didn't create") or the indirect way of stating the conclusion.

#### Revised Exemplars:

Example 3: I've never met a person from France who doesn't love cheese, so the French must have a genetic predisposition to loving cheese. [Yes]

Example 7: The fact that some people claim to have seen ghosts doesn't prove that ghosts exist. [No]  
(some examples omitted)