  
**COMET : “Cone of experience” enhanced  
 large multimodal model for mathematical problem generation**

**Sannyuya Liu<sup>1,2</sup>, Jintian Feng<sup>1,2</sup>, Zongkai Yang<sup>1,2</sup>, Yawei Luo<sup>3</sup>,  
 Qian Wan<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Xiaoxuan Shen<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Jianwen Sun<sup>1,2\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>National Engineering Research Center of Educational Big Data, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Artificial Intelligence in Education, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China

<sup>3</sup>School of Software Technology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China

{liusy027, zkyang027, wanq8228, shenxiaoxuan, sunjw}@ccnu.edu.cn  
 fjt2018@mails.ccnu.edu.cn, yaweiluo@zju.edu.cn

### Abstract

The automatic generation of high-quality mathematical problems is practically valuable in many educational scenarios. Large multimodal model provides a novel technical approach for the mathematical problem generation because of its wide success in cross-modal data scenarios. However, the traditional method of separating problem solving from problem generation and the mainstream fine-tuning framework of monotonous data structure with homogeneous training objectives limit the application of large multimodal model in mathematical problem generation. Addressing these challenges, this paper proposes COMET, a “Cone of Experience” enhanced large multimodal model for mathematical problem generation. Firstly, from the perspective of mutual ability promotion and application logic, we unify stem generation and problem solving into mathematical problem generation. Secondly, a three-stage fine-tuning framework guided by the “Cone of Experience” is proposed. The framework divides the fine-tuning data into symbolic experience, iconic experience, and direct experience to draw parallels with experiences in the career growth of teachers. Several fine-grained data construction and injection methods are designed in this framework. Finally, we construct a Chinese multimodal mathematical problem dataset to fill the vacancy of Chinese multimodal data in this field. Combined with objective and subjective indicators, experiments on multiple datasets fully verify the effectiveness of the proposed framework and model.

**keywords:** Mathematical Problem Generation, Cone Methodology, Large Multimodal Model, Educational Large Model, Smart Education

\*Qian Wan, Xiaoxuan Shen, and Jianwen Sun are the corresponding authors.

### 1 Introduction

As a vital driving force leading the revolution of technological and industrial development, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is restructuring various industries. For education, the impact of GenAI is unprecedented (Wang et al., 2023a). The Large Language Model (LLM), as one of the most representative technologies of GenAI, displays excellent capabilities in text generation and processing (Achiam et al., 2023; Ouyang et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2023). The Large Multimodal Model (LMM) further expands the data boundaries of the LLM and has achieved widespread success in cross-modal tasks (including image captioning and visual question answering) (Liu et al., 2024a; Li et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023). The integration and application of LMM has become a key approach to promote the digital transformation of education, since most of the teaching resources and records in the educational scenario are multimodal data.

In recent years, many researchers have been exploring the possibilities of combining LMM with education, such as assisted writing (Liu et al., 2024b) and emotional support (Lissak et al., 2024). However, there is still a lack of relevant research in the generation of educational resources, especially in the field of mathematical problem generation. The shortage of high-quality educational resources is one of the main contradictions in the digitization of education. As shown in Figure 1, a high-quality mathematical problem needs to be carefully designed by domain experts and meet multiple requirements. First of all, completeness. During the teaching process, the mathematical problem is for teachers, students, and parents concurrently. Therefore it should contain four parts: mind of design,

stem, mind of solution, and answer, all with fluent language and correct logic. Secondly, precision. The mathematical problem should accurately reflect the objectives of the curriculum, be highly related to given knowledge points, and provide the function of exercises and tests. Lastly, differentiation. For certain key knowledge points under investigation, the mathematical problem should differentiate in theme, problem type, difficulty level, etc., to better serve complex and diverse learning needs.

In summary, constructing high-quality mathematical problems requires the ability to generate both stems and solutions to form a complete closed loop. Traditionally, the studies of mathematical problem generation are divided into two independent subfields, namely stem generation (Polozov et al., 2015) (some works simply record as problem generation) and problem solving (Kushman et al., 2014). These studies mostly design rules or deep neural networks to achieve reasoning, but are ineffective due to limitations in feature engineering and model capabilities, and the research paradigm that separates stem generation and problem solving does not meet the application requirement in educational scenarios. LLM, which provides a novel approach for mathematical problem generation, can not only generate coherent and logical replies against cross-modality data, but also respond to diverse demands because of its ability to in-context learning and instruction following. However, there are still challenges when directly applying the existing LMM to mathematical problem generation. Firstly, current work mostly focuses only on enhancing one aspect of the abilities of LLM in stem generation or problem solving, with little research proposing methods to simultaneously enhance both aspects of the model on the scale of multimodality. Secondly, general LMMs have learned abundant general concepts from a massive amount of pre-training data, but lack specialized knowledge needed for mathematical problem generation. Thirdly, implementing domain fine-tuning based on general LMM is currently the basic paradigm to execute domain task transfer. Previous data structure, as well as construction methods, are simple, and the training objectives are not diverse enough, thus it's hard to fully adapt to the application requirements of the target domain.

To address the above issues, this paper proposes a “Cone of Experience” enhanced large multi-

modal model for mathematical problem generation (COMET). Firstly, stem generation and problem solving are unified into mathematical problem generation tasks. Intuitively, the professional knowledge and practical experience required for stem generation and problem solving share commonalities. Integrating the two abilities into a single model can benefit the promotion of each other, and is more practically logical in educational scenarios. Secondly, inspired by the “Cone of Experience” theory proposed by American educator Edgar Dale (Dale, 1947), we propose a three-stage fine-tuning framework. The “Cone of Experience” divides human learning experience into three layers: symbolic experience, iconic experience, and direct experience. The experiences of different layers are interconnected and only by fully integrating all three layers can high-quality learning be achieved. From the perspective of Data-centric AI (DCAI) (Zha et al., 2023), we believe that the depth and breadth of transfer training are key to domain transfer. Accordingly, for the specific task of mathematical problem generation, we design multiple fine-grained data production methods for the three types of experiences, establish multi-level experience data injection methods, and form a complete fine-tuning framework. Finally, a Chinese multimodal mathematical problem dataset (CMM12K) is formulated, filling the gap in Chinese multimodal corpus in this field. The effectiveness of the framework and model is comprehensively validated with both objective and subjective indicators on multiple datasets.

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- From the perspective of DCAI, we propose COMET, a “Cone of Experience” enhanced large multimodal model for mathematical problem generation. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to systematically enhance mathematical problem generation on a single LMM.
- The formal definition of a three-stage fine-tuning framework based on the “Cone of Experience” is provided, together with the data flow production methods for symbolic experience, iconic experience, and direct experience. The corresponding knowledge infusion methods are empirically demonstrated.
- A Chinese multimodal mathematical problem




Figure 1: The diagram of mathematical problem generation and the “Cone of Experience” guided model fine-tuning.

dataset (CMM12K) is built, which includes 4 types of problems and 12,000 samples. This work fills the gap in the field of Chinese multimodal corpus and provides a high-quality benchmark for subsequent research.

- A large number of experiments have been carried out on multiple datasets, and the advancement and effectiveness of the proposed framework and model have been verified through qualitative and quantitative analysis.

## 2 Related Work

As mentioned above, the complete closed-loop of mathematical problem generation involves two dimensions of stem generation (previous works simply record as problem generation) and problem solving. This section introduces related work from the perspective of technological development.

Early studies focus on the design of generation rules and reason templates through summarizing the characteristics and patterns of mathematical problems (Singh et al., 2012). These works accomplish stem generation or mathematical reasoning by combining the concepts, formulas, and theorems (Polozov et al., 2015). Nandhini et al. (Nandhini and Balasundaram, 2011) proposed two stem generation methods based on templates and context-free grammar, generating stem with more diversified structures and semantics. Moura et al. (De Moura et al., 2015) built a knowledge base with a large number of mathematical theorems embedded, providing interactive theorem proving based on rule reasoning. These methods have a certain degree of controllability and a high accuracy rate, but lack problem adaptability and creativity.

With the development of machine learning, methods such as decision trees and support vector machine have been widely used to address mathematical stem generation or reasoning, recognizing the

structure and patterns of problems by models which are trained based on large amounts of labeled data. Heilman et al. (Heilman, 2011) used a syntactic parser to convert input text into tree representations and designed templates to achieve automatic transformation of problem forms. Roy et al. (Roy et al., 2015; Roy and Roth, 2016) mapped unstructured text to a more easily reasoned representation space to eliminate text ambiguity, which can reason multi-step arithmetic problems. Deep learning further provides more powerful models, including seq2seq model, attention mechanism, graph network, etc., providing new approaches for the generation and reasoning of a wide range of mathematical problems such as arithmetic, algebra, and geometry (Wu et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2019; Cao et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2021). Zhou et al. (Zhou and Huang, 2019) first proposed a seq2seq model based on the attention mechanism, which generated the stem of applied problems given equations and mathematical topics, significantly improving the quality and diversity of generation. Wang et al. (Wang et al., 2017) used recurrent neural network to transform math word problems into equations and based on similarity retrieval to improve reasoning performance. Group-ATT (Li et al., 2019) applied multi-head attention to extract the global feature, numerical feature, and quantity pair feature of math word problems, achieving significant performance improvement on the Math23K dataset.

The mathematical problem generation has entered a new stage because of the sharply developed and applied LLM (Christ et al., 2024; Drori et al., 2022; Yue et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023), since by training on large amounts of corpus LLMs can understand complex language structures including mathematical problems. In terms of stem generation, Droria et al. (Drori et al., 2022) use OpenAI Codex (LLM of code data fine-tuning) to approach human-level in generating college-level mathemat-

ical stems. Zong et al. (Zong and Krishnamachari, 2023) based on the few-shot learning prompt GPT-3 to achieve the generation of related topics. In terms of problem solving, WizardMath (Luo et al., 2023) proposed a reinforcement learning from the evol-instruct feedback method to construct more complex instruction datasets, enhancing the mathematical reasoning ability of LLaMA-2. MathGLM (Yang et al., 2023) demonstrates proficient multi-digit arithmetic ability with only 2B parameters. MathPrompter (Imani et al., 2023) increases the credibility of the output result by generating multiple algebraic expressions or Python functions to solve the same problem based on zero-shot chain of thought. ToRA (Gou et al., 2023) integrates computational libraries and symbolic solvers to solve complex mathematical problems.

### 3 Methodology

Figure 2 is a schematic diagram of the three-stage fine-tuning framework. The entire fine-tuning process is guided by the ‘‘Cone of Experience’’, injecting symbolic experience, iconic experience, and direct experience. This section first defines the global fine-tuning goals and notations, decomposing the application requirements of the target domain into three subtasks for reinforcement. Then, the three-stage fine-tuning framework is expanded according to the type of injected experience, elaborating on the definitions, construction methods, and training methods.

#### 3.1 Problem Formulation

To effectively apply LMM in teaching scenarios, this work mainly enhances three capabilities of LMM during the domain fine-tuning process: controllable generation (CG), analogy generation (AG), and fine-grained solving (FS) for mathematical problems. Both CG and AG reflect the ability of LMM to generate problems, the difference being that the former generates the mind of design and original problem according to given requirements (such as problem type, knowledge point, difficulty level, etc.), while the latter understands and transforms the seed problems (such as changing topic and type, expanding knowledge point or adjusting difficulty level). The FS reflects the problem-solving capacity of LMM, emphasizing the importance of producing detailed solution steps similar to textbook references.

For LMM, the instructions for the above three

tasks can be formally defined as follows:

1. Given the problem type  $t$ , knowledge point  $c$ , difficulty-level  $d$  and grade level  $g$ , the CG prompt is constructed as  $q_c = F_c(t, c, d, g)$ .
2. Given the seed problem  $s \in S$ , the AG prompt is constructed as  $q_a = F_a(s)$ .
3. Suppose a math problem is  $p$ , the prompt identifier of FS is  $q_s = F_s(p)$ .

The  $F_c, F_a, F_s$  can be flexibly designed according to the scene, and the settings in this work can be seen in Section 3.4. Please note that in this paper,  $x$  represents a vector or a string,  $x$  represents a scalar or a single character,  $X$  represents a set, and  $\mathbf{X}$  represents a function.

The task requirements are defined as  $q_{in} \in \{q_c, q_a, q_s\}$ . This work can be defined as performing three-stage fine-tuning based on the general LMM  $F_{lmm}^{(0)}$ , combined with the ‘‘Cone of Experience’’ theory, to obtain an LMM  $F_{lmm}^{(3)}$  that meets the application requirements of mathematical problem generation in the teaching scene, so as to maximize the following conditional probability:

$$P_{lmm}(\mathbf{m}|q_{in}; \theta^{(3)}) = \prod_{k=1}^{N_m} P_{lmm}(w_k^m | q_{in} \oplus \mathbf{w}_{<k}^m; \theta^{(3)}). \quad (1)$$

$$P_{lmm}(\mathbf{a}|q_{in}, \mathbf{m}; \theta^{(3)}) = \prod_{k=1}^{N_a} P_{lmm}(w_k^a | q_{in} \oplus \mathbf{m} \oplus \mathbf{w}_{<k}^a; \theta^{(3)}). \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta^{(3)}$  is the parameters of LMM  $F_{lmm}^{(3)}$ ,  $\oplus$  represents the string concatenation operation.  $\mathbf{m} = \{w_1^m, w_2^m, \dots, w_{N_m}^m\}$  represents the mind of design or problem-solving steps generated by LMM, and  $\mathbf{a} = \{w_1^a, w_2^a, \dots, w_{N_a}^a\}$  represents the original problem or final answer generated by the LMM.

#### 3.2 Symbolic Experience: Learning through Abstractions

This paper defines symbolic experience as the background knowledge related to the target domain, or the prerequisite knowledge required to carry out the target task. Symbolic experience does not directly help the model solve specific tasks, but it




Figure 2: The diagram of the three-stage fine-tuning framework.

provides strong support. For mathematical problem generation, we summarize symbolic experience into four types for production: book knowledge, graph knowledge, arithmetic knowledge, and general knowledge.

The data sources of **book knowledge** include textbooks, lecture notes, teachers’ books, pedagogy, and psychology books, aiming to build teaching concepts and supplement subject knowledge. Through methods such as web crawling, OCR, and manual annotation, we complete data collection and pre-processing (de-duplication, noise reduction, etc.) via both online and offline channels. The number of book knowledge tokens sorted out in this work is approximately 140M.

We construct a large heterogeneous subject knowledge graph, where the node types include grade, knowledge points, concept descriptions, and example problems. This graph encompasses 1, 225 knowledge points and related concepts from elementary to junior high school, providing approximately 18, 000 example problems. To train LMM using structured data, we design a graph sampling method based on random walk to extract diversified and differentiated disciplinary information. Then GPT4(V) is used to transform the edge information into a concatenated text, thereby generating **graph knowledge** for symbolic experiences. Specifically, the heterogeneous subject knowledge graph is represented as  $G = \langle \{N_c, N_g, N_d, N_p\}, E \rangle$ , where  $N_c, N_g, N_d, N_p$  represent the node sets of knowl-

edge points, grade, concept descriptions, and related example problems.  $E$  is the set of edges between all nodes. The generation process of graph knowledge can be seen in Algorithm 1, which generates two types of training samples: a whole link learning sample (Sample\_1) is formed as a four-tuple  $\{grade, knowledge\ point, concept\ description, example\ problem\}$ , and a relationship learning sample (Sample\_2) formed by the concatenation of multiple adjacent knowledge points, totaling 220M tokens.

The function of **arithmetic knowledge** is to compensate for the shortcomings of LMM in arithmetic, to reduce the probability of numerical errors occurring in the mathematical reasoning process. It is an equation consisting of pure numbers and mathematical operators. We directly use the arithmetic dataset proposed by Yang et al. (Yang et al., 2023). This dataset is carefully designed, containing not only operations such as addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, and exponentiation, but also various numerical formats such as integers, decimals, percentages, fractions, and negative numbers. In this work, approximately 200M tokens are extracted as fine-tuning data for arithmetic knowledge.

We extracted approximately 220M tokens of generic data (including plain text, single-turn, and multi-turn Q&A) from open-source corpora, such as Wikipedia, SkyPile-150B(Wei et al., 2023), MOSS(Sun et al., 2023) and BELLE(Ji et al., 2023),

---

**Algorithm 1** Graph Knowledge Generation

---

**Input:**  $G = \langle \{N_c, N_g, N_d, N_p\}, E \rangle$ ,  
 $D_1 = \emptyset, D_2 = \emptyset$

**Output:** Sample\_1, Sample\_2

```
1:  $n_i = \mathbf{random}(N_c)$ 
2:  $D_1 = D_2 = \{n_c\}$ 
3:  $n_j = \mathbf{random}(N_g)$ 
4: if  $e_{ij}$  is not None then
5:    $D_1 = D_1 \cup \{n_j\}$ 
6: end if
7:  $n_j = \mathbf{random}(N_d)$ 
8: if  $e_{ij}$  is not None then
9:    $D_1 = D_1 \cup \{n_j\}$ 
10: end if
11: for  $k = 1; k < 3; k++$  do
12:    $n_j = \mathbf{random}(N_d)$ 
13:   if  $e_{ij}$  is not None then
14:      $D_2 = D_2 \cup \{n_j\}$ 
15:   end if
16: end for
17: for  $k = 1; k < 5; k++$  do
18:    $n_j = \mathbf{random}(N_c - \{n_i\})$ 
19:   if  $e_{ij}$  is not None then
20:      $D_2 = D_2 \cup \{n_j\}$ 
21:   end if
22: end for
23: Sample_1 =  $\mathbf{GPT4V}(D_1)$ 
24: Sample_2 =  $\mathbf{GPT4V}(D_2)$ 
```

---

as the **general knowledge** in symbolic experience. The main role of this knowledge is to slow down the forgetting phenomenon caused by continued pre-training.

This stage processes all the data associated with symbolic experience as pre-training form and infuses it into the LMM for learning, i.e., no masking of data content is undertaken. The backpropagation of model training computes loss from the first token of the input. Assuming the input sample is  $\mathbf{x}$ , the loss function at this stage is as follows:

$$\mathit{Loss}_{1st}(\theta^{(0)}) = - \sum_{x_i \in \mathbf{x}} \log \mathbf{P}(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}; \theta^{(0)}). \quad (3)$$

### 3.3 Iconic Experience: Learning through Observation

The iconic experience is defined as the data generated by the subject in the process of performing the target task, which includes not only human experts proficient in the target task but also the large model. Injecting the iconic experience aims to allow LMM to learn mathematical problem generation from humans and improve upon the failed reasoning data produced by other LMMs. This paper summarizes the iconic experience into three types of production: the experience of stem generation, problem solving, and failure.

To construct **stem generation experience**, we first collect exercises and test items covering all grades from elementary to junior high school. Next, based on manual annotation methods, we extracted key information from math problems in several dimensions including educational grade, problem type, knowledge points, and difficulty, and deduced problem requirements in reverse. Finally, we constructed a query-problem pair, with manual writing examples of mind of design, and used GPT4(V) for bulk supplementation of question making ideas in a few-shot manner. The final data form is  $\{problem\ requirement, mind\ of\ design, original\ problem\}$ .

To construct **problem solving experience**, we hire normal school students to write analyses and answers for the collected mathematical problems. However, due to differences in cognitive levels and writing styles between individuals, it is difficult to align the granularity of the analyses. To generate fine-grained analyses, we use GPT4(V) to generate high-quality analyses with consistent writing styles based on manually parsed data. Three generation methods are proposed:

1. The task requires GPT4(V) to directly solve the problem:  $\{q\} \mapsto \{s\}$ .
2. The task requires GPT4(V) to fill in the middle process when both the problem and answer are given:  $\{q, a\} \mapsto \{s\}$ .
3. When the complete problem, analyses, and answer are given, GPT4(V) is required to rewrite the analyses:  $\{q, s, a\} \mapsto \{s'\}$ .

We chose the second method as the data production method for this stage due to its stability. The final data form is  $\{mathematical\ problem, mind\ of\ solution, final\ answer\}$ .

**Failure experience** is mainly generated by LMMs that have not been domain-adapted. First, a collaborative environment consisting only of LMMs is built, among which GPT4(V) plays the role of the discriminator, and multiple LMMs (such as Qwen-VL-Chat, Yi-VL-6/34B, etc.) play the role of generators. Secondly, two generators are randomly assigned to complete the task of mathematical problem generation, and then the discriminator guides and evaluates the degree of completion. Finally, the summarized procedural data forms a sample in the format  $\{task\ instruction, collaboration\ information, guidance\ feedback\}$ .

In this stage, the data pertaining to the iconic experience is learned by the LMM in the form of instruction Tuning. All data is arranged in a query-

response pair, and a masking process is applied to the query part. The backward propagation of model training only starts calculating loss from the first token of the response. Suppose the query-response pairs are defined as  $\mathbf{q} : \mathbf{a}$ , the model input sequence is  $\mathbf{x} = \{\mathbf{q} \oplus \mathbf{a}\}$ . The loss function at this stage is as follows:

$$\text{Loss}_{2st}(\theta^{(1)}) = - \sum_{x_i \in \mathbf{a}} \log \mathbf{P}(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{<i}; \theta^{(1)}). \quad (4)$$

### 3.4 Direct Experience: Learning by Doing

The direct experience is defined as the procedural data generated when the fine-tuned object carries out the target task with results feedback. Such experience aims to correct the inference preference of the LMM with higher-order domain values, allowing it to embodied evolve during the practice.

Firstly, we design a set of task instructions for three subtasks (CG, AG, and FS). For CG, the focus of the prompt design is to highlight the controllable elements in the generation process. This paper mainly considers four controllable factors in the problem generation process: grade, problem type, knowledge point, and difficulty level, and requires giving out the mind of design. For AG, the prompt design focuses on asking the model to first understand the seed problem to initially judge the important elements such as problem type and knowledge points, and then give the mind of design and rewrite the problem in the form of chain of thought. For FS, the core concept of the prompt design is to clearly require the model to generate a detailed analysis process rather than just outputting an answer. All prompts designed in this work for the three tasks are shown in Figure 3.

Secondly, the LMM can produce multiple different responses to the same query due to the randomness of its reasoning. We order the preferences of multiple responses corresponding to the same instruction. This paper utilizes human preferences (manual annotation) and model preferences (GPT4(V) generation) during the preference ranking process. The final data form is  $\{\text{task instruction, high preference response, low preference response}\}$ .

The fine-tuning stage uses the direct preference optimization (Rafailov et al., 2024) (DPO) algorithm to infuse direct experience into LMM, the loss function is as follows:

$$\text{Loss}_{3st}(\theta^{(2)}, \theta^{(3)}) = -\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l \sim D} [\log \sigma(\beta \log \frac{\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}; \theta^{(3)})}{\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}; \theta^{(2)})} - \beta \log \frac{\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}; \theta^{(3)})}{\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}; \theta^{(2)})})]. \quad (5)$$

the  $\theta^{(3)}$  uses  $\theta^{(2)}$  as the initial solution, for the same input  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_w$  and  $\mathbf{y}_l$  represent the preferred solution and the non-preferred solution.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Implementation

We conduct the ‘‘Cone of Experience’’ enhanced three-stage fine-tuning based on the well-trained Qwen-VL-Chat(Bai et al., 2023) provided by Alibaba Cloud. For all fine-tuning stages, Adam with different learning rates is used as the optimizer, and the gradient truncation threshold is set to 0.5. We incorporate a warmup ratio of 0.05 and employ the batch size of 64. To control overfitting, we apply a weight decay of 0.1. The Max token is uniformly set to 2, 048, and the data is spliced or truncated in the pre-processing stage to improve training efficiency or reduce information loss. In addition, we employ deepspeed with ZeRO-2 stage(Rajbhandari et al., 2020) to improve parallel efficiency for speed up training.

In the first and second stages, we use LoRA (Hu et al., 2021) to perform parameter-efficient fine-tuning, then set rank, alpha and dropout to 16, 32 and 0.05. All linear layers (including the image encoder) of LMM except the head layer are designated to apply the LoRA adapter. Among them, the learning rate of the first stage is set to  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ , and halved in the second stage. We use the DPO(Rafailov et al., 2024) algorithm to inject direct experience for learning reasoning preferences in the third stage. The learning rate is  $5 \times 10^{-5}$ , the DPO smoothing value is 0.1. To ensure reproducibility, the random seed is set to 42 during the whole experiment. The three-stage fine-tuning is performed on 8 NVIDIA A800-80G. For one epoch, the three-stage fine-tuning takes about 200, 50, and 20 GPU hours. In the test stage, the inference parameters of LMM are uniformly set top\_k to 20, top\_p to 0.7, repetition\_penalty to 1, and temperature to 0.3.

### 4.2 Dataset and Baseline

The datasets used are shown in Table 1. GSM8K(Cobbe et al., 2021) is an English single-




Figure 3: Prompt of the three tasks.

modal math word problem (MWP) dataset, containing 7,473 training samples and 1,319 test samples. It mainly tests the reasoning and arithmetic abilities of primary school math. TAL-SCQ5K-CN<sup>1</sup> is a Chinese single-modal multiple-choice problem (MCP) dataset for K12 math, including 3,000 training samples and 2,000 test samples.

This work builds a Chinese multi-modal math problem dataset CMM12K, which includes 6,000 single-modal math problems and 6,000 multi-modal math problems, covering most of the knowledge points in K12 math from primary school to junior high school. This dataset contains four types of problems: MCP, math fill-in-the-blank problem (MFP), MWP, and math proof problem (MPP). The training set of CCM12K is divided into 10,000 samples, and the development set and test set are 1,000 samples each.

Five open source LMMs are specified as baselines, covering different parameter levels, including Qwen-VL-Chat(7B)(Bai et al., 2023), Yi-VL-6B/34B(Young et al., 2024), LLaVA-1.6(7B)(Liu et al., 2024a), CogVLM(17B)(Wang et al., 2023b). It should be noted that in the three-stage fine-tuning, all datasets are aligned with Chinese. The training sets of each dataset participate in the construction of iconic experience and the direct experience mainly depends on the development set. The test set is completely isolated from all fine-tuning stages.

### 4.3 Metrics

This study designs three types of evaluation criteria for different capabilities of LMM.

**Scoring mode based on GPT4(V).** Multiple scoring dimensions are designed for **controllable generation (CG)**, **analogy generation (AG)**, and **fine-grained solving (FS)**. The scoring dimensions of CG include language fluency (LF) (both math-

ematical terms and formulas), logical correctness (LC), content completeness (CC) (both ideas and stems), knowledge point relevance (KR), difficulty appropriateness (DA) and type adaptability (TA). The scoring dimensions of AG include language fluency (LF), logical correctness (LC), content completeness (CC), reasoning rationality(RR), and seed relevance (SR). The scoring dimensions of FS include language fluency (LF), logical correctness (LC), analytical completeness (AC), and answer accuracy (AA). The GPT4(V) is required to give a score and reason in the range of 1 to 10 according to the dimension.

**Arena mode based on GPT4(V).** Considering the subjectivity of mathematical problem generation, GPT4(V) is introduced as a referee to comprehensively rule on different responses of the same query from aspects such as accuracy, fluency, and values. Specifically, we calculate a rating value for each LMM to represent the ability on a certain task. During the judging process by GPT4(V), the ELO rating algorithm(Elo, 1967; Zheng et al., 2024) is used to update the rating value of the participating LMM. Assume the initial ELO rating value is 1,000. In  $M$  rounds of competition, two LMMs (called LMM- $x$  and LMM- $y$ ) are randomly selected to reply to the same query each time. According to the ruling results of GPT4(V), the rating value is calculated as follows:

$$E_x = \frac{1}{1 + 10^{(R_x - R_y)/400}}, \quad (6)$$

$$R'_i = R_i + K \cdot (PK(i) - E_i). \quad (7)$$

where  $R_x$  and  $R_y$  respectively represent the rating values of LMM- $x$  and LMM- $y$  in the previous round,  $E_x$  and  $E_y = 1 - E_x$  represent the current expected rating value.  $R'_i$  ( $i \in \{x, y\}$ ) represents the updated rating value of LMM- $i$ ,  $PK(i) \in \{0, 1\}$  is a boolean function that identi-

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/math-eval/TAL-SCQ5K>



Table 1: Statistics of datasets.

Dataset	Language	Modal	Type	#Train.	#Dev.	#Test.
GSM8K	En $\rightarrow$ Zh	Single	MWP	7,473	-	1,319
TAL-SCQ5K-CN	Zh	Single	MCP	3,000	-	2,000
CMM12K	Zh	Multi	MCP, MFP, MWP, MPP	10,000	1,000	1,000

fies whether LMM- $i$  win in this round.  $K$  represents the K-factor, which defaults to 4 and controls the change rate of rating.

**Objective evaluation indicators.** For problems with clear answers (this work refers to MCP, MFP, and MWP), the accuracy (ACC) is returned through matching to report the solving performance of LMM. For the MPP, BLEU-1/2/L(Papineni et al., 2002) and ROUGE-1/2/3/4(Lin, 2004) are used to approximate testing.

## 5 Result and Discussion

### 5.1 Performance of Controllable Generation

**Scoring mode.** We employed GPT4(V) to evaluate the responses of LMMs to CG tasks on the test set and subsequently reported the average scores across six dimensions. As illustrated in Figure 4(a), our model outperforms all other baselines in 4 of 6 dimensions(LF, LC, KR, and DA).

Figure 4(b) shows that our model performs comparably to Yi-VL-34B across the six dimensions of CG tasks. Models with comparable parameter levels, such as Qwen-VL-Chat (7B), LLaVA-1.6 (7B), and Yi-VL-6B, demonstrate slightly inferior performance, while the larger parameter-scale model, CogVLM with 17B parameters, exhibits relatively lower performance.

Although our model slightly lags behind Yi-VL-34B in terms of content completeness and problem type adaptability, it’s important to note that our parameter count is approximately five times smaller than that of Yi-VL-34B. Therefore, this discrepancy may arise from limitations imposed by the scale of parameters, which could hinder the comprehension and processing of contextual information.

Through a three-stage fine-tuning process guided by the “Cone of Experience”, our model can effectively focus on generating responses that prioritize controllable factors such as language fluency, logical correctness, knowledge point relevance, and difficulty appropriateness.

**Arena mode.** We conducted approximately 3,600 competitions, where two LMMs were ran-

domly selected for an anonymous battle, and the winner was determined by GPT4(V). As shown in Figure 5(a), upon completing all competitions, our model’s ELO rating significantly surpassed the baselines with a median value of 1,185.

The heatmap illustrates the win rates of battles between various LMMs, revealing that our model exhibits absolute superiority when battling against Qwen-VL-Chat, Yi-VL-6B, and LLaVA-1.6. Moreover, even when pitted against Yi-VL-34B, our model maintains a slight edge with a 2% advantage.

This outcome suggests that while larger parameter sizes may enhance text comprehension and generation capabilities, our model, after undergoing multi-modal fine-tuning guided by the “Cone of Experience”, exceeds the performance of a 34B-parameter LMM in CG task without altering its parameter scale.

### 5.2 Performance of Analogy Generation

**Scoring mode.** In the AG task, our model demonstrates robust capabilities and absolute superiority. As depicted in Figure 4(a) and (b), firstly, our model comprehensively outperforms all baselines in various evaluation dimensions of AG, particularly surpassing the strong baseline Yi-VL-34B with a parameter size five times larger than ours. Secondly, our backbone model Qwen-VL-Chat ranks relatively lower among the six models, around the 4th to 5th position, trailing behind models with similar parameter scales such as Yi-VL-6B and LLaVA-1.6. However, following the three-stage fine-tuning guided by the “Cone of Experience”, its AG capabilities have significantly improved, with an average score increase of approximately 60% across all dimensions.

**Arena mode.** As illustrated in Figure 5(b), after undergoing 3,600 random competition rounds, our model’s ELO Rating in AG tasks significantly surpasses all baselines. From the win rate heatmap, it’s evident that our model exhibits absolute dominance when facing models with equivalent or double the parameter scale, defeating Qwen-VL-Chat, Yi-VL-6B, CogVLM, and LLaVA-1.6 with win rates of




Figure 4: Performance of our model and baselines on a broad range of problem-solving and generation fine-grained indicators. (a) The average score on 15 indicators in three tasks (CG, AG, and FS); (b) The rank of models’ scores in each evaluation indicator. Here, each evaluation indicator is expressed as ‘task-dimension’, and the number in the radar chart refers to the average score of models, we only present the scores of our model and Yi-VL-34B for visualization purposes. For instance, the label ‘CG-DA’ depicted at the bottom of the radar chart denotes the difficulty appropriateness (DA) measure for the controllable generation (CG) task, where our model attains scores of 8.57 (rank 1), while Yi-VL-34B obtains 7.89 (rank 2).

97%, 96%, 100%, 93% respectively. Even when confronted with baselines five times larger in parameter size, our model maintains a win rate of 73%. AG tasks hold educational value in demand for problem generation. Although our backbone model may lack training in this specific skill, our model successfully acquires it through the three-stage fine-tuning process. This outcome further validates the superiority of the proposed framework and model in this study.

### 5.3 Performance of Fine-grained Solving

**Scoring mode.** We report the scores for 4 dimensions in the FS task of all LMMs on the test set. The average scores across various evaluation dimensions are presented in Figure 4(a), where our model achieved the state-of-the-art (SOTA) in 3 of 4 evaluation dimensions (LC, AC, and AA), falling slightly short only in language fluency (LF) compared to Yi-VL-34B. Figure 4(b) depicts the ranking across all evaluation dimensions, further validating the superiority of our model, which maintains an absolute lead in most dimensions with a relatively smaller parameter size (7B). Moreover, by comparing with the backbone model Qwen-VL-Chat, we can con-

clude that the three-stage fine-tuning guided by the ‘‘Cone of Experience’’ significantly enhances its FS capabilities.

**Arena mode.** As illustrated in Figure 5(c), after 3, 600 competition rounds, our model triumphs over all baselines with the highest ELO Rating. The average ELO rating leads the backbone model Qwen-VL-Chat by approximately 20%, and also maintains an advantage against Yi-VL-34B. However, analyzing from the perspective of win rates reflected in the heatmap, our model lags behind Yi-VL-34B with a slight disadvantage, as it has a win rate of only 49%.

Based on the scoring results of GPT4(V) and the arena outcomes, it can be concluded that, in the FS task, our model demonstrates significant performance improvement compared to the backbone model Qwen-VL-Chat, surpassing baselines of the same parameter scale comprehensively, and even shows certain advantages compared to baselines approximately five times its size.

### 5.4 Result of Objective Evaluation

**Performance of Objective Problems.** As shown in Table 2, our model dramatically outperforms




Figure 5: The statistics of ELO rating over 3, 600 rounds and the win rate between models. The three subfigures, (a), (b), and (c), respectively represent tasks FS, CG, and AG. For each subfigure, the top section represents the ELO rating, here we sorted the models based on their ELO rating medians, while the bottom section represents the win rate. Abbreviations for Yi-VL-6B/34B, LLaVA1.6, and Qwen-VL-Chat, denoted as Yi-6/34, LLaVA, and Qwen respectively.

Table 2: Performances of each LMM on GSM8K, TAL-SCQ5K-CN, and CMM12K. Here Single/Multi indicates single modal/multi modal. All results are reported in terms of Acc (%), **bold** indicates optimal performance while underline indicates suboptimal performance.

Model	GSM8K	TAL-SCQ5K-CN	CMM12K						
			Total	MCP		MFP		MWP	
				Single	Multi	Single	Multi	Single	Multi
Qwen-VL-Chat	18.04	<u>16.20</u>	24.12	<u>27.33</u>	22.00	29.61	17.33	29.13	19.33
Yi-VL-6B	22.52	6.55	21.05	14.00	18.67	32.19	18.67	28.16	14.67
LLaVA-1.6	18.65	10.05	19.42	17.33	<u>24.67</u>	27.04	11.33	22.82	13.33
CogVLM	8.87	5.35	14.11	4.67	22.67	21.89	7.33	17.48	10.67
Yi-VL-34B	<b>38.66</b>	7.60	<u>24.54</u>	16.67	16.67	<b>38.62</b>	<u>19.33</u>	<u>33.98</u>	<u>22.00</u>
Ours	<u>28.89</u>	<b>22.05</b>	<b>33.84</b>	<b>35.33</b>	<b>34.00</b>	<u>35.62</u>	<b>29.33</b>	<b>35.44</b>	<b>33.33</b>

the backbone model Qwen-VL-Chat in terms of accuracy on GSM8K and TAL-SCQ5K-CN (+10.62%, +5.85%), achieving state-of-the-art (SOTA) on TAL-SCQ5K-CN. Although Yi-VL-34B leads on GSM8K, its parameter size, which is 5 times larger than ours, implies greater training cost and time.

On CMM12K, our model’s overall score of 33.84% remarkably exceeds all baselines, with approximately an 8% performance advantage over the second-place Yi-VL-34B. Specifically, we conducted statistics on two modalities and three problem types, totaling  $2 \times 3 = 6$  categories. The results show that our model achieved SOTA in 5 of 6 categories, only slightly lagging behind Yi-VL-34B

in single modal MFP by a small margin ( $-3\%$ ). Compared with the baseline of the same parameter size, our model leads in all types of problems. For CogVLM, which has twice the parameter size of ours, our model maintains a lead of more than 15% in all tasks. In summary, our model achieves relatively excellent problem-solving performance in all types of problems with a smaller parameter size (approximately 20% of Yi-VL-34B).

**Performance of MPP.** In regards to the MPP in the CMM12K dataset, we draw from the evaluation logic of machine translation, comparing each LMM’s response with the standard answer and calculating BLEU and ROUGE scores. The standard answer here is derived from manual annotation, en-

Table 3: Performances of each LMM on CMM12K with MPP, **bold** indicates optimal performance (higher is better for all metrics).

Category	Metric	Qwen-VL-Chat	Yi-VL-6B	LLaVA	CogVLM	Yi-VL-34B	Ours
Total	ROUGE@1	0.38	0.32	0.35	0.20	0.38	<b>0.80</b>
	ROUGE@2	0.25	0.20	0.21	0.05	0.20	<b>0.67</b>
	ROUGE@L	0.32	0.27	0.23	0.11	0.27	<b>0.69</b>
	BLEU@1	0.28	0.32	0.27	0.18	0.34	<b>0.71</b>
	BLEU@2	0.17	0.15	0.11	0.05	0.16	<b>0.62</b>
	BLEU@3	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.02	0.11	<b>0.54</b>
	BLEU@4	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.07	<b>0.47</b>
Single-Modal	ROUGE@1	0.37	0.32	0.37	0.21	0.37	<b>0.81</b>
	ROUGE@2	0.24	0.18	0.21	0.06	0.20	<b>0.68</b>
	ROUGE@L	0.30	0.26	0.22	0.12	0.25	<b>0.67</b>
	BLEU@1	0.24	0.29	0.25	0.18	0.30	<b>0.69</b>
	BLEU@2	0.14	0.14	0.10	0.05	0.14	<b>0.60</b>
	BLEU@3	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.02	0.09	<b>0.52</b>
	BLEU@4	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.06	<b>0.46</b>
Multi-Modal	ROUGE@1	0.39	0.33	0.33	0.18	0.40	<b>0.80</b>
	ROUGE@2	0.26	0.20	0.20	0.04	0.23	<b>0.66</b>
	ROUGE@L	0.34	0.28	0.25	0.10	0.31	<b>0.67</b>
	BLEU@1	0.31	0.33	0.29	0.18	0.38	<b>0.68</b>
	BLEU@2	0.18	0.15	0.13	0.05	0.19	<b>0.59</b>
	BLEU@3	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.13	<b>0.51</b>
	BLEU@4	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.09	<b>0.43</b>

compassing not only the geometric elements and their relationships but also the complete proof process. By calculating BLEU and ROUGE, we can approximately determine whether the output of the LMM is in accordance with mathematical grammar and proof logic. Table 3 displays the response quality of our model and the baseline model on single-modal and multi-modal proof problems. The results indicate that our model is superior to all baselines as far as the response quality of the proof problems is concerned.

### 5.5 Ablation Study

To validate the effectiveness of the three-stage fine-tuning framework proposed in this paper, we designed the following ablation experiments. We refer to the model after the  $i^{th}$  stage of fine-tuning as  $S_i$ , where  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . We preserved all checkpoints of the fine-tuning stages:  $S_0$  - the original backbone model Qwen-VL-Chat without any fine-tuning.  $S_1$  - the model after the first stage of fine-tuning, injected with symbolic experience.  $S_2$  - based on  $S_1$ , the model after the second stage of fine-tuning, infused with iconic experience.  $S_3$  - based on  $S_2$ , the model after the third stage of fine-tuning, incorporating direct experience.

We first obtained these four models’ responses on the test set regarding the CG, AG, and FS tasks, and scored them based on GPT4(V) in 15 fine-grained dimensions. Figure 6 shows the score

changes on 15 dimensions for the three types of tasks. The results indicate that with the deepening of the three-stage fine-tuning, the model’s scores in all dimensions show an increasing trend.

We calculated the absolute performance improvements at each fine-tuning stage and reported them in Table 4. The results show that on most capability dimensions,  $\Delta_2 = \max\{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3\}$ , meaning that the second stage contributed the most to the performance improvement in the three-stage fine-tuning framework based on the “cone of experience”. We also observe some exceptions, including the four dimensions FS-EC, AG-CC, AG-RR, and AG-SR, whose common feature is that the original backbone model performs poorly, and the first stage of training plays a key role in improving the performance on these dimensions. In all dimensions of each task, further improvements in model performance can be achieved through continuous injecting of direct experience in the third stage of fine-tuning.

### 5.6 Case Study

To demonstrate the strength of our model, we have selected some examples of CG, AG, and FS tasks respectively. Previous results, such as Figure 4, have already proven that Yi-VL-34B - a model with more than five times the number of parameters as ours, is a comparable competitor. Thus, for each task, we show the difference in response quality




Figure 6: The average scores across various dimensions for our model at each stage of training.



Figure 7: Case of the three tasks. The key correct parts of responses are highlighted in green and the incorrect ones in red.

between our model, the backbone model Qwen-VL-Chat, and Yi-VL-34B when using the same prompt, the case details refer to Figure 7.

**Case of CG** In the example shown in Figure 7(a), LMM was asked to generate one problem based on the given planar geometric picture. Our model accurately captured the geometric elements in the picture and expressed the test problem using the correct mathematical language. In contrast, Qwen-VL-Chat failed to comprehend the content of the given picture, erroneously providing the condition ( $\triangle ADC \sim \triangle AEC$ , but both ADC and AEC are not triangles). For Yi-VL-34B, the problem it constructed was not based on the given image, hence not aligning with requirements.

**Case of FS** Given this problem, Qwen-VL-Chat correctly understood the elements in the picture,

but its erroneous reasoning steps ( $AD = AC = 3\text{cm}$  is given, but actually  $AD = 2AC = 6\text{cm}$ ) led to an incorrect final result. Yi-VL-34B made similar mistakes as Qwen-VL-Chat. However, our model first parsed the problem requirements, and then extracted the geometric elements of the given picture, and finally correctly reasoned step by step according to the problem to arrive at the correct answer ( $DB = 4\text{cm}$ ).

**Case of AG** We require LMMs to simulate the seed problem and construct a new problem. Each LMM first analyzes the ideas for the construction of the seed problem and then constructs a problem, and they are also asked to explain the thought process behind the constructed problem.

Our model first understands the meaning of the problem, parses the content of the knowledge

Table 4: Performance improvements( $\Delta$ ) of each evaluation dimension at each stage. Here,  $\Delta_i$  represents the improvement in average score relative to the  $(i - 1)^{th}$  stage after the  $i^{th}$  stage training, the **bold** indicates  $\max\{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3\}$ .

Task	dimension	$\Delta_1$	$\Delta_2$	$\Delta_3$
FS	LF	0.385	<b>0.510</b>	0.195
	LC	0.560	<b>0.935</b>	0.190
	AC	<b>1.300</b>	0.560	0.075
	AA	0.315	<b>0.765</b>	0.090
CG	LF	0.365	<b>1.945</b>	0.380
	LC	0.655	<b>2.140</b>	0.370
	CC	0.290	<b>1.200</b>	0.595
	KR	1.170	<b>1.375</b>	0.485
	DA	0.600	<b>1.745</b>	0.485
	TA	0.125	<b>1.920</b>	0.435
AG	LF	0.535	<b>2.640</b>	0.070
	LC	1.120	<b>2.450</b>	0.105
	CC	<b>2.045</b>	1.855	0.020
	RR	<b>2.150</b>	1.575	0.125
	SR	<b>2.330</b>	0.810	0.070

points tested (the sum of the interior angles of a triangle is  $180^\circ$ ), and tests a similar knowledge point (determine the shape of a triangle based on its angles) by modifying the problem scenario. This demonstrates that the symbolic experience, especially graph knowledge injected in the first stage helps the model find similar knowledge points based on the given knowledge point.

For Qwen-VL-Chat, the problem it generates, there is a discrepancy between the idea of the problem and the content of the problem, and the generated problem has not been tested for data rationality and does not conform to logic (it is paradoxical that there are two angles of  $40^\circ$  and  $65^\circ$  in a right triangle).

On the other hand, Yi-VL-34B correctly interprets the meaning of the seed problem, analyzes the knowledge points tested, and modifies the problem scenario by adding conditions. However, the quality of its problem can be further improved because it introduces an invalid condition (the length of BC is meaningless for solving  $\angle B$ ). Although there is no logical issue with this constructed problem, compared to our model’s response, the problem constructed by our model is more reasonable.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose COMET, a “Cone of Experience” enhanced large multimodal model for mathematical problem generation. Inspired by the “Cone of Experience” theory, we follow the growth process of teachers to define the experience as sym-

bolic, iconic, and direct. Based on this, we design a three-stage fine-tuning framework to enhance the capabilities of problem generation and problem solving within a single LMM to meet the requirements of educational applications. Moreover, a Chinese multimodal mathematics problem dataset (CMM12K) is built to alleviate the scarcity of Chinese multimodal corpora in this field. Extensive experiments have demonstrated the advancement and effectiveness of the proposed model. In the future, we will explore retrieval-enhanced generation methods based on model recall behavior, since the proposed direct experience can potentially serve as LMM historical memory.

## Acknowledgments

This work was financially supported by the National Science and Technology Major Project (Grant Nos. 2022ZD0117105), National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 62293554 and 62307015), China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grant Nos. 2023M741304 and 2023T160256), Hubei Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 2023AFA020 and 2023AFB295), Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant Nos. CCNU23XJ007) and Knowledge Innovation Program of Wuhan-Shuguang Project (Grant Nos. 2023010201020390).

## References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*.
- Yixuan Cao, Feng Hong, Hongwei Li, and Ping Luo. 2021. A bottom-up dag structure extraction model for math word problems. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pages 39–46.
- Jiaqi Chen, Jianheng Tang, Jinghui Qin, Xiaodan Liang, Lingbo Liu, Eric P Xing, and Liang Lin. 2021. Geoqa: A geometric question answering benchmark towards multimodal numerical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14517*.
- Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Zhong Muyan, Qinglong

- Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. 2023. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14238*.
- Bryan R Christ, Jonathan Kropko, and Thomas Hartvigsen. 2024. Mathwell: Generating educational math word problems at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15861*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Edgar Dale. 1947. Audio-visual materials. *Air Aff.*, 2:179.
- Leonardo De Moura, Soonho Kong, Jeremy Avigad, Floris Van Doorn, and Jakob von Raumer. 2015. The lean theorem prover (system description). In *Automated Deduction-CADE-25: 25th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Berlin, Germany, August 1-7, 2015, Proceedings 25*, pages 378–388. Springer.
- Iddo Drori, Sarah Zhang, Reece Shuttleworth, Leonard Tang, Albert Lu, Elizabeth Ke, Kevin Liu, Linda Chen, Sunny Tran, Newman Cheng, et al. 2022. A neural network solves, explains, and generates university math problems by program synthesis and few-shot learning at human level. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(32):e2123433119.
- Arpad E Elo. 1967. The proposed uscf rating system, its development, theory, and applications. *Chess Life*, XXII(8):242–247.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yujie Yang, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2023. Tora: A tool-integrated reasoning agent for mathematical problem solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17452*.
- Michael Heilman. 2011. *Automatic factual question generation from text*. Ph.D. thesis, Carnegie Mellon University.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.
- Shima Imani, Liang Du, and Harsh Shrivastava. 2023. Mathprompter: Mathematical reasoning using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05398*.
- Yunjie Ji, Yong Deng, Yan Gong, Yiping Peng, Qiang Niu, Lei Zhang, Baochang Ma, and Xiangang Li. 2023. Exploring the impact of instruction data scaling on large language models: An empirical study on real-world use cases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14742*.
- Nate Kushman, Yoav Artzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Regina Barzilay. 2014. Learning to automatically solve algebra word problems. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 271–281.
- Jierui Li, Lei Wang, Jipeng Zhang, Yan Wang, Bing Tian Dai, and Dongxiang Zhang. 2019. Modeling intra-relation in math word problems with different functional multi-head attentions. In *Proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 6162–6167.
- Zhang Li, Biao Yang, Qiang Liu, Zhiyin Ma, Shuo Zhang, Jingxu Yang, Yabo Sun, Yuliang Liu, and Xiang Bai. 2023. Monkey: Image resolution and text label are important things for large multi-modal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06607*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Shir Lissak, Nitay Calderon, Geva Shenkman, Yaakov Ophir, Eyal Fruchter, Anat Brunstein Klomek, and Roi Reichart. 2024. The colorful future of llms: Evaluating and improving llms as emotional supporters for queer youth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11886*.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024a. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36.
- Meilu Liu, Lawrence Jun Zhang, and Christine Biebricher. 2024b. Investigating students’ cognitive processes in generative ai-assisted digital multimodal composing and traditional writing. *Computers & Education*, 211:104977.
- Qianying Liu, Wenyv Guan, Sujian Li, and Daisuke Kawahara. 2019. Tree-structured decoding for solving math word problems. 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 2370–2379.
- Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. 2023. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09583*.
- Kumaresh Nandhini and Sadhu Ramakrishnan Bala-sundaram. 2011. Math word question generation for training the students with learning difficulties. In *Proceedings of the International Conference & Workshop on Emerging Trends in Technology*, pages 206–211.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al.

2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. *Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation*. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Oleksandr Polozov, Eleanor O’Rourke, Adam M Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, Sumit Gulwani, and Zoran Popović. 2015. Personalized mathematical word problem generation. In *Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–16. IEEE.
- Subhro Roy and Dan Roth. 2016. Solving general arithmetic word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.01413*.
- Subhro Roy, Tim Vieira, and Dan Roth. 2015. Reasoning about quantities in natural language. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3:1–13.
- Rohit Singh, Sumit Gulwani, and Sriram Rajamani. 2012. Automatically generating algebra problems. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 26, pages 1620–1628.
- Tianxiang Sun, Xiaotian Zhang, Zhengfu He, Peng Li, Qinyuan Cheng, Hang Yan, Xiangyang Liu, Yunfan Shao, Qiong Tang, Xingjian Zhao, et al. 2023. Moss: Training conversational language models from synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15020*, 7.
- Hanchen Wang, Tianfan Fu, Yuanqi Du, Wenhao Gao, Kexin Huang, Ziming Liu, Payal Chandak, Shengchao Liu, Peter Van Katwyk, Andreea Deac, et al. 2023a. Scientific discovery in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature*, 620(7972):47–60.
- Lei Wang, Yan Wang, Deng Cai, Dongxiang Zhang, and Xiaojiang Liu. 2018. Translating a math word problem to an expression tree. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.05632*.
- Weihan Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, et al. 2023b. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03079*.
- Yan Wang, Xiaojiang Liu, and Shuming Shi. 2017. Deep neural solver for math word problems. In *Proceedings of the 2017 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 845–854.
- Tianwen Wei, Liang Zhao, Lichang Zhang, Bo Zhu, Lijie Wang, Haihua Yang, Biye Li, Cheng Cheng, Weiwei Lü, Rui Hu, et al. 2023. Skywork: A more open bilingual foundation model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19341*.
- Qinzhao Wu, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. 2022. Automatic math word problem generation with topic-expression co-attention mechanism and reinforcement learning. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 30:1061–1072.
- Zhen Yang, Ming Ding, Qingsong Lv, Zhihuan Jiang, Zehai He, Yuyi Guo, Jinfeng Bai, and Jie Tang. 2023. Gpt can solve mathematical problems without a calculator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03241*.
- Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, et al. 2024. Yi: Open foundation models by 01.ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652*.
- Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhao Chen. 2023. Mammoth: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05653*.
- Daochen Zha, Kwei-Herng Lai, Fan Yang, Na Zou, Huiji Gao, and Xia Hu. 2023. Data-centric ai: Techniques and future perspectives. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 5839–5840.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2024. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Aojun Zhou, Ke Wang, Zimu Lu, Weikang Shi, Sichun Luo, Zipeng Qin, Shaoqing Lu, Anya Jia, Linqi Song, Mingjie Zhan, et al. 2023. Solving challenging math word problems using gpt-4 code interpreter with code-based self-verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07921*.
- Qingyu Zhou and Danqing Huang. 2019. Towards generating math word problems from equations and topics. In *Proceedings of the 12th international conference on natural language generation*, pages 494–503.
- Mingyu Zong and Bhaskar Krishnamachari. 2023. Solving math word problems concerning systems of equations with gpt-3. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 15972–15979.