

Inference Scaling vs Reasoning: An Empirical Analysis of Compute-Optimal LLM Problem-Solving

Marwan Abdelhameed
Department of Computer Science
New York University
New York, United States
marwan@nyu.edu

Pavly Halim
Department of Computer Science
New York University
New York, United States
pavly@nyu.edu

Abstract—Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) have predominantly focused on maximizing accuracy and reasoning capabilities, often overlooking crucial computational efficiency considerations. While this approach has yielded impressive accuracy improvements, it has led to methods that may be impractical for real-world deployment due to computational overhead and latency constraints. This paper investigates the potential synergy between reasoning enhancement and computational efficiency by analyzing the integration of two contrasting approaches: Quiet-STaR (Self-Taught Reasoner)[1], which enhances reasoning through structured intermediate rationales, and REBASE (REward BALanced SEarch)[2], which optimizes inference through reward-guided tree search. Through comprehensive empirical analysis using the Mistral-7B model on the GSM8K dataset, we demonstrate that while each method excels in its primary objective—Quiet-STaR achieving superior accuracy (32.03%) despite high computational cost (554.66s runtime, 12.73T FLOPs), and REBASE providing exceptional efficiency (8.47s runtime, 2.35T FLOPs) while maintaining baseline-comparable accuracy (10.94%)—their integration reveals fundamental challenges in reconciling reasoning depth with computational efficiency. The combined approach unexpectedly results in degraded performance (9.38% accuracy, 143.66s runtime), highlighting critical insights about the complex interplay between reasoning enhancement and efficiency optimization in LLMs. Our findings illuminate the need for novel architectures and algorithms specifically designed to bridge the gap between these competing objectives, while providing concrete directions for future research in compute-efficient reasoning methods.

In addressing this challenge, two distinct approaches have emerged, each targeting a different aspect of the problem. The first, Quiet-STaR (Self-Taught Reasoner), represents a breakthrough in enhancing model reasoning capabilities through structured intermediate thinking. By introducing learnable start-of-thought and end-of-thought tokens, Quiet-STaR enables models to generate internal rationales that guide their predictions, significantly improving zero-shot performance across various reasoning tasks. This method builds on the growing evidence that explicit reasoning steps lead to more reliable and interpretable outputs.

The second approach, REBASE (REward BALanced SEarch), takes a fundamentally different direction by focusing on computational efficiency during inference. Through its innovative reward-balanced search algorithm, REBASE optimizes the exploration of solution spaces by dynamically controlling node expansion based on quality metrics. This method eliminates the need for expensive rollouts while maintaining solution diversity, demonstrating significant improvements in compute efficiency without substantial accuracy degradation.

These contrasting approaches raise an intriguing question: could their integration create a synergistic effect, combining Quiet-STaR’s enhanced reasoning capabilities with REBASE’s computational efficiency? The potential benefits of such a combination are compelling:

- **Enhanced Decision Quality:** Leveraging structured reasoning within an efficient search framework could lead to more reliable solutions.
- **Optimized Resource Utilization:** Intelligent pruning of reasoning paths could reduce computational waste while maintaining reasoning depth.
- **Improved Scalability:** A combined approach might enable more sophisticated reasoning within practical computational constraints.

However, this integration presents significant challenges. The methods operate on fundamentally different principles: Quiet-STaR promotes expansive exploration of reasoning paths, while REBASE aims to minimize computational over-

I. INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across diverse tasks, from mathematical reasoning to complex problem-solving[3]. However, as these models grow in sophistication, a critical tension has emerged between enhancing their reasoning capabilities and maintaining computational efficiency. While numerous approaches have been proposed to improve model reasoning, most focus solely on accuracy improvements without considering the substantial computational overhead they introduce[3], [4]. This oversight becomes particularly significant in real-world applications, where computational resources and response time constraints often determine deployment feasibility.

head through aggressive pruning. Understanding how these competing objectives interact is crucial for developing more efficient reasoning systems.

Our study presents a systematic investigation of this integration, making several key contributions:

- 1) A comprehensive empirical analysis of the interaction between reasoning enhancement and computational efficiency optimization
- 2) Detailed examination of performance trade-offs across accuracy, computational cost, and runtime
- 3) Identification of key challenges and limitations in combining these approaches
- 4) Concrete recommendations for future research directions in compute-efficient reasoning methods

Using the Mistral-7B model evaluated on the GSM8K dataset, we provide quantitative and qualitative insights into the challenges and opportunities of balancing reasoning capability with computational efficiency. Our findings have important implications for the development of future language models that must operate under real-world computational constraints while maintaining high-quality reasoning capabilities.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Quiet-STaR

Quiet-STaR extends self-taught reasoning to arbitrary text by training language models to generate rationales that explain future text at each token. Unlike previous approaches like chain-of-thought prompting or traditional STaR that focus on specific question-answering tasks, Quiet-STaR operates on general unstructured text data. The method introduces several key innovations:

- **Parallel Generation:** A novel algorithm that enables efficient generation of rationales at all token positions in parallel by carefully constructing attention masks, allowing each generated token to attend to relevant previous tokens while maintaining independence between different reasoning paths.
- **Meta-Tokens:** Learned start-of-thought and end-of-thought tokens that control rationale generation. The start token puts the model into "thinking mode" while the end token signals completion of the thought. These tokens are initialized from em dash embeddings to leverage the model's pre-existing knowledge of pauses in text.
- **Mixing Architecture:** A learned interpolation between predictions with and without thoughts, implemented via a shallow MLP that outputs weights determining how much to incorporate post-rationale predictions. This helps smooth the transition to using generated thoughts.
- **Non-myopic Learning:** Extended teacher-forcing that allows the model to learn from multiple future tokens rather than just the immediate next token, helping capture longer-range dependencies and semantic content.

The method operates in three main steps:

- 1) **Think:** Generate rationales in parallel across input tokens

- 2) **Talk:** Mix post-rationale and base predictions using learned weights
- 3) **Learn:** Optimize rationale generation through REINFORCE based on prediction improvements

B. REBASE

REBASE (REward BALanced SEarch) introduces a novel tree-search algorithm designed for compute-optimal inference in language model problem-solving. Building on empirical scaling laws analysis, REBASE addresses key limitations of previous methods like MCTS while achieving better cost-performance trade-offs:

- **Node Quality Reward:** Uses a reward model to score intermediate nodes, eliminating the need for explicit rollouts while ensuring high-quality solution paths. This approach differs from MCTS by directly evaluating node quality rather than requiring expensive simulations.
- **Balanced Exploration:** Expands nodes according to softmax-normalized reward scores, subject to a total expansion budget. This balances between exploring promising paths and maintaining sufficient solution diversity.
- **Efficient Resource Usage:** By avoiding costly rollouts and focusing computation on promising paths, REBASE achieves significantly better computational efficiency than sampling-based or traditional tree-search methods.
- **Pareto-Optimal Performance:** Demonstrates superior cost-performance trade-offs, particularly when using smaller models. For instance, REBASE with a 7B parameter model can outperform larger 34B models across multiple compute budgets.

The algorithm proceeds by:

- 1) Computing rewards for expandable nodes using a process reward model
- 2) Selecting nodes for expansion based on softmax-normalized scores
- 3) Expanding selected nodes within the computational budget
- 4) Aggregating results through weighted voting

This approach has shown particular effectiveness in mathematical reasoning tasks, where it achieves competitive accuracy while using substantially fewer computational resources than alternatives. The method's success demonstrates the importance of balancing reasoning depth with efficient resource allocation.

C. Scaling Laws and Computation

Both Quiet-STaR and REBASE build on established scaling laws for neural language models. According to Kaplan et al.[5], the forward compute cost for a Transformer model can be approximated as:

$$C_{\text{forward}} \approx 2N + 2n_{\text{layers}}n_{\text{ctx}}d_{\text{model}} \quad (1)$$

where:

- N represents the total number of non-embedding parameters, given by:

$$N = 2d_{\text{model}}n_{\text{layers}}(2d_{\text{attn}} + d_{\text{ff}})$$

- n_{layers} is the number of transformer layers
- n_{ctx} is the context length (sequence length)
- d_{model} is the dimension of the residual stream
- d_{attn} is the dimension of attention heads, where $d_{\text{attn}} = d_{\text{model}}/n_{\text{heads}}$
- d_{ff} is the dimension of the intermediate feed-forward layer

These equations allow us to predict the computational cost (in FLOPs) per token during inference. This understanding is crucial for evaluating the trade-offs introduced by Quiet-STaR’s extended reasoning phases and REBASE’s tree-search pruning. For example, Quiet-STaR increases the effective n_{layers} through additional reasoning steps, while REBASE attempts to reduce unnecessary expansions, potentially lowering the effective n_{ctx} processed per query. By calculating FLOPs with different model configurations, we can make informed decisions about resource allocation and understand why certain integrations may fail to yield expected synergies.

The practical impact of these scaling laws becomes apparent when considering that Quiet-STaR introduces additional computational overhead through its rationale generation, which effectively increases the total computation per token. Meanwhile, REBASE’s pruning strategies aim to minimize this overhead by selectively processing only the most promising paths. Understanding these interactions through the lens of Kaplan et al.’s scaling laws helps explain the empirical performance characteristics we observe in our experiments.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Experimental Design

We conducted a systematic investigation of integrating reasoning enhancement (Quiet-STaR) with computational optimization (REBASE) using a series of controlled experiments. Our experimental design focused on isolating the effects of each method while measuring their combined impact on both performance and computational efficiency.

1) *Model Architecture*: We utilized the Mistral-7B model as our base architecture, chosen for its balance of capability and computational tractability. The model maintains the standard transformer architecture with the following specifications:

- Parameter Count: 7B parameters (non-embedding)
- Context Length: 384 tokens for primary evaluations
- Architecture: Standard transformer with relative positional embeddings

2) *Dataset*: Our evaluation used the GSM8K dataset, a standardized benchmark for mathematical reasoning that provides:

- 128 carefully selected questions from the GSM8K test set
- Range of difficulty levels to assess reasoning capabilities
- Clear evaluation metrics through verifiable numeric answers

B. Implementation Details

1) *Quiet-STaR Components*: We implemented Quiet-STaR with the following key components:

1) Thought Token Generation:

- Custom start-of-thought and end-of-thought tokens
- Parallel generation algorithm for efficient rationale production
- Teacher forcing for multi-token ahead prediction

2) Mixing Architecture:

- Three-layer MLP mixing head
- Input: Concatenated hidden states (with/without thought)
- Output: Scalar weight for logit interpolation

2) *REBASE Implementation*: We implemented REBASE with the following specifications:

1) Tree Search Parameters:

- Tree widths: {3, 6, 16} (varied for analysis)
- Softmax temperature: 0.2 for node selection
- Node quality reward based on process reward model

2) Pruning Strategy:

- Dynamic node expansion based on reward signals
- Balanced exploration through softmax normalization
- Early stopping based on node quality thresholds

C. Integration Strategy

For the combined Quiet-STaR and REBASE approach, we implemented:

1) State Synchronization:

- Unified hidden state representation across reasoning steps
- Shared reward model for both thought quality and tree search
- Coordinated pruning and thought generation stages

2) Resource Management:

- Dynamic compute allocation between reasoning and search
- Thought token budget based on tree depth
- Adaptive batch sizing for efficient parallel computation

D. Hardware and Infrastructure

All experiments were conducted on:

- Hardware: Single NVIDIA A100 GPU (80GB)
- CPU Configuration: 8 CPUs for parallel processing
- Memory: 512GB system RAM
- Number of majority votes: 6

E. Experimental Protocol

Our experimental procedure followed these steps:

1) Baseline Establishment:

- Base model performance measurement with 6 votes
- Individual Quiet-STaR evaluation with 6 votes

TABLE I: Comprehensive Performance Analysis

Config.	Acc. (%)	FLOPs (T)	Time (s)	Acc/TFLOP	Acc/Sec	Eff. Score
Base	10.16	11.22	52.47	0.91	0.19	17.29
Quiet-STaR	32.03	12.73	554.66	2.52	0.06	15.12
REBASE-3	10.94	2.35	8.47	4.66	1.29	601.14
REBASE-6	10.16	4.96	17.82	2.05	0.57	116.85
REBASE-16	12.50	13.57	46.90	0.92	0.27	24.84
Integration	9.38	4.25	143.66	2.21	0.07	15.47

Note: Best values in each column are shown in **bold**. REBASE-N indicates REBASE with width=N. Note: REBASE-N indicates

REBASE with width=N. Acc. = Accuracy, Sec = Second, Eff. = Efficiency

- Individual REBASE evaluation with varying widths 3, 6, 16, where the width is equivalent to numvotes

2) Integration Testing:

- Combined model implementation
- Compute efficiency measurement
- Accuracy and timing evaluations

3) Comparative Analysis:

- Performance comparison across configurations
- Resource utilization analysis
- Scaling behavior investigation

Each experimental condition was evaluated with multiple runs to ensure statistical reliability, with performance metrics averaged across runs. Standard deviations were computed to assess the stability of our results.

IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

A. Performance Analysis

1) *Evaluation Metrics*: We developed three key metrics to assess performance holistically:

$$\text{Accuracy per TFLOP} = \frac{\text{Accuracy (\%)}}{\text{FLOPs (Trillion)}} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Accuracy per Second} = \frac{\text{Accuracy (\%)}}{\text{Time (seconds)}} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Efficiency Score} = (\text{Acc/TFLOP} \times \text{Acc/Second}) \times 100 \quad (4)$$

These metrics capture both performance and computational efficiency, enabling multi-dimensional analysis of each approach.

B. Comparative Results

C. Key Findings

1) *Pure Reasoning Approach (Quiet-STaR)*: The Quiet-STaR implementation demonstrated:

- Superior accuracy (32.03%) - 3.15× improvement over baseline
- High computational overhead: 12.73T FLOPs/Inference
- Significant latency: 554.66s average runtime
- Limited efficiency (15.12 score) due to computational costs

Analysis: The substantial accuracy improvement suggests effective reasoning capabilities, but at the cost of significant computational overhead. This trade-off indicates Quiet-STaR may be most suitable for applications where accuracy is paramount and computational resources are not constrained.

2) *Inference Optimization (REBASE)*: REBASE showed distinct characteristics across different widths:

- Optimal efficiency at w=3: 601.14 efficiency score
- Minimal resource usage: 2.35T FLOPs (w=3)
- Fast execution: 8.47s runtime (w=3)
- Maintained baseline accuracy: 10.94% (w=3)

Analysis: REBASE demonstrates superior efficiency, particularly at lower tree widths. The w=3 configuration represents an optimal balance between computational cost and accuracy maintenance, suggesting its suitability for resource-constrained deployments.

3) *Integration Challenges*: The combined approach revealed unexpected challenges:

- Degraded accuracy: 9.38% (below baseline)
- Moderate compute requirements: 4.25T FLOPs
- Increased latency: 143.66s runtime
- Poor efficiency: 15.47 score

Analysis: The performance degradation in the integrated approach suggests fundamental incompatibilities between the two methods. Three primary factors contribute to this interference:

- 1) **Optimization Conflict**: Divergent objectives between reasoning enhancement and computational efficiency
- 2) **State Management**: Challenges in maintaining coherent state representations across both mechanisms
- 3) **Resource Competition**: Inefficient allocation of computational resources between reasoning and search processes

D. Implications

Our findings have several important implications for the field:

1) Architectural Considerations:

- Need for specialized architectures that can better integrate reasoning and efficiency mechanisms
- Importance of unified state representations in combined approaches

2) Resource Management:

- Critical role of dynamic resource allocation in efficiency optimization
- Need for better strategies to balance reasoning depth with computational cost

3) Future Development:

- Opportunity for new hybrid approaches that better reconcile reasoning and efficiency
- Potential for adaptive mechanisms that dynamically adjust between approaches based on task requirements




Fig. 1: Comprehensive Performance Analysis: (a) shows the trade-off between accuracy and computational cost, (b) demonstrates the relationship between accuracy and runtime, and (c) compares the overall efficiency scores across all configurations. Note the logarithmic scales used to better visualize the wide range of values.

V. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

A. Current Limitations

Our study encountered several significant limitations:

- **Model Architecture:**
 - Limited to Mistral-7B architecture
 - Potential architecture-specific effects not explored
- **Implementation Constraints:**
 - Incomplete documentation for Quiet-STaR inference and reasoning generation
 - The thoughts generated sometimes are not human readable
- **Evaluation Scope:**
 - Focus on mathematical reasoning tasks only
 - Limited exploration of different reasoning domains

VI. FUTURE WORK

We identify several promising directions for future research:

- Investigation of the negative interference between approaches
- Development of more compatible reasoning-inference combinations
- Broader evaluation across different types of reasoning tasks
- Dynamic width adjustment for REBASE

VII. CONCLUSION

Our study provides a comprehensive analysis of the challenges in integrating reasoning enhancement (Quiet-STaR) with computational optimization (REBASE). While each

method shows promise independently, their combination introduces unexpected complexities that limit overall performance. These findings highlight the need for more sophisticated integration approaches that can effectively balance reasoning quality with computational efficiency.

The significant performance gap between the individual methods and their integration suggests that future work should focus on understanding and addressing the fundamental incompatibilities between these approaches. This might include developing new state representations, exploring adaptive control mechanisms, or designing unified optimization objectives that better align the goals of enhanced reasoning and efficient computation.

VIII. CODE AVAILABILITY

The implementation of our experiments and analysis code is publicly available at <https://github.com/MarwanWalid2/Reasoning-vs-InferenceScaling>. The repository contains all necessary code to reproduce our results, including model configurations, and evaluation scripts.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Zelikman, Y. Wu, and N. Moses, "Quiet-star: Self-taught reasoning with non-myopic objectives," *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [2] Y. Wu, Z. Sun, S. Li, S. Welleck, and Y. Yang, "Inference scaling laws: An empirical analysis of compute-optimal inference for problem-solving with language models," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00724>
- [3] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, B. Ichter, F. Xia, E. Chi, Q. Le, and D. Zhou, "Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, 2022.
- [4] M. Nye, A. J. Andreassen, G. Gur-Ari, H. Michalewski, J. Austin, D. Bieber, D. Dohan, A. Lewkowycz, M. Bosma, D. Luan, C. Sutton, and A. Odena, "Show your work: Scratchpads for intermediate computation with language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00114*, 2021.
- [5] J. Kaplan, S. McCandlish, T. Henighan, T. B. Brown, B. Chess, R. Child, S. Gray, A. Radford, J. Wu, and D. Amodei, "Scaling laws for neural language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.