

# CDS: Data Synthesis Method Guided by Cognitive Diagnosis Theory

Haokun Zhao<sup>1</sup>, Jinyi Han<sup>2</sup>, Jiaqing Liang<sup>3\*</sup>, Yanghua Xiao<sup>1,2</sup>

Shanghai Key Laboratory of Data Science, School of Computer Science, Fudan University<sup>1</sup>

Shanghai Institute of Artificial Intelligence for Education, East China Normal University<sup>2</sup>

Shanghai Key Laboratory of Data Science, School of Data Science, Fudan University<sup>3</sup>

hkzhao23@m.fudan.edu.cn, haixiahan03@gmail.com,

{liangjiaqing, shawyh}@fudan.edu.cn

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated outstanding capabilities across various domains, but the increasing complexity of new challenges demands enhanced performance and adaptability. Traditional benchmarks, although comprehensive, often lack the granularity needed for detailed capability analysis. This study introduces the **Cognitive Diagnostic Synthesis (CDS)** method, which employs Cognitive Diagnosis Theory (CDT) for precise evaluation and targeted enhancement of LLMs. By decomposing complex tasks into discrete knowledge points, CDS accurately identifies and synthesizes data targeting model weaknesses, thereby enhancing the model’s performance. This framework proposes a comprehensive pipeline driven by knowledge point evaluation, synthesis, data augmentation, and filtering, which significantly improves the model’s mathematical and coding capabilities, achieving up to an 11.12% improvement in optimal scenarios.

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated exceptional capabilities across diverse tasks. However, the increasing complexity of emerging challenges has raised higher demands on model performance, and the shortcomings exposed in practical applications also highlight the need for new methods to further enhance their capabilities.

To achieve continuous improvement during training, developers commonly analyze model responses using various benchmarks and adjust the training corpus accordingly. For example, when LLMs underperform on mathematical benchmarks such as GSM8k, targeted math data is incorporated into subsequent training cycles to address specific weaknesses. Recent studies have utilized advanced LLMs like GPT-4 as synthesizers (Dai

et al., 2023) or gathers their response as a new instruction-tuning dataset by prompting them (Sun et al., 2023). These approaches leverage distilled data from advanced models to supplement the training corpus and improve the fine-tuning process.




Figure 1: Existing benchmarks evaluate models using metrics such as overall accuracy or Pass@k. While these metrics offer a broad view of model capabilities, they lack the granularity required to specifically and quantitatively assess a model’s mastery of individual knowledge points, such as dissecting mathematical abilities into specific knowledge points like area, probability, etc.

In this context, we identify two primary concerns: (1) Existing benchmarks typically rely on coarse-grained metrics such as overall accuracy to summarize model capabilities. As shown in Figure 1, while these metrics provide a dataset-level overview, they fail to pinpoint specific strengths or weaknesses, particularly at the level of individual knowledge points or sub-skills. This lack of fine-grained analysis restricts actionable insights into model deficiencies and impedes targeted improvements. (2) The traditional method of indiscriminately generating data to expand the training corpus is inefficient. It does not fully leverage the advanced capabilities of LLMs. Beyond data generation, advanced language models have demonstrated exceptional analytical and evaluative capa-

\*Corresponding Author

bilities. Guiding these models to perform analysis prior to data synthesis can significantly enhance the quality of the generated data. (Bai et al., 2023; Dai et al., 2023). We are thus inspired by the cognitive diagnosis theory (CDT) in educational psychology, which, unlike traditional assessment methods that provide only an overall score or general evaluation, emphasizes assessing an individual’s mastery of specific knowledge points or skills and identifying their strengths and weaknesses. This approach informs the design of strategies for enhancing LLMs’ further training by mirroring the personalized and targeted methodologies employed in human education.

Specifically, we introduce the **Cognitive Diagnostic Synthesis** (CDS) method, utilizing CDT at both macro and micro levels to optimize model evaluation and guide data synthesis. From a macro perspective, we decompose problems into multiple knowledge points and statistically evaluate the model’s mastery of each knowledge point. From a micro perspective, we guide advanced LLMs to perform cognitive diagnosis based on the specific answering records of the student model, identifying the mastery of knowledge points revealed during the answering process. This diagnosis is then used as the context for Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning to facilitate the synthesis of high-quality data focused on weakly mastered knowledge points. Furthermore, the macro-level knowledge point diagnosis results can also be used to guide the synthesis of diverse data and serve as a reference for subsequent data filtering.

Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

(1) We apply CDT to introduce a more fine-grained knowledge point-level evaluation process into the model assessment, enabling a deeper understanding of model capabilities.

(2) We design two data synthesis strategies: one based on statistically derived cognitive results to target the synthesis of data that addresses weakly mastered knowledge points, and the other based on specific error diagnoses from the model’s incorrect responses which leverages the capabilities of advanced LLMs to diagnose the student model, analyze the causes of errors, and generate targeted supplemental data. Based on these synthetic data, we apply knowledge point-constrained rewriting and multi-knowledge point fusion data augmentation methods.

(3) We propose a two-stage data filtering approach. In the first stage, we use advanced LLMs

to score the synthesized data from multiple dimensions. In the second stage, we introduce  $CDS_{Score}$ , a metric that simultaneously considers the frequency of knowledge points in instructions, the student LLM’s initial mastery of knowledge points, and the number of knowledge points involved in the instructions, to perform high-quality data selection.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Cognitive Diagnosis Theory

Cognitive Diagnosis Theory (CDT) provides fine-grained assessments by diagnosing an individual’s mastery of specific knowledge points, offering actionable insights for targeted interventions (Junker and Sijtsma, 2001; Rupp et al., 2010). CDT focuses on identifying strengths and weaknesses through models such as DINA (De La Torre, 2009) and G-DINA (de la Torre, 2011). These models leverage Q-Matrix Theory (Tatsuoka, 1983) to link test items with underlying knowledge points and provide probabilistic mastery estimates. While CDT integrated with AI has been widely applied in educational assessments (Minn, 2022; Wang et al., 2019; Liu, 2021), its application in data synthesis and model improvement is highly underexplored.

### 2.2 Synthetic Data for Improving Model

Leveraging advanced LLMs to generate training data has become a widely adopted strategy for improving open-source models (Dai et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023; Mitra et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023; Ivison et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023b; Mitra et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2023; Kumar et al., 2020; Li et al., 2024a, 2023). Concurrently, researchers have investigated generating corrective data through error analysis of target models (An et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2024) and enhancing learning via comparative analysis of positive and negative examples (Ying et al., 2024). Zhang et al. (2024) optimized prompts by extracting reasoning principles from errors, while Liao et al. (2024) analyzed errors in smaller LMs, storing derived knowledge and summaries in specialized knowledge bases to enhance reasoning performance.

Some studies begin with knowledge-based synthesis, generating knowledge concepts from online course platforms (Huang et al., 2024b), GPT-4 (Li et al., 2024b), and seed instruction analysis and clustering (Huang et al., 2024a), thereby guiding advanced LLMs in data synthesis. However, these approaches have several limitations: simple nom-

inal concepts are inadequate for producing high-quality and diverse synthetic data and may significantly deviate from real-world distributions. Moreover, these methods focus solely on synthesis and overlook the potential of knowledge points to evaluate model weaknesses, thereby limiting the targeting and effectiveness of data synthesis.

### 3 Methods

#### 3.1 CDS Method

We propose the CDS method, as illustrated in Figure 2. The main steps are as follows:

**Step 1: Tagging the Benchmark with knowledge points.** We employ an advanced LLM to annotate each sample in the benchmark with relevant knowledge points through a two-round tagging process. (1) In the first round, the model performs unrestricted coarse annotations, after which all identified knowledge points are retrieved to construct a comprehensive set. This set is then merged and refined to eliminate redundancies, ensuring that the knowledge points are mutually independent, comprehensively covered, and possess appropriate granularity. (2) In the second round, the refined set of knowledge points is utilized by the advanced LLM to conduct fine-grained tagging, guaranteeing that these points originate from a limited and meticulously curated collection. The Question-Knowledge Point Matrix in the Figure 2 illustrates the annotation results, where 0 indicates that a knowledge point was not examined and 1 indicates that it was examined.

**Step 2: Evaluating the student LLM and globally diagnosing knowledge point mastery.** We assess the student Large Language Model (LLM) using the benchmark annotated in Step 1, leveraging the Deterministic Inputs, Noisy "And" gate (DINA) cognitive diagnosis model. This model operates under the assumption that mastery of each knowledge point associated with a question is binary and all-or-nothing: a correct response indicates mastery of all relevant knowledge points, whereas an incorrect response signifies a lack of mastery. Based on the student LLM’s accuracy in answering each question, we construct a Knowledge Point Diagnostic Matrix. This matrix evaluates the global diagnostic performance of the student model using two metrics: the frequency of knowledge point assessments and the accuracy of knowledge point mastery, with the calculation formulas provided as follow.

$$\text{Acc}(kp) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \text{Correctness}_i \cdot Q\text{-KP}_i(kp)}{\sum_{i=1}^N Q\text{-KP}_i(kp)} \% \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Freq}(kp) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N Q\text{-KP}_i(kp)}{N} \% \quad (2)$$

where  $\text{Correctness}_i$  is a binary indicator specifying whether question  $i$  was answered correctly (1 for correct, 0 otherwise),  $Q\text{-KP}_i(kp)$  is a binary indicator from the Question-Knowledge Point Matrix indicating whether knowledge point  $kp$  is associated with question  $i$  (1 for associated, 0 otherwise), and  $N$  is the total number of questions.

We focus on rarely tested knowledge points and low-accuracy knowledge points, which are identified as the weakly mastered knowledge points of the student LLM. These points will also be prioritized in the subsequent data synthesis process.

**Step 3: Data synthesis based on cognitive diagnosis.** We propose two synthetic strategies, one from a global perspective and the other from a fine-grained perspective, to synthesize targeted data. (1) **Global Strategy:** Based on the global knowledge point mastery identified in Step 2, the Advanced LLM synthesizes data by focusing on weakly mastered knowledge points. Unlike approaches that directly expose the model to original questions during prompt-based generation, this strategy abstracts away from the original questions and operates exclusively at the knowledge point level. This effectively avoids the phenomenon where the model, when prompted with the original questions, unconsciously rewrites or rephrases them, resulting in biased or redundant outputs. By decoupling data synthesis from direct exposure to the original questions, this method ensures that the generated data is both novel and independent, addressing the limitations of prompt-based approaches that may inadvertently overfit to the original dataset. (2) **Fine-Grained Strategy:** Advanced LLMs have demonstrated robust capabilities in error analysis and in identifying both weakly and well-mastered knowledge points. By diagnosing the specific causes of incorrect answers in the student LLM’s responses, we can accurately identify insufficiently mastered knowledge points, which are then prioritized in subsequent data synthesis. In contrast, well-mastered knowledge points are deprioritized to avoid redundancy and optimize training efficiency.

To further improve the relevance and quality of the synthesized data, the diagnostic results from the Advanced LLM are incorporated into the data synthesis process as a Chain-of-Thought (CoT) con-




Figure 2: The pipeline of CDS method.

text. This Diagnose-then-Synthesis approach allows the synthesized data to specifically target the weak points of the student LLM, ensuring precise improvement while maintaining both data quality and training efficiency.

The multi-strategy synthesis method not only generates diverse training data but also effectively reduces data redundancy and mitigates monotony. Moreover, the diversity of the data enables the model to learn various representations and applications of knowledge points, enhancing its generalization and robustness.

**Step 4: Data Augmentation** To further enhance the diversity and volume of the synthesized data, we adopt two data augmentation strategies: (1) Knowledge Point-Constrained Instruction Rewrite: Building upon existing approaches that utilize seed instructions with constraints and diverse prompt

templates for rewriting (Dai et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2023), we introduce a knowledge point constraint that ensures the generated instructions assess the same knowledge points as the original ones. This relatively mild constraint preserves the diversity of instructions while keeping them aligned with the model’s weaknesses. (2) Multi-Knowledge Point-Based Instruction Fusion: We sample pairs of instructions from the synthetic data pool and task the advanced LLM with generating new instructions that integrate the knowledge points covered by both inputs. This approach significantly increases the complexity and comprehensiveness of the synthesized data by generating instructions that involve the cross-application of multiple knowledge points. To further refine the augmentation process, we employ a probabilistic enhancement strategy, where only a small subset of data is sampled and



augmented at each iteration, with the augmented instructions added back into the instruction pool. Additionally, we control the maximum number of knowledge points assessed in each instruction to avoid generating overly complex or ambiguous instructions.

**Step 5: Data Filtering** After synthetic data augmentation, the subsequent filtering phase discards samples that fail to meet the required quality standards. This process ensures that only high-quality entries are retained in the dataset, thereby improving the overall reliability and usability of the generated data. We design a two-stage filtering pipeline: (1) First, an advanced LLM assigns scores to the synthetic data based on multiple criteria, including correctness and knowledge point relevance. Only samples with scores exceeding the threshold  $\theta$  are retained. (2) Second, we introduce a novel metric,  $Q_{\text{Score}}$ , which integrates the initial accuracy of the student model on each knowledge point and the frequency with which knowledge points are assessed in the synthetic dataset. This metric prioritizes problems that: (a) assess a greater number of knowledge points (i.e., more complex and comprehensive), (b) involve knowledge points that are underrepresented in the synthetic dataset, and (c) target knowledge points where the student model initially performs poorly. The  $Q_{\text{Score}}$  is calculated as follows:

$$CDS_{\text{Score}}(d_i) = \sum_{kp_j \in \mathcal{K}_{d_i}} KP_{\text{Score}}(kp_j), \quad d_i \in \mathcal{D}_s \quad (3)$$

$$KP_{\text{Score}}(kp_j) = \text{Norm} \left[ w \cdot \log \left( \frac{1}{\text{Acc}_{kp_j} + \epsilon} \right) + (1 - w) \cdot \log \left( \frac{1}{\text{Freq}_{kp_j}^* + \epsilon} \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

where  $CDS_{\text{Score}}(d_i)$  is the overall score of instruction  $d_i$ , with  $\mathcal{D}_s$  as the synthetic dataset,  $\mathcal{K}_{d_i}$  as the set of knowledge points assessed by  $d_i$ , and  $KP_{\text{Score}}(kp_j)$  as the score of the  $j$ -th knowledge point in  $d_i$ . Here,  $\text{Acc}_{kp_j}$  denotes the student LLM’s initial accuracy on  $kp_j$ ,  $\text{Freq}_{kp_j}^*$  is the frequency of  $kp_j$  in  $\mathcal{D}_s$ ,  $w$  is a balancing weight, and  $\text{Norm}(\cdot)$  is a normalization function.

We apply a  $1-\sigma$  principle, retaining samples with  $CDS_{\text{Score}}(d_i) > \mu - \sigma$ , to construct the final supplementary training dataset for fine-tuning the student LLM.

## 4 Experimental Setup

### 4.1 Datasets

We assess two primary capabilities: mathematical reasoning and coding. For each, we designate a training dataset  $D_{\text{train}}$  and an evaluation dataset  $D_{\text{eval}}$ , comprising both In-Domain (ID) and Out-of-Domain (OOD) subsets to evaluate generalization beyond the training distribution. Specifically, GSM8k (Cobbe et al., 2021) serves as the ID dataset for mathematical reasoning, while GSM8k-PLUS (Li et al., 2024c), augmented with mathematical perturbations, is used as the OOD dataset. For coding, MBPP (Austin et al., 2021) is the ID dataset, and HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) is employed for OOD evaluation.

### 4.2 Language Models

We use Qwen1.5-7B-Chat (Bai et al., 2023) and Llama3-8B-Instruct (AI@Meta, 2024) as the student LLMs, with Qwen2-72B-Instruct (Yang et al., 2024) serving as the advanced LLM.

### 4.3 Training Setup

We train the models on 1 NVIDIA A800 GPUs with ZeRO Stage 1 (Rajbhandari et al., 2020) from DeepSpeed (Rasley et al., 2020), using AdamW (Kingma and Ba, 2015) as the optimizer and LoRA (Hu et al., 2021) with a rank of  $r = 8$  for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. The batch size is 32, with a maximum sequence length of 2,048 and 1 training epoch.

### 4.4 Inference Setup

We tailor sampling strategies to specific tasks. For code generation, we use sampling with temperature 0.3, top- $p$  0.8, and top- $k$  10. For mathematical reasoning, we adopt greedy decoding. Both tasks apply 0-shot inference and limit the output to a maximum of 512 tokens.

### 4.5 Baselines

#### 4.5.1 Synthetic Baselines

We consider several baselines for comparison with our method as follows: (1) *Prompt*: Directly prompting the model to answer. (2) *IFT*: Using previously unused instructions from the in-domain training set for fine-tuning. (3) *Learning from Errors by Contrast (LEC)* (Ying et al., 2024): Using SentenceBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) to embed erroneous cases, selecting the most similar positive examples based on the L2 distance, and

utilizing both positive and negative cases to prompt the advance LLM for synthesis. (4) *AugGPT* (Dai et al., 2023): Previously unused instructions from the in-domain training set are sampled as seed data to generate synthetic data using the advanced LLM. (5) *LLM2LLM* (Lee et al., 2024): Generate additional data using incorrect examples from the evaluation set with the advanced LLM. (6) *MUSTARD* (Huang et al., 2024b): Questions are generated based on randomly selected seed concepts from online course platforms, with corresponding answers produced by an advanced LLM and subsequently filtered for correctness using a sophisticated detector. We employ Qwen2-72B-Instruct as the advanced LLM and detector, ensuring consistent instruction quantity across all baselines.

#### 4.5.2 Filtering Baselines

We evaluate our filtering algorithm against several baselines as follows: (1) *Cluster-Based Selection (CBS)* (Chen et al., 2023a): Instructions are embedded using SentenceBERT, clustered with HDBSCAN (Campello et al., 2013), and samples are selected using the K-Center-Greedy algorithm. (2) *Coreset* (Sener and Savarese, 2017): Similar to CBS, instructions are embedded with SentenceBERT, and samples are selected using the K-Center-Greedy algorithm. (3) *Diversity* (Wang et al., 2022): For each instruction, the ROUGE score is computed against a randomly selected subset of  $n$  samples ( $n \ll M$ ). We select  $k$  samples with the lowest ROUGE scores. (4) *Length*: Samples are selected based on the length of the input instructions, focusing on the longest instances ( $\text{Length}_{\text{long}}$ ) to assess their impact. (5) *Perplexity* (Marion et al., 2023): Samples are selected based on low per-token perplexity, indicating high model certainty and fluency. (6) *AlpaGasus* (Chen et al., 2024): Each data point is scored using an advanced LLM, such as ChatGPT, based on dimensions such as helpfulness and accuracy. Instances with low scores are filtered out. (7) *Random*: Instances are selected purely at random from the dataset.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Main Results

The main experimental results of our methods and baseline approaches across various tasks are presented in Table 1.

### 5.2 Evaluation of Filtering Strategies

The main experimental results of our filtering strategy and baseline approaches across various tasks are presented in Table 2.

Method	Code		Math	
	MBPP	HumanEval	GSM8k	GSMPlus
	P@1	P@1	Acc	Acc
<i>Qwen1.5-7B-Chat</i>				
Prompt	29.20	32.32	54.00	33.92
IFT	28.00	31.10	52.42	33.72
LEC	29.60	31.71	52.20	33.76
AugGPT	<b>32.00</b>	32.93	46.38	28.86
LLM2LLM	31.60	<b>35.98</b>	53.82	33.76
MUSTARD	32.60	31.10	<b>57.42</b>	<b>35.96</b>
<b>CDS(our)</b>	<b>35.20</b>	<b>36.59</b>	<b>64.54</b>	<b>43.86</b>
<i>Llama3-8B-Instruct</i>				
Prompt	41.40	54.88	62.02	42.50
IFT	41.60	<b>55.49</b>	61.64	<b>42.78</b>
LEC	<b>42.80</b>	54.88	55.62	42.48
AugGPT	40.00	51.83	47.32	36.00
LLM2LLM	<b>42.80</b>	<b>56.10</b>	55.76	41.46
MUSTARD	41.40	54.88	<b>62.16</b>	42.44
<b>CDS(our)</b>	<b>42.80</b>	<b>55.49</b>	<b>73.14</b>	<b>55.60</b>

Table 1: The main experimental results of our methods and baseline approaches across various tasks are presented. Experiments are conducted using two different LLMs: Qwen1.5-7B-Chat and Llama3-8B-Instruct. The top two performances are highlighted in **red bold** and **black bold**, respectively.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced the Cognitive Diagnostic Synthesis (CDS) method, which leverages Cognitive Diagnosis Theory (CDT) to perform fine-grained, knowledge point-level evaluations of Large Language Models (LLMs). CDS enables targeted data synthesis by decomposing problems into specific knowledge points and utilizing advanced LLMs for detailed cognitive diagnosis, effectively addressing identified model weaknesses. We developed two data synthesis strategies—cognitive-based synthesis and error diagnosis-guided synthesis—and implemented a two-stage data filtering approach featuring the novel  $\text{CDS}_{\text{Score}}$  metric. Our experiments demonstrate that CDS significantly enhances LLM performance by generating high-

Method	Code							Math						
	MBPP			HumanEval			Avg	GSM8k			GSMPlus			Avg
	0.1k	0.2k	0.3k	0.1k	0.2k	0.3k	-	0.4k	0.8k	1.6k	0.4k	0.8k	1.6k	-
CBS	22.80	31.00	30.60	<b>35.37</b>	<b>30.49</b>	29.27	29.92	41.80	<b>62.00</b>	60.94	27.08	<b>40.40</b>	40.24	45.41
CoreSet	22.80	30.60	<b>32.80</b>	32.93	26.22	31.71	29.51	50.76	59.70	60.06	34.10	38.14	38.66	46.90
Diversity	23.80	31.60	32.60	<b>34.76</b>	24.39	<b>34.15</b>	30.32	43.28	56.14	61.64	28.54	35.08	39.80	44.08
Length <sub>long</sub>	21.00	30.40	30.40	34.15	26.22	32.93	29.18	36.96	59.52	61.02	24.10	38.40	39.46	43.24
Perplexity	<b>29.00</b>	<b>32.20</b>	32.20	<b>34.76</b>	<b>29.27</b>	33.54	<b>31.83</b>	<b>53.04</b>	60.80	<b>62.52</b>	<b>35.32</b>	40.18	<b>41.56</b>	<b>48.90</b>
AlpaGasus	22.80	31.40	32.60	32.32	27.44	32.93	29.92	45.68	<b>62.34</b>	56.82	30.70	<b>40.20</b>	37.32	45.51
Random	21.80	31.20	32.40	32.32	26.51	31.71	29.32	49.44	58.38	59.32	33.76	38.70	38.86	46.41
<b>CDS<sub>score</sub>(our)</b>	<b>28.80</b>	<b>31.80</b>	<b>33.40</b>	32.93	29.00	<b>35.37</b>	<b>31.88</b>	<b>53.80</b>	60.80	<b>62.56</b>	<b>36.02</b>	39.96	<b>41.24</b>	<b>49.06</b>

Table 2: The main experimental results of our filtering strategy and baseline approaches across various tasks are presented. Experiments are conducted using Qwen1.5-7B-Chat. The top two performances are highlighted in **red bold** and **black bold**, respectively.

quality, targeted training data and facilitating efficient model fine-tuning. Future work will explore the broader applicability of CDS across various domains and further refine synthesis and filtering techniques to maximize the potential of LLMs.

## References

- AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).
- Shengnan An, Zexiong Ma, Zeqi Lin, Nanning Zheng, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. [Learning from mistakes makes llm better reasoner](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2310.20689.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie J. Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc V. Le, and Charles Sutton. 2021. [Program synthesis with large language models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2108.07732.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenhang Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, K. Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Yu Bowen, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xing Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. 2023. [Qwen technical report](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2309.16609.
- Ricardo J. G. B. Campello, Davoud Moulavi, and Jörg Sander. 2013. [Density-based clustering based on hierarchical density estimates](#). In *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- Haowen Chen, Yiming Zhang, Qi Zhang, Hantao Yang, Xiaomeng Hu, Xuetao Ma, Yifan YangGong, and Junbo Jake Zhao. 2023a. [Maybe only 0.5% data is needed: A preliminary exploration of low training data instruction tuning](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2305.09246.
- Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Sriniwasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, and Hongxia Jin. 2024. [Alpagasus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.08701.
- Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Sriniwasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, et al. 2023b. [Alpagasus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08701*.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Pondé, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yura Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, David W. Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William H. Guss, Alex Nichol, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, Andrew Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew M. Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. [Evaluating large language models trained on code](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2107.03374.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman.

2021. [Training verifiers to solve math word problems](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2110.14168.
- Haixing Dai, Zheng Liu, Wenxiong Liao, Xiaoke Huang, Yihan Cao, Zihao Wu, Lin Zhao, Shaochen Xu, W. Liu, Ninghao Liu, Sheng Li, Dajiang Zhu, Hongmin Cai, Lichao Sun, Quanzheng Li, Dinggang Shen, Tianming Liu, and Xiang Li. 2023. [Auggpt: Leveraging chatgpt for text data augmentation](#).
- Jimmy De La Torre. 2009. Dina model and parameter estimation: A didactic. *Journal of educational and behavioral statistics*, 34(1):115–130.
- Jimmy de la Torre. 2011. [The generalized dina model framework](#). *Psychometrika*, 76:179–199.
- Yao Fu, Hao-Chun Peng, Litu Ou, Ashish Sabharwal, and Tushar Khot. 2023. [Specializing smaller language models towards multi-step reasoning](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2301.12726.
- J. Edward Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2106.09685.
- Yiming Huang, Xiao Liu, Yeyun Gong, Zhibin Gou, Yelong Shen, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2024a. [Key-point-driven data synthesis with its enhancement on mathematical reasoning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.02333.
- Yinya Huang, Xiaohan Lin, Zhengying Liu, Qingxing Cao, Huajian Xin, Haiming Wang, Zhenguo Li, Linqi Song, and Xiaodan Liang. 2024b. [Mustard: Mastering uniform synthesis of theorem and proof data](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.08957.
- Hamish Ivison, Yizhong Wang, Valentina Pyatkin, Nathan Lambert, Matthew E. Peters, Pradeep Dasigi, Joel Jang, David Wadden, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hanna Hajishirzi. 2023. [Camels in a changing climate: Enhancing lm adaptation with tulu 2](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2311.10702.
- Brian W. Junker and Klaas Sijtsma. 2001. [Cognitive assessment models with few assumptions, and connections with nonparametric item response theory](#). *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 25:258 – 272.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. [Adam: A method for stochastic optimization](#). In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Varun Kumar, Ashutosh Choudhary, and Eunah Cho. 2020. [Data augmentation using pre-trained transformer models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2003.02245.
- Nicholas Lee, Thanakul Wattanawong, Sehoon Kim, Karttikeya Mangalam, Sheng Shen, Gopala Krishna Anumanchipalli, Michael W. Mahoney, Kurt Keutzer, and Amir Gholami. 2024. [Llm2llm: Boosting llms with novel iterative data enhancement](#). In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Chen Li, Weiqi Wang, Jingcheng Hu, Yixuan Wei, Nanning Zheng, Han Hu, Zheng Zhang, and Houwen Peng. 2024a. [Common 7b language models already possess strong math capabilities](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2403.04706.
- Haoran Li, Qingxiu Dong, Zhengyang Tang, Chaojun Wang, Xingxing Zhang, Haoyang Huang, Shaohan Huang, Xiaolong Huang, Zeqiang Huang, Dongdong Zhang, Yuxian Gu, Xin Cheng, Xun Wang, Si-Qing Chen, Li Dong, Wei Lu, Zhifang Sui, Benyou Wang, Wai Lam, and Furu Wei. 2024b. [Synthetic data \(almost\) from scratch: Generalized instruction tuning for language models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.13064.
- Haoran Li, Yiran Liu, Xingxing Zhang, Wei Lu, and Furu Wei. 2023. [Tuna: Instruction tuning using feedback from large language models](#). In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Qintong Li, Leyang Cui, Xueliang Zhao, Lingpeng Kong, and Wei Bi. 2024c. [Gsm-plus: A comprehensive benchmark for evaluating the robustness of llms as mathematical problem solvers](#). In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Huanxuan Liao, Shizhu He, Yao Xu, Yuanzhe Zhang, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2024. [Neural-symbolic collaborative distillation: Advancing small language models for complex reasoning tasks](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2409.13203.
- Qi Liu. 2021. [Towards a new generation of cognitive diagnosis](#). In *IJCAI*, pages 4961–4964.
- Max Marion, Ahmet Üstün, Luiza Pozzobon, Alex Wang, Marzieh Fadaee, and Sara Hooker. 2023. [When less is more: Investigating data pruning for pre-training llms at scale](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.04564.
- Sein Minn. 2022. [Ai-assisted knowledge assessment techniques for adaptive learning environments](#). *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.*, 3:100050.
- Arindam Mitra, Luciano Del Corro, Shweti Mahajan, Andres Coda, Clarisse Simoes, Sahaj Agrawal, Xuxi Chen, Anastasia Razdaibiedina, Erik Jones, Kriti Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, Guoqing Zheng, Corby Rosset, Hamed Khanpour, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2023. [Orca 2: Teaching small language models how to reason](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2311.11045.
- Arindam Mitra, Hamed Khanpour, Corby Rosset, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2024. [Orca-math: Unlocking the potential of slms in grade school math](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.14830.
- Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. [Zero: memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models](#). In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, SC 2020, Virtual Event / Atlanta, Georgia, USA, November 9-19, 2020*, page 20. IEEE/ACM.



- Jeff Rasley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. [Deepspeed: System optimizations enable training deep learning models with over 100 billion parameters](#). In *KDD '20: The 26th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Virtual Event, CA, USA, August 23-27, 2020*, pages 3505–3506. ACM.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks](#). In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Andre A. Rupp, Jonathan L Templin, and Robert Henson. 2010. [Diagnostic measurement: Theory, methods, and applications](#).
- Ozan Sener and Silvio Savarese. 2017. [Active learning for convolutional neural networks: A core-set approach](#). *arXiv: Machine Learning*.
- Zhiqing Sun, Yikang Shen, Qinhong Zhou, Hongxin Zhang, Zhenfang Chen, David D. Cox, Yiming Yang, and Chuang Gan. 2023. [Principle-driven self-alignment of language models from scratch with minimal human supervision](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2305.03047.
- Kikumi K. Tatsuoaka. 1983. [Rule space: An approach for dealing with misconceptions based on item response theory](#). *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 20:345–354.
- Fei Wang, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, Zhenya Huang, Yuying Chen, Yu Yin, Zai Huang, and Shijin Wang. 2019. [Neural cognitive diagnosis for intelligent education systems](#). In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2306.04751.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. [Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions](#). In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhao Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. [Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2304.12244.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Ke-Yang Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Min Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng
- Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yunyang Wan, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zhi-Wei Fan. 2024. [Qwen2 technical report](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2407.10671.
- Jiahao Ying, Mingbao Lin, Yixin Cao, Wei Tang, Bo Wang, Qianru Sun, Xuanjing Huang, and Shuicheng Yan. 2024. [Llms-as-instructors: Learning from errors toward automating model improvement](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2407.00497.
- Tianjun Zhang, Aman Madaan, Luyu Gao, Steven Zheng, Swaroop Mishra, Yiming Yang, Niket Tandon, and Uri Alon. 2024. [In-context principle learning from mistakes](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.05403.