

Benchmarking Large Language Models via Random Variables

Zijin Hong¹, Hao Wu^{1,2}, Su Dong¹, Junnan Dong¹, Yilin Xiao¹, Yujing Zhang¹
Zhu Wang¹, Feiran Huang³, Linyi Li⁴, Hongxia Yang^{1†}, Xiao Huang¹

¹The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

²University of Electronic Science and Technology of China

³Jinan University ⁴Simon Fraser University

zijin.hong@connect.polyu.hk; wh.pyjnd@gmail.com

hongxia.yang@polyu.edu.hk; xiao.huang@polyu.edu.hk

Abstract

With the continuous advancement of large language models (LLMs) in mathematical reasoning, evaluating their performance in this domain has become a prominent research focus. Recent studies have raised concerns about the reliability of current mathematical benchmarks, highlighting issues such as simplistic design and potential data leakage. Therefore, creating a reliable benchmark that effectively evaluates the genuine capabilities of LLMs in mathematical reasoning remains a significant challenge. To address this, we propose **RV-Bench**, a framework for **Benchmarking LLMs via Random Variables** in mathematical reasoning. Specifically, the background content of a random variable question (RV question) mirrors the original problem in existing standard benchmarks, but the variable combinations are randomized into different values. LLMs must fully understand the problem-solving process for the original problem to correctly answer RV questions with various combinations of variable values. As a result, the LLM’s genuine capability in mathematical reasoning is reflected by its accuracy on RV-Bench. Extensive experiments are conducted with 29 representative LLMs across 900+ RV questions. A leaderboard for RV-Bench ranks the genuine capability of these LLMs. Further analysis of accuracy dropping indicates that current LLMs still struggle with complex mathematical reasoning problems.

1 Introduction

The emergence of large language models (LLMs) has led to impressive results across a wide range of applications, including machine translation (Zhang et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024), text summarization (Liu et al., 2024d), and question answering (Kamalloo et al., 2023). With advancements in LLMs’ reasoning capabilities (Huang and Chang, 2023), their performance on complex tasks such

[†]Corresponding author




Figure 1: When mathematical questions are presented with identical content but different random variable combinations, the LLM’s performance on these questions is not as accurate as on the original problem. This discrepancy poses challenges in evaluating the genuine performance of LLMs in mathematical reasoning.

as code generation (Hong et al., 2024b,a), planning (Huang et al., 2024a), and, particularly, mathematical reasoning and computation (Romera-Paredes et al., 2024), has become a central focus within the LLM research community (Zhao et al., 2023). Domain-specific studies of LLMs in mathematical reasoning (Ahn et al., 2024) highlight their strong potential for addressing real-world challenges. As this area continues to be a prominent focus of LLM research, numerous promising methods (Luo et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024b) and benchmarks (Fang et al., 2024) have been developed to enhance LLMs’ performance on mathematical tasks.

However, **are current evaluations of LLMs in mathematical reasoning truly reliable?** Fig. 1 illustrates a discrepancy within the well-known MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021b) dataset. In our pilot experiments, powerful LLMs like GPT-4o (Achiam et al., 2023) perform well on math problems in standard benchmarks but experience a significant drop in accuracy when answering questions with the same content but different numerical combinations of variables (Mirzadeh et al., 2024), as detailed in Sec. 4.4. This discrepancy raises

two potential concerns about the current evaluation framework: **1) The design of standard benchmarks may be overly simplistic for contemporary LLMs**, as they typically only evaluate performance on fixed-variable problems. The LLMs may not genuinely understand the problem but instead “guess” the correct answer (Dong et al., 2024); **2) The problems in widely-used benchmarks might be “memorized” by LLMs** due to potential data leakage during training, allowing the models to achieve high accuracy solely on the original problems (Ni et al., 2024). The latter concern presents a significant challenge in assessing the genuine capabilities of LLMs (Deng et al., 2024).

The advanced study presents an in-depth analysis suggesting that the probabilistic modeling of LLMs during the reasoning process obscures the fact that they are not genuinely capable of formal reasoning (Shi et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2024). Additionally, the ongoing improvements in model performance have drawn research focus to potential issues such as data contamination and overfitting during LLM training (Xu et al., 2024a). Given that mathematics is a foundational topic applicable across a wide range of semantic scenarios, the increasing popularity and prevalence of math datasets like GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), MathQA (Amini et al., 2019), and MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021b) raise the risk of potential data contamination. Although recent studies on contamination detection (Chern et al., 2024; Ni et al., 2024) can signal unreliable results during the evaluation phase, they fail to reflect the genuine performance of LLMs, as data leakage likely occurs during the training phase and remains non-intervenable (Kapoor and Narayanan, 2023).

The above situation raises a critical issue: **current benchmarks may not truly reflect the performance of LLMs** (Balloccu et al., 2024; Mirzadeh et al., 2024). In this context, **effectively benchmarking LLMs for genuine mathematical reasoning capabilities** remains a significant challenge. To address this, we propose **RV-Bench** in this study as a solution for benchmarking LLMs in mathematical reasoning using **random variables questions (RV questions)**, providing a genuine and effective evaluation framework that addresses concerns 1) and 2) mentioned above.

Specifically, we construct question functions based on the original problem from two selective mathematical data sources: MATH (Hendrycks

et al., 2021b) and LeetCode-Math¹. These functions generate instantiated questions with random variables and their corresponding answers. The RV questions are then collected to evaluate LLMs’ mathematical reasoning capabilities. Unlike existing math benchmarks (Cobbe et al., 2021; Hendrycks et al., 2021b), RV-Bench includes questions with a wide range of variable combinations, rather than fixed ones. Furthermore, RV-Bench provides “unseen” questions, allowing LLMs to demonstrate their genuine performance even if the model has been contaminated by certain benchmarks (Mirzadeh et al., 2024). To achieve high accuracy in this framework, an LLM must fully understand the problem-solving process to correctly answer the RV questions, effectively reflecting its genuine capabilities in mathematical reasoning.

In summary, our contributions are listed in the following:

- We propose **RV-Bench**, a framework that benchmarks LLMs using RV questions, providing a comprehensive evaluation of their genuine mathematical reasoning capabilities, regardless of potential data leakage in standard benchmarks during model training.
- We compare the accuracy of LLMs on RV questions with their accuracy on original problems. The observed drop in accuracy reveals the limitations of current LLMs, suggesting a potential reliance on original solutions. Additionally, we highlight the domain dependence of LLMs in mathematical reasoning, raising concerns about the reliability of current LLM evaluations in this field.
- We introduce the random variables framework for genuinely evaluating model performance to the LLMs community. Our work will be fully open-source to support further research.

2 Related Work

2.1 Benchmarking LLMs

The rapid development of LLMs has significantly advanced the evaluation of their capabilities (Chang et al., 2024). Well-designed benchmarks such as MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021a), GLUE (Wang et al., 2018), MMLU-Pro (Wang et al., 2024b), SuperGLUE (Wang et al., 2019), CommonSenseQA (Talmor et al., 2019), and

¹<https://leetcode.com/problem-list/math/>




Figure 2: An example of a question function from RV-Bench, constructed based on a problem from the MATH test set. The question function `Question` comprises three modules: `initialization`, `solution`, and `generation`. Initially, the `initialization` module randomizes a specific combination of variables within a given range. Subsequently, the `solution` module returns an answer for this combination. Finally, the `generation` module outputs the instantiated question along with the corresponding answer, forming a QA pair for RV-Bench.

ARC (Clark et al., 2018) have pioneered the evaluation of general tasks like question answering (QA), natural language understanding (NLU), and commonsense reasoning. As LLMs have demonstrated success across various domains, there has been a growing demand to evaluate their performance on task-specific benchmarks (Chang et al., 2024). As a result, an increasing number of domain-specific datasets have been introduced. For example, BoolQ (Clark et al., 2019) and SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016) evaluate reading comprehension (Hong and Liu, 2024) and language-based complex reasoning, while GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021b), and MathQA (Amini et al., 2019) focus on mathematical problem-solving. With the growing number of LLMs, leaderboards such as the OpenLLM Leaderboard (Beeching et al., 2023; Fourier et al., 2024) and OpenCompass (Contributors, 2023) now provide comprehensive evaluations across various mainstream benchmarks. For more complex reasoning tasks, benchmarks like InfiBench (Li et al., 2024), MathBench (Liu et al., 2024c), and OlympicArena (Huang et al., 2024b) have been successively released.

Our proposed RV-Bench is also a domain-specific benchmark for evaluating LLMs’ math-

ematical reasoning capabilities. The well-designed random variables framework effectively reflects LLMs’ genuine performance in understanding mathematical problems.

2.2 LLMs in Mathematical Reasoning

Mathematical reasoning is a task that effectively showcases the capabilities of LLMs and has garnered significant attention within the community, achieving remarkable advancements (Ahn et al., 2024). Techniques such as continual pre-training (Lin et al., 2024), fine-tuning (Yuan et al., 2023), and reinforcement learning (Wang et al., 2024a) are extensively employed to enhance LLMs’ mathematical reasoning. This has led to the development of math-specific LLMs like Qwen-Math (Yang et al., 2024b), DeepSeek-Math (Shao et al., 2024), and MetaMath (Yu et al., 2024). Consequently, these methodologies have attained near-perfect performance on complex mathematical reasoning datasets (Fourrier et al., 2024). OpenMath (Toshniwal et al., 2024) highlighted the importance of question diversity during fine-tuning, achieving a 96% accuracy on the grade-school arithmetic reasoning benchmark GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021). Likewise, o1 (Zhong et al., 2024) improved performance on the high-

school-level mathematical competition benchmark MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021b), attaining nearly 95% accuracy.

Most recently, GSM-Symbolic (Mirzadeh et al., 2024) uncovered a limitation regarding LLMs’ genuine capabilities in arithmetic reasoning by evaluating them with diverse questions generated from symbolic templates of GSM8K. The study revealed that LLMs tend to replicate reasoning steps observed during training, rather than genuinely reasoning through specific problems, which poses a critical challenge to the current evaluation methodologies for LLMs. To further address this issue, our proposed RV-Bench employs “unseen” RV questions to effectively assess LLMs’ mathematical reasoning. We provide a re-ranking and comparison with the original MATH benchmark, demonstrating that LLMs still face significant challenges in understanding and solving complex mathematical reasoning questions, thereby revealing their genuine capabilities.

3 RV-Bench

As exemplified in Fig. 2, a question function in RV-Bench is illustrated. In this section, we detail the process of constructing RV-Bench, spanning from the data sources to the annotation process.

3.1 Data Sources

The proposed RV-Bench comprises question functions constructed based on the problems collected from two selective data sources: the MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021b) test set and the LeetCode-Math branch.

MATH is a well-known dataset that covers 12,500 challenging mathematics problems targeted at high-school mathematics competitions. It includes annotated answers with full step-by-step reasoning processes, frequently used to enhance LLMs’ capabilities in complex mathematical reasoning. Following the processing settings of the MATH-split in another widely-adopted dataset, PRM800K (Lightman et al., 2024), we construct 110 question functions by uniformly selecting problems at random from the test split for the following process. LeetCode is a widely recognized platform providing coding and algorithmic problems for users to practice coding skills (Coignion et al., 2024). As part of the coding questions, LeetCode-Math includes algorithmic questions whose content is designed based on mathematical reasoning and

computation. Our motivation for selecting LeetCode as one of our data sources is derived from its original focus on coding problems. By transforming these problems into mathematical reasoning formats, we ensure these problems are unlikely to have been encountered during the LLMs’ training. This transformation effectively showcases genuine model performance, independent of potential data leakage in coding formats. Through a careful review of all candidate solutions for each question, we construct 90 question functions by reformatting the question content with random variables, selected at random.

Consequently, the question functions in RV-Bench are randomly sampled from their respective data sources, maintaining similar distributions of difficulty, type, and bias as the original problems.

3.2 Question Functions Construction

As illustrated in Fig. 2, the complete question function consists of three modules: initialization, solution, and generation. These modules are responsible for instantiating the random variables, solving the questions with any variable combinations, and generating the QA pairs for RV-Bench, respectively.

In this section, we detail the construction of the question function by thoroughly describing the annotation process for each module.

Preliminaries. To ensure the quality of our benchmark, we recruited 10 candidate annotators, all of whom are graduate students with strong backgrounds in mathematics and computer science (majoring in one domain and achieving an "A" grade in the other through examination). Candidates were required to solve a selection of mathematical and coding problems (100 in total) sampled from the MATH test set and LeetCode for qualification purposes. Ultimately, six candidates were chosen to serve as the professional annotators for RV-Bench.

For a specific problem, as exemplified in Fig. 2, the annotator initially reviews the problem meticulously to ensure a thorough understanding of the original content and the text-based solution provided. If the problem is found to be unclear or insufficiently comprehended by the annotator, it is subjected to a post-calibration process for further discussion, details of which are provided in Sec. 3.4. Problems that are well comprehended proceed to the annotation process as described below.

Original Problem:

Suppose that we roll 2 fair 6-sided dice. What is the probability that the 2 numbers rolled sum to 4?

Initialization:

num_dice $\in \{2, 3, 4\}$

target_sum $\in [\text{num_dice}, 6 \times \text{num_dice}]$

Table 1: **Step 1.** Annotators first review the problem and identify the variables, assigning each variable a semantic-based name. Then, a random range is set for each variable. The ranges are required to maintain the difficulty level of the original problem.

Step 1: Identify and Initialize the Variables.

For a problem meeting the criteria, the annotator begins by identifying the variables. Typically, key numbers, names, and equations are potential candidates for random variables. In practice, a problem may contain multiple variables, but to maintain a consistent difficulty level, only those variables that align with the original problem’s intent are selected for randomization. As illustrated in Tab. 1, the original problem involves calculating the probability for a specific sum with two dice. The number of dice and the target sum, which are integral to the problem’s intent, are identified as variables, highlighted in green and yellow, respectively. The description “6-sided dice” which serves as a characteristic of the objective content, is not identified as a variable and is shown in gray. Once the variables are identified, the annotator locates their numerical and symbolic elements in the original problem and replaces them with slots.

Next, the annotator assigns a range to the identified variables, accompanied by semantically related variable names to define the initialization module. For variables that involve interdependent calculations, their ranges must be mutually constrained to ensure the question remains solvable (details are discussed in Sec. 3.3). For example, in Tab. 1, the range of the target sum depends on the number of dice. To initialize the question function, each variable is assigned a random value selected from its range.

Step 2: Construct the General Solution. For RV questions, the numerical outcomes will vary with different combinations of variable values. Therefore, a general solution must be constructed to solve the problem irrespective of these values.

In the case of problems from the MATH test set,

Original Solution:

There are 3 ways to roll a sum of 4: 3 on the first die and ... 3 on the second die.

There are 36 total possibilities, so the probability is $\frac{3}{36} = \frac{1}{12}$.

Solution:

total_outcomes = 6*num_dice

enumerate the possible outcomes

prob = outcomes / total_outcomes

Table 2: **Step 2.** Annotators convert the original text-based step-by-step solution into code implementation. Due to the close coupling of some solutions with specific problems, annotators may need to revise the solutions to ensure they are generalizable.

the provided solutions include detailed text-based step-by-step problem-solving process. The annotator is required to convert these text-based solutions into code implementations. In certain instances, the annotator may need to revise the code implementation because some text-based solutions are coupled tightly to the specific problem and lack generalization. The process of constructing a general solution for LeetCode-Math problems differs slightly. For each problem, some code-based solutions are available from the community², which have been validated through successful execution. The annotator must identify and comprehend a Python solution and transform it into the appropriate format, therefore defining the solution module based on the community-provided solutions.

Once the variable combination has been initialized in Step 1, the solution module takes it as input and returns a correct corresponding answer. This module undergoes further validation for correctness and effectiveness through calibration among annotators, as detailed in Sec. 3.4.

Step 3: Generate the QA Pairs. Following the completion of the previous steps, where the initialized variables and the general solution for various variable combinations were defined, annotators proceed to Step 3. In this step, annotators utilize the problem content with slots identified in Step 1 to define the generation module. This involves filling the slots with randomized variable values and formatting the output into question-answer (QA)

²An solution instance can be found [here](#).

Step 1 & Step 2:

num_dice = 3

target_sum = 9

prob = $\frac{25}{216}$

Generation:

Q: Suppose that we roll 3 fair 6-sided dice. What is the probability that the 3 numbers rolled sum to 9?

A: $\frac{25}{216}$

Table 3: **Step 3.** Based on the initialized variables from Step 1 and the corresponding answer from Step 2, the QA pair is generated as an instantiated question.

pairs. Importantly, the original problem may include content that is extraneous to the problem (e.g., restrictions related to computational environments). Annotators are required to remove these irrelevant sections to ensure the question content focuses solely on the pertinent details. All generated questions from different question functions are compiled into a comprehensive question set for RV-Bench.

3.3 Conditions

To maintain the difficulty level of the RV questions consistent with the original problems, we incorporate difficulty control conditions when defining the random ranges for variables. We establish three conditions/criteria for setting the random range in Step 1: 1) The fluctuation range of variables should remain uniform across different questions; 2) Variables that significantly affect the problem’s complexity may be fixed as constants; 3) The random range for simpler questions can be broader, whereas for more challenging questions, it should be narrower to prevent considerable variations in difficulty. By controlling the difficulty level, we ensure that LLMs are fairly compared on RV questions relative to the original problem, minimizing performance differences that could arise from variations in difficulty.

3.4 Calibration and Post-Filtering

Following the annotation process, we undertake a calibration and post-filtering step (Li et al., 2024) to enhance the consistency and objectivity of the question functions in RV-Bench. During Step 1, any problematic question that is not well-comprehended is promptly subjected to calibration and discussion. Confusing problems are collab-

oratively reevaluated and re-entered into the annotation process. If a problem cannot guarantee solvability or generalization for random variables, it is removed from the dataset. After all question functions have been annotated, a cross-calibration process is conducted. Annotators review each other’s annotations, verifying the correctness of the question functions and testing the runtime of the solution module across a broad spectrum of variable combinations. This runtime testing helps identify potential issues, such as exceeding maximum recursion depth, to ensure that each unique variable combination remains correctly solvable. Additionally, question functions derived from LeetCode that do not closely relate to mathematical reasoning or computation are filtered out.

4 Experiments & Analysis

In this section, we present our experimental findings on benchmarking LLMs via random variables:

- First, we introduce the RV-Bench leaderboard, ranked across various LLMs. We employ four carefully designed metrics to highlight the capabilities and characteristics of LLMs from different perspectives.
- Next, we compare the accuracy of RV-Bench questions with their original corresponding problems, presenting the accuracy drop across different model sizes and families.
- Finally, we validate the consistency of RV-Bench using various random seeds on representative LLMs, demonstrating the effectiveness of the generated questions in RV-Bench.

4.1 Experimental Setups

Datasets. After the calibration and post-filtering processes, RV-Bench consists of 183 question functions, with 108 derived from the MATH test set and 75 from LeetCode-Math. To evaluate LLM performance on both RV and original versions, we sample the corresponding original problems from the MATH test set (**MATH-Sp**) and LeetCode-Math (**LeetCode-Sp**). Specifically, we define the problem that is instantiated with input and output provided by examples found below the official description as the original problem in LeetCode³.

³Annotators are required to select the appropriate example; an instance can be found [here](#).

For each question function, five instantiated RV questions are generated. In total, 540 RV questions are generated for the MATH question functions (**MATH-RV**) and 375 for the LeetCode question functions (**LeetCode-RV**). This question set is utilized in the main experiments described in Sec. 4.3 and Sec. 4.4. To assess the consistency of RV-Bench (Sec. 4.5), we create 50 question sets⁴, each consisting of one question generated by each MATH-RV function.

Evaluation Metrics. We define four metrics for RV-Bench evaluation:

1. **Exact Match Accuracy (EM):** This metric measures the correctness of each question through strict string matching.
2. **Group Accuracy@ n (GA@ n):** This metric indicates that all n RV questions are answered correctly. Given the stringent condition of "all correct" for LLMs, this metric essentially represents a lower bound and is unlikely to approach the infimum, due to the inherent randomness of neural networks (Zhuang et al., 2022).
3. **Complete Accuracy (CA):** This metric assesses whether the original problem is answered correctly and at least 80% (rounded up) of the RV questions are also correct. It reflects the proportion of questions where the LLMs demonstrate full understanding and can correctly answer both the RV and original versions.
4. **Original Only Ratio (OOR):** This metric evaluates whether the original problems from the standard benchmark are answered correctly, while at least 20% (rounded down) of the RV questions are incorrect. It indicates the proportion of questions where the LLMs exhibit partial understanding, able to answer only the original version correctly but not the RV version.

Implementations. Following the evaluation setup of LLaMA-3 (Dubey et al., 2024), we employ 4-shot prompting using example problems from Minerva (Lewkowycz et al., 2022) during inference on MATH-RV and MATH-Sp. Similarly, for LeetCode-RV and LeetCode-Sp, we select four

⁴We uniformly sample 50 numbers from 1-1000 at random as random seeds for question generation.

problems from LeetCode-Math and manually craft step-by-step solutions to serve as the few-shot examples. All experiments on open-source LLMs are conducted on an NVIDIA server with 8 A100 GPUs, while proprietary LLMs are accessed via APIs provided by their respective platforms.

4.2 Model Selection

The selected models include a diverse range of popular and well-recognized LLMs, covering various model sizes and families to draw comprehensive conclusions across different aspects. Given the current focus on open-source LLMs, we select widely-used representative models such as LLaMA (Dubey et al., 2024), Qwen (Bai et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024a), Phi (Abdin et al., 2024), Yi (Young et al., 2024), Gemma (Team et al., 2024), DeepSeek (Liu et al., 2024a), and Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023) to evaluate their genuine mathematical capabilities. We also include math-specific open-source models tailored for mathematical domain expertise: Qwen-Math (Yang et al., 2024b), Mathstral, and DeepSeek-Math (Shao et al., 2024). For proprietary LLMs, we incorporate well-known models like GPT-3.5 (Brown et al., 2020), GPT-4o (Achiam et al., 2023), Claude-3 (Anthropic, 2023), GLM-4-Plus (GLM et al., 2024), and DeepSeek-V3-Chat (Liu et al., 2024b). Finally, given the rising interest in large reasoning models (LRMs) in both academia and industry, we also include QwQ (Team, 2024; Yang et al., 2024a) and GLM-Zero-Preview.

4.3 Main Results

Tab. 4 provides a comprehensive overview of the performance of various LLMs on our proposed RV-Bench. Based on the metric definitions in Sec. 4.1, it is apparent that, in most cases, the order of metric values for the same model typically follows $EM \geq CA \geq GA@5$. LLMs with genuine reasoning capabilities are expected to perform exceptionally well across these three metrics, while maintaining a preferably lower score in OOR. As a result, the generally lower values of GA@5 and CA, particularly in LeetCode-RV, imply that while models are capable of correctly answering certain instances of questions, they tend to struggle with consistency across multiple instantiated RV questions sharing the same background. This observation suggests that current LLMs still face challenges in thoroughly understanding and solving complex mathematical reasoning problems, particularly those of specific types

#	Models	MATH-RV				LeetCode-RV				Overall (EM) (↑)
		EM (↑)	GA@5 (↑)	CA (↑)	OOB (↓)	EM (↑)	GA@5 (↑)	CA (↑)	OOB (↓)	
1	DeepSeek-V3-Chat	84.00	67.62	75.24	5.71	58.93	36.00	38.67	10.67	73.55
2	QwQ-32B	77.52	45.71	62.86	6.67	54.93	26.67	44.00	10.67	<u>68.11</u>
3	Qwen2.5-72B-It	80.00	<u>62.86</u>	75.24	7.62	50.13	18.67	29.33	18.67	67.55
4	Qwen2.5-7B-It	78.86	<u>62.86</u>	<u>68.57</u>	7.62	46.40	20.00	29.33	14.67	65.34
5	GLM-Zero-Preview	69.71	41.90	48.57	5.71	58.93	<u>33.33</u>	<u>42.67</u>	12.00	65.22
6	Phi-4	71.05	43.81	56.19	7.62	<u>55.73</u>	<u>30.67</u>	36.00	5.33	64.67
7	GPT-4o	74.67	45.71	60.00	<u>6.67</u>	46.40	18.67	30.67	16.00	62.89
8	Qwen2.5-32B-It	72.19	48.57	62.86	12.38	48.80	22.67	33.33	10.67	62.44
9	Claude-3.5-Sonnet	64.19	36.19	43.81	13.33	<u>55.73</u>	29.33	34.67	10.67	60.67
10	Qwen2.5-Math-7B-It	74.29	49.52	65.71	8.57	41.07	16.00	21.33	17.33	60.45
11	Llama-3.1-70B-It	68.95	41.90	53.33	<u>6.67</u>	40.00	14.67	18.67	14.67	56.89
12	GLM-4-Plus	64.19	37.14	49.52	11.43	42.67	17.33	20.00	16.00	55.22
13	Qwen2.5-3B-It	68.38	44.76	60.00	10.48	36.00	12.00	18.67	18.67	54.89
14*	Qwen2.5-7B-Base	54.86	30.48	34.29	13.33	32.80	9.33	13.33	21.33	45.66
15*	Phi-3-Medium-It	55.43	29.52	39.05	13.33	32.00	10.67	16.00	16.00	45.66
16	GPT-3.5-Turbo	50.67	22.86	28.57	8.57	32.00	9.33	10.67	16.00	42.89
17	Yi-1.5-9B-Chat	51.62	21.90	34.29	7.62	28.80	9.33	10.67	17.33	42.11
18	Gemma-2-27B-It	52.00	31.43	40.00	12.38	24.27	5.33	6.67	10.67	40.45
19	Mathstral-7B-It	51.24	24.76	31.43	15.24	25.07	8.00	12.00	18.67	40.34
20*	Phi-3-Mini-It	50.48	24.76	34.29	10.48	25.87	8.00	6.67	20.00	40.22
21*	Yi-1.5-34B-Chat	47.05	9.52	26.67	14.29	30.67	4.00	12.00	12.00	40.22
22	Llama-3.1-8B-It	48.19	23.81	29.52	14.29	27.47	12.00	13.33	<u>8.00</u>	39.56
23	DeepSeek-Math-7B-Chat	50.86	22.86	34.29	8.57	20.00	4.00	6.67	9.33	38.00
24	Gemma-2-9B-It	50.86	32.38	33.33	9.52	20.00	4.00	5.33	16.00	38.00
25	Llama-3.2-3B-It	41.33	16.19	21.90	15.24	25.60	5.33	8.00	<u>8.00</u>	34.78
26	Mixtral-8x7B-It-v0.1	34.86	9.52	17.14	11.43	25.87	5.33	8.00	18.67	31.11
27	Llama-3.1-8B-Base	27.05	5.71	11.43	12.38	21.87	5.33	10.67	17.33	24.89
28	Mistral-7B-It-v0.3	20.38	2.86	4.76	14.29	20.80	2.67	8.00	16.00	20.56
29	DeepSeek-7B-Chat	16.38	2.86	4.76	16.19	13.60	0.00	2.67	17.33	15.22

Table 4: The **RV-Bench** leaderboard across various LLMs comprises the RV-questions generated from MATH (**MATH-RV**) and LeetCode (**LeetCode-RV**) question functions. The leaderboard is ranked by **Overall (EM)**, which denotes the exact match accuracy for all generated RV-questions in the question set defined in Sec. 4.1. The rank ID of each model is listed in the column #, with the best and second-best results for each column highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively. An * indicates that the model is ranked based on the thousandth percentile of the Overall (EM). (↑) indicates a higher value is better for this metric, while (↓) indicates a lower value is better.

within this domain (Liu et al., 2024c).

Notably, the performance of nearly all LLMs on LeetCode-RV is significantly inferior compared to MATH-RV. A plausible explanation is the higher difficulty level of LeetCode-RV questions, as these algorithmic math problems introduce additional complexities requiring enumeration reasoning and problem-solving skills beyond basic mathematical calculations. Another potential factor is the relative abundance of math-related training data in domains similar to MATH-RV (e.g., MATH’s training split), contrasted with the scarcity of data resembling LeetCode-RV. As noted in Sec. 3.1, LeetCode-related data is predominantly used for enhancing coding skills rather than mathematical reasoning, making it unlikely for an LLM to incorporate these questions during training. The true reason behind this phenomenon is not fully explored in this paper, and further targeted experiments are necessary to provide conclusive explanations (Zhao et al., 2023).

In detail, DeepSeek-V3-Chat (Liu et al., 2024b) achieves the best performance, excelling not only in exact match accuracy with 73.55% but also in

GA@5, CA, and OOR metrics, showcasing its robust genuine mathematical reasoning capabilities. Additionally, LRMs like QwQ-32B (Team, 2024) and GLM-Zero-Preview, despite their moderate size of approximately 30B, demonstrate strong and reliable mathematical reasoning abilities like large-scale LLMs. Their performance, enhanced by computational scaling during inference, even surpasses advanced models such as GPT-4o. Furthermore, the Phi-4 model (Abdin et al., 2024), with just 14B parameters, achieves remarkable results, outperforming GPT-4o and further validating the efficacy of synthetic data. The Qwen2.5 family (Yang et al., 2024a), including the 72B and 7B (also math-specific (Yang et al., 2024b)) versions and even the 3B version, exhibits robust mathematical reasoning capabilities across nearly all metrics.

4.4 Accuracy Dropping

Fig. 3 illustrates the accuracy decline of various LLMs when transitioning from the original problems in standard benchmarks to RV questions in RV-Bench. Each bar represents the accuracy drop for a specific LLM, with blue indicating the MATH




Figure 3: Accuracy drop ratio calculated by comparing the accuracy of RV and the original version of MATH (MATH-RV vs. MATH-Sp) and LeetCode (LeetCode-RV vs. LeetCode-Sp). A larger drop ratio indicates a greater discrepancy in accuracy between the original problems and the RV questions. The rank ID shown in the yellow box corresponds to the ranks in Tab. 4.

domain and red indicating the LeetCode domain. Most models exhibit a substantial decrease in performance, with some experiencing drops exceeding 40%. By comparing performance in MATH-RV and MATH-Sp, this phenomenon suggests a potential reliance on memorization of specific problems and replicating reasoning steps observed during training, rather than genuine understanding. Moreover, by examining the model rank highlighted in the yellow box in Fig. 3, we observe a general trend: the lower a model’s rank, the greater its accuracy drop on RV questions. This indicates that lower-ranked LLMs not only tend to perform poorly on RV questions but also exhibit larger accuracy discrepancies compared to their performance on the original problems.

An intriguing observation is the notable disparity in accuracy drops between the MATH and LeetCode domains. As shown in Fig. 3, while the accuracy drop from the standard benchmark to RV-Bench generally decreases in the MATH domain, it does not always exhibit a similar reduction in the LeetCode domain. For example, the LLMs with rank ID 22 (Llama-3.1-8B-It (Dubey et al., 2024)) and 18 (Gemma-2-27B-It (Team et al., 2024)) display a significant disparity in accuracy drop between the MATH and LeetCode domains. This highlights that some models exhibit greater robustness to random variable perturbations in the MATH domain but are more sensitive in the LeetCode domain. This suggests that the mathematical reasoning capabilities acquired by these models during training are heavily domain-dependent, rather than representing a general domain-agnostic reasoning capability. This raises concerns about the reliability




Figure 4: The distribution of EM across 50 RV question sets generated from the question functions of MATH-RV using different random seeds. The blue curve illustrates the trend of the distribution, indicating the mean and variance of MATH-RV accuracy.

of current LLM evaluation benchmarks. Specifically, even if stringent measures are in place to prevent data leakage during training, models could still potentially inflate evaluation results by incorporating synthetic samples tailored to the test data domain.

4.5 Consistency with Randomization

To ensure the effectiveness of the proposed RV questions and the repeatability of the results. Fig. 4 examines the consistency of model performance across 50 RV questions set generated by different random seeds. Each subplot shows the accuracy

distribution for a specific LLM, fitted with an approximate normal distribution curve. Although there are variations in some question sets, the models exhibit relatively consistent performance across various randomization. For example, GPT-4o achieves a mean accuracy of 76.26% with a standard deviation of ± 3.46 , while DeepSeek-v3-Chat attains 85.35% with ± 1.66 , presenting consistent reliability across runs. These findings suggest that despite fluctuations from different random seeds, the RV questions maintain a consistent difficulty level, reinforcing the validity of RV-Bench in accurately reflecting LLMs' genuine reasoning capabilities.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced **RV-Bench**, a novel framework designed to benchmark the genuine mathematical reasoning capabilities of LLMs using random variable questions. Unlike existing benchmarks that rely on fixed-variable problems, RV-Bench evaluates the LLM's capability to understand and solve mathematical problems across a wide range of variable combinations, making it a more reliable and effective evaluation framework. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrated that current LLMs, despite showing high performance on standard benchmarks, often experience a significant drop in accuracy when faced with random variable instantiations. This drop in accuracy highlights the limitations of current models, suggesting that they may rely on memorization rather than genuine understanding of the underlying mathematical principles. Our analysis also revealed that the domain-specific nature of LLMs' reasoning abilities raises concerns about the reliability of current benchmarks, which often fail to capture the full scope of model capabilities. The RV-Bench leaderboard provides a transparent ranking of models based on their genuine mathematical reasoning abilities, serving as a valuable resource for future research and development.

References

Marah Abidin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, et al. 2024. Phi-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08905*.

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman,

Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. In *EACL 2024 Student Research Workshop (EACL)*.

Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. MathQA: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*.

Anthropic. 2023. The Claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku. *Anthropic*.

Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*.

Simone Balloccu, Patrícia Schmidtová, Mateusz Lango, and Ondrej Dusek. 2024. Leak, cheat, repeat: Data contamination and evaluation malpractices in closed-source LLMs. In *European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL)*.

Edward Beeching, Clémentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, Sheon Han, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Omar Sanseviero, Lewis Tunstall, and Thomas Wolf. 2023. Open llm leaderboard (2023-2024). *Hugging Face*.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, Wei Ye, Yue Zhang, Yi Chang, Philip S. Yu, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. 2024. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*.

Steffi Chern, Zhulin Hu, Yuqing Yang, Ethan Chern, Yuan Guo, Jiahe Jin, Binjie Wang, and Pengfei Liu. 2024. Behonest: Benchmarking honesty of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13261*.

Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BoolQ: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*.

- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- 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*.
- Tristan Coignon, Clément Quinon, and Romain Rouvoy. 2024. A performance study of llm-generated code on leetcode. In *International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering (EASE)*.
- OpenCompass Contributors. 2023. Opencompass: A universal evaluation platform for foundation models. *GitHub repository*.
- Chunyuan Deng, Yilun Zhao, Xiangru Tang, Mark Gestein, and Arman Cohan. 2024. Investigating data contamination in modern benchmarks for large language models. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*.
- Junnan Dong, Zijin Hong, Yuanchen Bei, Feiran Huang, Xinrun Wang, and Xiao Huang. 2024. Clr-bench: Evaluating large language models in college-level reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17558*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Meng Fang, Xiangpeng Wan, Fei Lu, Fei Xing, and Kai Zou. 2024. Mathodyssey: Benchmarking mathematical problem-solving skills in large language models using odyssey math data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18321*.
- Clémentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, Alina Lozovskaya, Konrad Szafer, and Thomas Wolf. 2024. Open llm leaderboard v2. *Hugging Face*.
- Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Dan Zhang, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, et al. 2024. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021a. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021b. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the MATH dataset. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Zijin Hong and Jian Liu. 2024. Towards better question generation in QA-based event extraction. In *Findings of Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Zijin Hong, Zheng Yuan, Hao Chen, Qinggang Zhang, Feiran Huang, and Xiao Huang. 2024a. Knowledge-to-SQL: Enhancing SQL generation with data expert LLM. In *Findings of Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Zijin Hong, Zheng Yuan, Qinggang Zhang, Hao Chen, Junnan Dong, Feiran Huang, and Xiao Huang. 2024b. Next-generation database interfaces: A survey of llm-based text-to-sql. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08426*.
- Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. 2023. Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey. In *Findings of Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Xu Huang, Weiwen Liu, Xiaolong Chen, Xingmei Wang, Hao Wang, Defu Lian, Yasheng Wang, Ruiming Tang, and Enhong Chen. 2024a. Understanding the planning of llm agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02716*.
- Zhen Huang, Zengzhi Wang, Shijie Xia, Xuefeng Li, Haoyang Zou, Ruijie Xu, Run-Ze Fan, Lyumanshan Ye, Ethan Chern, Yixin Ye, et al. 2024b. Olympiarena: Benchmarking multi-discipline cognitive reasoning for superintelligent ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12753*.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Bowen Jiang, Yangxinyu Xie, Zhuoqun Hao, Xiaomeng Wang, Tanwi Mallick, Weijie J Su, Camillo Jose Taylor, and Dan Roth. 2024. A peek into token bias: Large language models are not yet genuine reasoners. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Ehsan Kamalloo, Nouha Dziri, Charles Clarke, and Davood Rafiei. 2023. Evaluating open-domain question answering in the era of large language models. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Sayash Kapoor and Arvind Narayanan. 2023. Leakage and the reproducibility crisis in machine-learning-based science. *Patterns*.
- Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Johan Andreassen, David Dohan, Ethan Dyer, Henryk Michalewski, Vinay Venkatesh Ramasesh, Ambrose Slone, Cem Anil, Imanol Schlag, Theo Gutman-Solo, Yuhuai Wu, Behnam Neyshabur, Guy Gur-Ari, and Vedant Misra. 2022. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.

- Linyi Li, Shijie Geng, Zhenwen Li, Yibo He, Hao Yu, Ziyue Hua, Guanghan Ning, Siwei Wang, Tao Xie, and Hongxia Yang. 2024. Infibench: Evaluating the question-answering capabilities of code large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2024. Let’s verify step by step. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Zhenghao Lin, Zhibin Gou, Yeyun Gong, Xiao Liu, yelong shen, Ruochen Xu, Chen Lin, Yujiu Yang, Jian Jiao, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2024. Not all tokens are what you need for pretraining. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bin Wang, Bingxuan Wang, Bo Liu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, et al. 2024a. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04434*.
- Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. 2024b. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*.
- Hongwei Liu, Zilong Zheng, Yuxuan Qiao, Haodong Duan, Zhiwei Fei, Fengzhe Zhou, Wenwei Zhang, Songyang Zhang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. 2024c. MathBench: Evaluating the theory and application proficiency of LLMs with a hierarchical mathematics benchmark. In *Findings of Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Yixin Liu, Kejian Shi, Katherine He, Longtian Ye, Alexander Fabbri, Pengfei Liu, Dragomir Radev, and Arman Cohan. 2024d. On learning to summarize with large language models as references. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*.
- 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*.
- Iman Mirzadeh, Keivan Alizadeh, Hooman Shahrokhi, Oncel Tuzel, Samy Bengio, and Mehrdad Farajtabar. 2024. Gsm-symbolic: Understanding the limitations of mathematical reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05229*.
- Shiwen Ni, Xiangtao Kong, Chengming Li, Xiping Hu, Ruifeng Xu, Jia Zhu, and Min Yang. 2024. Training on the benchmark is not all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.01790*.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohammadamin Barekatain, Alexander Novikov, Matej Balog, M Pawan Kumar, Emilien Dupont, Francisco JR Ruiz, Jordan S Ellenberg, Pengming Wang, Omar Fawzi, et al. 2024. Mathematical discoveries from program search with large language models. *Nature*.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Y Wu, et al. 2024. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*.
- Freda Shi, Xinyun Chen, Kanishka Misra, Nathan Scales, David Dohan, Ed Chi, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Large language models can be easily distracted by irrelevant context. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. CommonsenseQA: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*.
- Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. 2024. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118*.
- Qwen Team. 2024. Qwq: Reflect deeply on the boundaries of the unknown. *Hugging Face*.
- Shubham Toshniwal, Ivan Moshkov, Sean Narenthiran, Daria Gitman, Fei Jia, and Igor Gitman. 2024. Openmathinstruct-1: A 1.8 million math instruction tuning dataset. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. Superglue: a stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *EMNLP 2018 Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP (EMNLP)*.
- Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Zhihong Shao, Runxin Xu, Damai Dai, Yifei Li, Deli Chen, Yu Wu, and Zhifang Sui. 2024a. Math-shepherd: Verify and reinforce LLMs step-by-step without human annotations. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.

- Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, Tianle Li, Max Ku, Kai Wang, Alex Zhuang, Rongqi Fan, Xiang Yue, and Wenhui Chen. 2024b. MMLU-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Cheng Xu, Shuhao Guan, Derek Greene, M Kechadi, et al. 2024a. Benchmark data contamination of large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04244*.
- Yifan Xu, Xiao Liu, Xinghan Liu, Zhenyu Hou, Yueyan Li, Xiaohan Zhang, Zihan Wang, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Zhao Wenyi, Jie Tang, and Yuxiao Dong. 2024b. ChatGLM-math: Improving math problem-solving in large language models with a self-critique pipeline. In *Findings of Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024a. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.
- An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, et al. 2024b. Qwen2.5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12122*.
- 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*.
- Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng YU, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. 2024. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chengpeng Li, Guanting Dong, Keming Lu, Chuanqi Tan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Scaling relationship on learning mathematical reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01825*.
- Biao Zhang, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2023. Prompting large language model for machine translation: a case study. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.
- Tianyang Zhong, Zhengliang Liu, Yi Pan, Yutong Zhang, Yifan Zhou, Shizhe Liang, Zihao Wu, Yanjun Lyu, Peng Shu, Xiaowei Yu, et al. 2024. Evaluation of openai o1: Opportunities and challenges of agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18486*.
- Wenhao Zhu, Hongyi Liu, Qingxiu Dong, Jingjing Xu, Shujian Huang, Lingpeng Kong, Jiajun Chen, and Lei Li. 2024. Multilingual machine translation with large language models: Empirical results and analysis. In *Findings of North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*.
- Donglin Zhuang, Xingyao Zhang, Shuaiwen Song, and Sara Hooker. 2022. Randomness in neural network training: Characterizing the impact of tooling. In *Machine Learning and Systems (MLSys)*.