

# ADVANCING MATH REASONING IN LANGUAGE MODELS: THE IMPACT OF PROBLEM-SOLVING DATA, DATA SYNTHESIS METHODS, AND TRAINING STAGES

Zui Chen<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Tianqiao Liu<sup>1</sup>, Mi Tian<sup>1</sup>, Qing Tong<sup>1</sup>, Weiqi Luo<sup>3</sup>, Zitao Liu<sup>3†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>TAL Education Group <sup>2</sup>ShanghaiTech University <sup>3</sup>Jinan University  
 {chenzui3, liutianqiao1, tianmi, tongqing}@tal.com  
 {liuzitao, lwq}@jnu.edu.cn

## ABSTRACT

Advancements in large language models (LLMs) have significantly expanded their capabilities across various domains. However, mathematical reasoning remains a challenging area, prompting the development of math-specific LLMs such as LLEMMA, DeepSeekMath, and Qwen2-Math, among others. These models typically follow a two-stage training paradigm: pre-training with math-related corpora and post-training with problem datasets for supervised fine-tuning (SFT). Despite these efforts, the improvements in mathematical reasoning achieved through continued pre-training (CPT) are often less significant compared to those obtained via SFT. This study addresses this discrepancy by exploring alternative strategies during the pre-training phase, focusing on the use of problem-solving data over general mathematical corpora. We investigate three primary research questions: (1) Can problem-solving data enhance the model’s mathematical reasoning capabilities more effectively than general mathematical corpora during CPT? (2) Are synthetic data from the same source equally effective, and which synthesis methods are most efficient? (3) How do the capabilities developed from the same problem-solving data differ between the CPT and SFT stages, and what factors contribute to these differences? Our findings indicate that problem-solving data significantly enhances the model’s mathematical capabilities compared to general mathematical corpora. We also identify effective data synthesis methods, demonstrating that the tutorship amplification synthesis method achieves the best performance. Furthermore, while SFT facilitates instruction-following abilities, it underperforms compared to CPT with the same data, which can be partially attributed to its poor learning capacity for hard multi-step problem-solving data. These insights provide valuable guidance for optimizing the mathematical reasoning capabilities of LLMs, culminating in our development of a powerful mathematical base model called JiuZhang-8B<sup>1</sup>.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

To address the challenge of insufficient mathematical reasoning capabilities in large language models (LLMs), various math-specific LLMs have been developed. These include models that enhance performance from the pre-training stage, such as LLEMMA (Azerbayev et al., 2023), DeepSeekMath (Shao et al., 2024), InternLM-Math (Ying et al., 2024), and Qwen2-Math (Yang et al., 2024a), as well as models that improve through post-training, such as MetaMath (Yu et al., 2023a), WizardMath (Luo et al., 2023), and KwaiYiiMath (Fu et al., 2023). These models generally follow a common training paradigm. During the pre-training stage, math-related corpora are filtered from extensive Internet data to augment the model’s mathematical knowledge. During the post-training stage, they typically utilize problem datasets and their augmented versions, such as Program-of-Thought (PoT) (Chen et al., 2022), evol-Instruct (Xu et al., 2023), and Tool-Integrated Reasoning

\*Work done during an internship at TAL Education Group.

†Corresponding authors.

<sup>1</sup>Model is available at <https://huggingface.co/zuiiii/JiuZhang-8B>




Figure 1: In this paper, we propose using a problem-solving database as a replacement for traditional corpora to enable more effective reasoning capabilities.

(TIR) (Gou et al., 2023; Yin et al., 2024), to construct supervised datasets for Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT). This enables the models to follow instructions and produce outputs in the desired format. Recently, there has been a growing focus on constructing preference datasets for the solution process to perform Step-DPO (Lai et al., 2024) or online-RLHF (Dong et al., 2024). These approaches aim to obtain more accurate reasoning pathways, thereby significantly enhancing the mathematical reasoning capabilities of the models.

Due to the intrinsic distinction between mathematical knowledge and general world knowledge, different strategies are required for their effective acquisition and application. The primary challenge in acquiring world knowledge lies in memorizing and understanding vast amounts of information, necessitating large corpora during the pre-training phase to enhance knowledge reserves (Roberts et al., 2020; Petroni et al., 2019; Dubey et al., 2024). In contrast, mathematical knowledge involves a relatively limited set of elements, concepts, axioms, and theorems that need to be memorized and understood. The real challenge often lies not in recalling the relevant knowledge but in using this knowledge for reasoning or planning (Hao et al., 2023).

From previous studies, it might seem that the continue pre-training (CPT) stage contributes less to mathematical reasoning abilities. However, recent studies, such as Physics of LLM (Allen-Zhu & Li, 2023) and MiniCPM (Hu et al., 2024), highlight the importance of teaching models how to utilize memorized knowledge during the pre-training stage. These findings raise concerns about the effectiveness of the prevalent paradigm for enhancing mathematical reasoning abilities, which primarily focuses on memorizing more mathematical knowledge during the pre-training phase and developing reasoning abilities in the post-training phase. Therefore, we propose that alternative strategies utilizing mathematical problems and their reasoning steps—referred to as problem-solving data—during the pre-training phase, to teach the model how to apply its memorized knowledge rather than simply increasing the volume of relevant data, can potentially lead to significant improvements in mathematical reasoning capabilities. With these considerations, we aim to explore the following fundamental research questions (RQs):

**RQ1:** During the CPT stage, can providing problem-solving data more effectively enhance the model’s mathematical reasoning capabilities compared to using general mathematical corpora?

**RQ2:** If problem-solving data can enhance mathematical reasoning capabilities, are synthetic data from the same source equally effective, and what synthesis methods are most efficient?

**RQ3:** How do the capabilities developed from the same problem-solving data differ between the CPT and SFT stages, and what factors contribute to these differences?

We addressed these three research questions and also provided valuable training insights for optimizing the mathematical reasoning ability of LLM:

For RQ1, in Section 3, we compared the impact of using problem-solving data and explored various math data mixture ratios, leading to the following result:

**Result 1:** Providing math problem-solving data significantly enhances the model’s mathematical capabilities compared to general mathematical corpora and a higher proportion of problem-solving data is more effective.

For RQ2, in Section 4, we delved into four data synthesis techniques: response diversification, query expansion, retrospective enhancement, and tutorship amplification, leading to the following result:

**Result 2:** Response diversification, query expansion, and tutorship amplification were effective. Among these, tutorship amplification methods emerged as distinctly superior, leveraging a teacher model to identify and correct errors based on the student model’s responses, aiming to equip the model with self-correction capabilities.

For RQ3, in Section 5.1, we first identified, from a holistic perspective, the differences in learning mathematical capabilities between the CPT and SFT stages using problem-solving data. Subsequently, in Section 5.2 and Section 5.3, we divided the problem-solving data into subsets based on data distribution and difficulty level to investigate the sources of these differences:

**Result 3:** Overall, while SFT can facilitate some learning of mathematical capabilities, it has a clear disadvantage compared to CPT.

**Result 4:** From the perspective of data distribution, both SFT and CPT primarily develop capabilities aligned with their data distributions. However, SFT’s in-domain (IND) learning ability is weaker than that of CPT. Regarding out-of-domain (OOD) capability learning, the conclusions are less clear, with only the observation that SFT is more susceptible to disturbances from data distribution compared to CPT.

**Result 5:** From the perspective of difficulty level, providing hard multi-step problem-solving data enables more effective learning, with this advantage being particularly evident in CPT compared to SFT. This may be the primary source of the learning capability differences between CPT and SFT. Therefore, we recommend preparing more challenging problem-solving data for the CPT phase.

After addressing our three RQs, we identified the optimal strategy combination and applied it to the LLaMa3-8B model (Dubey et al., 2024), resulting in the highly efficient JiuZhang-8B. JiuZhang-8B surpasses various math-specific models including DeepSeek-Math-7B-base (Shao et al., 2024) and Qwen2-Math-7B (Yang et al., 2024a), and exhibits capabilities comparable to Qwen2-Math-72B and the recently released Qwen2.5-Math-7B (Yang et al., 2024b). We introduced only 100B mathematical tokens, equivalent to 1/10 of Qwen2.5-Math-7B, and performed CPT based on a weaker base model. This validates that our proposed method is a more efficient approach for enhancing mathematical capabilities compared to existing paradigms. Additionally, JiuZhang-8B retains strong general knowledge capabilities, as confirmed by MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020) benchmarks. Since no post-training was conducted, we are releasing the base version of JiuZhang-8B, allowing the research community to perform further post-training to enhance its capabilities.

## 2 EXPERIMENTAL PREPARATION

In this section, we provide a comprehensive overview of experimental preparations, including data, baseline models, and metrics.

**Training Data.** The training data is categorized into three groups: **1) General corpus**, including scientific texts from the ArXiv subset of RedPajama (Computer, 2023), code datasets from AlgebraicStack (Azerbayev et al., 2023) and StarCoder (Li et al., 2023), and natural language datasets from the C4 and Wikipedia subsets of RedPajama (Computer, 2023), to prevent catastrophic forgetting and maintain robustness. **2) Mathematical corpus**, utilizing OpenWebMath (Paster et al., 2023) to enhance mathematical proficiency. **3) Problem-solving data**, including NuminaMath (LI et al., 2024), Lila (Mishra et al., 2023), and proprietary data, with 14 million pieces used for synthetic data augmentation. Our experiments employed 48.3B tokens from the general corpus, 13.7B

from the mathematical corpus, 7.2B from problem-solving data, and 30.54B from synthetic data. Detailed descriptions are provided in Appendix A.1.

**Base Model.** We selected Llama2 (Touvron et al., 2023) as our base model to ensure robustness in our findings, as it predates the release of OpenWebMath (Paster et al., 2023). By choosing a model that existed prior to the introduction of recent mathematical corpora, we effectively mitigate the risk of contamination from these newer datasets. More details in Appendix A.2.

**Evaluation Set.** To minimize dataset contamination and broaden capability assessment, we expanded our evaluation set to include GAOKAO and ZHONGKAO, alongside GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) and MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021). GAOKAO and ZHONGKAO datasets, developed post-Llama2 release, enable the measurement of a wider range of abilities. Detailed dataset descriptions are provided in Appendix A.3.

**Deduplication and Decontamination.** We employed the MinHash deduplication (Lee et al., 2022) framework to enhance training data quality by removing documents with significant duplicate content. This process included setting specific byte thresholds for deduplication and decontamination, effectively eliminating contaminated documents, particularly from OpenWebMath (Paster et al., 2023). Further details are in Appendix A.4.

**Evaluation Metrics.** Our evaluation follows a three-stage process: model inference using zero-shot and few-shot prompts, answer comparison to handle irregular outputs, and statistical scoring to determine accuracy. In the statistical scoring stage, we select the higher accuracy between the zero-shot and few-shot approaches for each dataset to ensure the reliability and robustness of the results, given that some models perform better in zero-shot settings while others prefer few-shot settings. We report the arithmetic mean of accuracies across datasets. Detailed methodologies are discussed in Appendix A.5.

### 3 PRACTICE MATH PROBLEM SOLVING IN CONTINUE PRE-TRAINING

We believe that, compared to simply remembering and understanding more mathematical knowledge from vast corpora, the focus of mathematical knowledge acquisition during the pre-training phase is primarily on learning to apply this knowledge for reasoning or planning. The intuitive approach is to provide corresponding data to practice. Therefore, in this section, we first aim to validate RQ1, specifically the effectiveness of providing problem-solving data during the CPT phase. This serves not only as a validation of our main argument but also as the foundation for subsequent research questions. We will then continue to explore the impact of the proportion of problem-solving data to determine an appropriate data ratio and verify the efficiency of providing problem-solving data.

**Experiments.** We designed four experimental groups, including one base group and three test groups. Our goal is to demonstrate the effectiveness of providing problem-solving data by comparing the base group with the test groups, while exploring suitable data mixing ratios through comparisons among the three test groups. Specifically, the total amount of math data used in the base group and test groups is the same, with the base group utilizing the math corpus as its math data. In contrast, the test groups employ a mix of the math corpus and problem-solving data as their math data, with the mixing ratios varied among the three test groups. The specific data details are as follow, where the **data mixture ratio** indicates the mixing proportion of general data to math data, and the **math data mixture ratio** reflects the blending proportion of the math corpus to problem-solving data. More experimental design discussions can be found in the appendix C.

- **Base1:** Using 48.3B general corpus and 14.7B math corpus, mixed in a 4:6 ratio.
- **Test1:** Using 48.3B general corpus, 7.5B math corpus, and 7.2B problem-solving data, with data mixture ratio 4:6, math data mixture ratio 5:5.
- **Test2:** Same as Test1, but using a math data mixture ratio of 3:7.
- **Test3:** Same as Test1, but using a math data mixture ratio of 7:3.

**Training Details.** We utilized Llama2 (Touvron et al., 2023) as the base model and CPT for 25,000 steps, with a global batch size of 1024 and a context length of 4096 tokens. The learning rate was warmed up to  $1e-4$  and then decayed to  $1e-5$  using a cosine schedule (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2016). The training data was split into 95% for training and 5% for validation. After completing the 25,000 steps, we selected the checkpoint with the lowest validation loss for evaluation as the result. We also




Figure 2: The average accuracy of the four groups varies with the number of steps.

observed that the average accuracy on the test sets did not show significant differences across the checkpoints immediately before and after the point where the validation loss converged.

**Results.** As shown in Figure 2, the blue line, representing the reference group following the current training paradigm, indicates that continued pre-training using the math corpus effectively improves problem-solving accuracy. However, compared to the other three curves, even though Base1 utilized the same number of tokens, the trend and extent of improvement in mathematical capabilities were significantly lower than those of the three test groups. For the three Test groups, the green line in Figure 2 shows that as the number of steps increases, its average accuracy consistently surpasses the other two. Notably, we did not introduce new tokens but simply altered the math data mixture ratio. In the appendix D, we include an additional test group, Test4, which uses only problem-solving data. Although it does not utilize any math corpus tokens, it achieves performance comparable to or even higher than that of the green line. Additionally, we reported the accuracy of four evaluation sets for further comparison. Thus, we achieve **Result 1: Providing math problem-solving data significantly enhances the model’s mathematical capabilities compared to general mathematical corpora and a higher proportion of problem-solving data is more effective.**

#### 4 EXPLORATION OF EFFICIENT DATA SYNTHESIS METHODS

In the preceding sections, Results 1 highlighted the effectiveness of problem-solving data. However, the limited availability of such data compared to internet data underscores the need for efficient data synthesis methods. Additionally, it is not yet fully researched whether further synthesis from the same problem-solving data during the pre-training stage can enhance model performance. To address these issues and RQ2, we explore four data synthesis methods: response diversification, query expansion, retrospective enhancement, and tutorship amplification. Our aim is to validate the effectiveness of synthesized data and identify the most efficient synthesis method. Below, we briefly introduce the data synthesis methods used in our study.

**Response Diversification** aims to enhance model capabilities by generating diverse reasoning paths through methods like rejection sampling. Since it does not alter the answers, response diversification does not require additional labeling, making it easy to implement. The effectiveness of response data synthesis has been established through various implementations (Yuan et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2023b; Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024). Instead of using a sampling-then-deduplication approach, we require the model to follow two steps to improve the efficiency of response diversification: 1) generate two distinct solutions based on the question and the original answer; 2) Select the solution with the correct final answer to serve as one diversified training sample.

**Query Expansion** aims to enhance model capabilities by expanding the question set. However, generating high-quality questions directly is challenging. Existing methods (e.g., Yu et al., 2023b and Mitra et al., 2024) leverage the concept of reshaping, which involves generating new questions based on existing questions and answers through rephrasing, reversing statements, and other techniques. The synthesis of new questions focuses on ensuring: 1) the accuracy of the newly generated questions, and 2) the accuracy of their corresponding answers. We integrate existing methods and

emphasize these key points by requiring the LLM to perform augmentation in four steps based on the input question and solution: 1) transform the question into a statement, 2) generate new questions based on the statement, 3) provide answers for the new questions, and 4) evaluate the answers and explain the reasoning. Our approach improves quality through three main aspects: first, we provide the original questions and answers; second, steps 1 and 2 ensure that the generated questions are valid and solvable; and third, steps 3 and 4 involve self-evaluation to assess the quality of the answers to the new questions.

**Retrospective Enhancement** Ye et al. (2024) posits that teaching the model to directly correct mistakes is beneficial. They employ a low-resource construction method that involves directly inserting subsequent steps into preceding ones, allowing models to retry upon regret. A special [back] token is used for identification, which is why we refer to it as retrospective enhancement. This method has been validated on GSM8K using a small parameter model with minimal pre-training. Our scenario differs in two key ways: 1) we utilize a more diverse question set, with some questions significantly different from the simpler forms in GSM8K; 2) we perform continued pre-training on a mainstream model that possesses a certain level of mathematical capability. We aim to validate the effectiveness of this straightforward method.

**Tutorship Amplification** is inspired by the real-life practice of teachers guiding students to rectify mistakes. As evidenced by OpenAI (2024), models can be trained to spot errors. This agrees with Ye et al. (2024), who suggest that while models can detect errors, they lack opportunities for correction. Unlike retrospective enhancement, which generates artificial errors leading to sub-optimal results, tutorship amplification simulates a realistic error correction process. In this process, a "strong" model, acting as a teacher, aids a "weak" model, representing a student. After the student model generates an answer to a problem, the teacher model performs the following steps: 1) Checks if the student’s answer is correct. 2) If correct, responds affirmatively. 3) If incorrect, points out the erroneous steps and continues solving from that point. We aim for this process to achieve three objectives: first, to construct realistic errors that are likely to occur; second, to enable self-evaluation and error identification; third, to facilitate timely correction of identified mistakes. We believe these three elements will aid the model in learning self-correction and enhancing its reasoning accuracy.

**Synthetic Data.** A seed set was created by filtering subsets from the original problem-solving data, based on the completeness of data and the number of reasoning steps involved. Following this, four data synthesis methods were applied to the seed set. Details regarding the quantity of the resulting synthetic data and associated token counts are provided in Table 1.

**Experiment.** We utilized a control group, Base2, which comprised 48.3B general corpus tokens, 14.7B math corpus tokens, and 7.2B problem-solving data. In addition to the data used in Base2, we introduced extra tokens generated from the four data synthesis methods to establish four experimental groups. These models were continuous pre-trained from the raw LLaMa2 base model. Each data combination was trained for at most 25,000 steps, and the checkpoint at which the validation set loss converged was selected. The final accuracy was then evaluated based on this chosen checkpoint. Other training parameters are consistent with those in Section 3.

| Model     | Num        | Tokens | GSM8K | Math  | Gaokao | Zhongkao | Average |
|-----------|------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|----------|---------|
| Base2     | -          | -      | 47.84 | 20.12 | 22.98  | 67.05    | 39.50   |
| Res-Div   | 14,018,544 | 6.82B  | 52.99 | 23.22 | 23.83  | 65.15    | 41.30   |
| Query-Exp | 24,459,192 | 4.78B  | 51.25 | 23.08 | 27.23  | 69.13    | 42.67   |
| Retro-Enh | 14,707,792 | 5.04B  | 45.11 | 21.72 | 22.98  | 66.67    | 39.12   |
| Tutor-Amp | 11,942,328 | 13.90B | 64.44 | 35.88 | 32.77  | 69.32    | 50.60   |

Table 1: Performance comparison of four experimental groups using different synthetic data methods and one control group across four evaluation sets. "Num" denotes the count of problem-solving questions and corresponding solutions used, while "Tokens" indicates the total number of tokens. The model abbreviations represent: Res-Div (Response Diversification), Query-Exp (Query Expansion), Retro-Enh (Retrospective Enhancement), and Tutor-Amp (Tutorship Amplification).

**Results.** The experimental results for the four combinations of synthetic data are presented in Table 1. From this, we derive **Result 3: Response Diversification, Query Expansion and Tutorship Amplification emerge as effective data synthesis techniques, with Tutorship Amplification reg-**

**istering particularly pronounced effects.** Conversely, Retrospective Enhancement appears to exert minimal influence. We postulate that this could be attributed to the fact that the erroneous data constructed is not grounded in actual sampling, resulting in a lower likelihood of occurrence and thereby inhibiting the model’s capacity for error detection and rectification learning. We also noticed that query expansion and response diversification yield limited enhancements. We propose two hypotheses for this observation: first, the ability to comprehend varied data formulations and learn multiple problem-solving methods might be skills that can be gleaned from the original data, and thus may not expand the model’s upper limit of reasoning capability; second, during data generation, the model’s self-evaluation might have failed to identify its own errors, thereby constraining the quality of the synthesized data. As for the effectiveness of Tutorship Amplification, our hypotheses are twofold: first, the model acquired a reasoning framework for self-checking, error detection, and correction through the tutorship amplification data; second, the tutorship amplification data facilitated the learning of knowledge application to correctly resolve problems via error correction. We anticipate that our analysis and hypotheses will offer valuable insight for future research endeavors.

## 5 ABILITIES ACQUISITION COMPARISON OF CPT AND SFT STAGES

In the previous two sections, we demonstrated that providing problem-solving data during the CPT phase efficiently teaches the model to apply mathematical knowledge and enhances its reasoning ability. However, how does this differ from developing mathematical reasoning skills during the SFT phase? In this section, we aim to explore this question. Specifically, we will first verify that the change in the training stage indeed raises the upper limits of the model’s capability, not merely due to the data. Then, we will investigate the sources of differences in mathematical learning between the CPT and SFT phases from two perspectives: data distributions and difficulty levels.

### 5.1 COMPARISON OF ABILITIES ACQUISITION

In this section, we explore how the stage at which problem-solving data is introduced (CPT vs. SFT) significantly affects the model’s ultimate capabilities. We have a total of 7.2B problem-solving data, which can be allocated at either the CPT or SFT stage. Additionally, we sample 0.072B problem-solving data for 1%-SFT to endow the model with instruction-following ability. We propose the following experimental settings to compare the acquisition of learning capabilities between the CPT and SFT stages:

- **Base1:** CPT with 48.3B general corpus and 14.7B math corpus.
- **Base2:** CPT with 48.3B general corpus, 7.5B math corpus, and 7.2B problem-solving data.
- **Base1-SFT:** SFT with 7.2B problem-solving data based on Base1.
- **Base1-1%SFT:** SFT with 0.072B problem-solving data based on Base1.
- **Base2-1%SFT:** SFT with 0.072B problem-solving data based on Base2.

It is important to note that we perform SFT on both Base1 and Base2 using 1% of the problem-solving data. This setup allows us to isolate the impact of instruction-following capability improvements and thereby assess the true enhancement in mathematical reasoning ability brought about by introducing problem-solving data at the CPT stage.

**Experiment Details.** During the SFT stage, we set a batch size of 256 and used a learning rate that decayed from  $1e-5$  to  $1e-6$  following a cosine schedule. We trained for 3 epochs, ensuring that the training loss converged. After convergence, we selected the optimal result from 10 checkpoints for reporting, which typically occurred around the checkpoints at 2 epochs. More experimental design discussions can be found in the appendix C.

**Results.** The evaluation results across the four datasets can be found in Appendix E. Their average accuracy is illustrated in Figure 3. First, we observed the red and blue shaded areas, where a small amount of SFT data brought similar improvements on both Base1 and Base2. From the evaluation results, this improvement stems from a significant reduction in the model’s previously inconsistent and repetitive outputs. We believe this is a result of the supervised approach in SFT, leading to leading to an interesting conclusion: **A small amount of SFT data is sufficient to enhance the model’s ability to follow instructions.**




Figure 3: Comparison of the acquisition of learning capabilities between the CPT and SFT stages

Next, we compared the results after removing the influence of instruction-following capabilities. At this point, the differences, denoted as  $SFT \Delta$  and  $CPT \Delta_2$ , can be viewed as the improvements in mathematical reasoning ability obtained during the SFT and CPT phases, respectively. Given that both used the same data, but the capability gain in SFT was only about 60% of that achieved during CPT. Additionally, comparing Base1-SFT and Base2, despite using the same data, Base1-SFT also gained the ability to follow instructions, yet its performance was still inferior to Base2. Thus we conclude **Result 3: Overall, while SFT can facilitate some learning of mathematical capabilities, it has a clear disadvantage compared to CPT.**

To better understand SFT’s impact on learning capabilities, we add three additional experimental groups, where we performed SFT with 10%, 20%, and 50% splits of the problem-solving data. These were compared with Base1, 1% SFT, and 100% SFT to analyze the effect of SFT data volume on reasoning improvement. The results are shown in Figure 7. We observed a significant increase in average accuracy at the 1% SFT markgroup, followed by a logarithmic-linear relationship between data volume and accuracy improvement. This further validates that a small amount of SFT data enhances the model’s ability to follow instructions. Moreover, increasing the SFT data may continue to logarithmically improve the model’s reasoning ability.

## 5.2 IMPACT OF DIFFERENT DATA DISTRIBUTIONS

In the previous section, we observed that the reasoning capability learned during the SFT phase is significantly weaker compared to CPT. In this section, we aim to explore the source of this difference. Our initial intuition was that data distributions might have different impacts on capability learning at each stage, with CPT possibly contributing to enhanced out-of-distribution (OOD) performance. However, our findings contradicted this hypothesis. Both CPT and SFT primarily develop capabilities aligned with the data distributions they are trained on.

**Experiment.** We designed our experiments by segmenting the training data based on evaluation sets. Specifically, we selected one evaluation set to represent in-distribution (IND) capabilities, with the remaining sets considered out-of-distribution (OOD). Correspondingly, we retained only the portions of the training data aligned with IND capabilities. However, it is important to note two key challenges: first, during the decontamination process, we already excluded any data that overlapped with the evaluation sets; second, the scope of mathematical abilities inherently includes overlap and coverage across different areas. Due to these factors, it is challenging to perfectly match training data to specific capabilities. Therefore, we utilized knowledge point labels from the original problem-solving data to segment out 0.83B middle school data, corresponding to ZHONGKAO as its IND capabilities, and 0.89B high school data, corresponding to GAOKAO as its IND capabilities. The OOD capabilities are represented by the remaining evaluation sets that do not align with these IND capabilities. More experimental design discussions can be found in the appendix C. The specific experimental design is as follows:

- **Base1:** As described in Section 3. CPT with 48.3B general corpus and 14.7B math corpus.
- **Middle-school-SFT:** SFT with 0.83B middle school data on Base1.



- **Middle-school-CPT**: CPT with Base1 data and middle school data.
- **High-school-SFT**: SFT with 0.89B high school data on Base1
- **High-school-CPT**: CPT with Base1 data and high school data.

| Model             | GSM8K         | Math          | Gaokao                | Zhongkao              | Average       |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Base1             | 28.20         | 9.48          | 8.09                  | 30.68                 | 19.11         |
| Middle-school-SFT | 22.67 (-5.53) | 16.36 (+6.88) | 10.21 (+2.12)         | <b>52.28 (+21.60)</b> | 25.38 (+6.27) |
| Middle-school-CPT | 29.42 (+1.22) | 15.04 (+5.56) | 8.09 (0.00)           | <b>54.71 (+24.03)</b> | 26.81 (+7.70) |
| High-school-SFT   | 19.11 (-9.09) | 13.48 (+4.00) | <b>16.60 (+8.51)</b>  | 36.78 (+6.10)         | 21.49 (+2.38) |
| High-school-CPT   | 23.96 (-4.24) | 13.82 (+4.34) | <b>22.98 (+14.89)</b> | 34.19 (+3.51)         | 23.74 (+4.63) |

Table 2: Differences in learning capabilities across various data distributions during different training stages.

**Results.** As shown in Table 2, for the IND capabilities represented by **bolded evaluation results**, learning during the CPT stage consistently led to greater improvements compared to learning during the SFT stage. This effect is especially evident in the learning of more challenging high school-level knowledge. In addition, for OOD capabilities, learning during the SFT stage experienced significantly more disruption. This is particularly noticeable for GSM8K (see the data distribution and capability dimension chart in Appendix B), which has the largest distributional difference. After SFT, the model’s performance on OOD tasks suffered more compared to CPT. Thus, we achieve **Result 4: Both SFT and CPT primarily develop capabilities aligned with their data distributions. However, SFT’s IND learning ability is weaker than that of CPT. Regarding OOD capability learning, the conclusions are less clear, with only the observation that SFT is more susceptible to disturbances from data distribution compared to CPT.**

### 5.3 IMPACT OF DIFFERENT DIFFICULTY LEVELS

In the previous section, although we clarified that both CPT and SFT involve in-domain capability learning, it remains unclear what cause SFT’s learning performance to be weaker than CPT’s. However, conclusions in Result 6 are more evident in the high school training data compared to middle school, prompting us to explore the difference in learning capabilities between CPT and SFT with varying difficulty levels problem-solving data.

**Experiment.** We selected a 5B subset of our problem-solving data and categorized it based on the number of solution reasoning steps: data requiring 1-3 steps was classified as easy, 4-7 steps as medium, and 8 or more steps as hard. The distribution of samples accounted for 36.0%, 38.4%, and 25.6% of the total data, respectively, while token counts made up 23.0%, 36.0%, and 41.0%, respectively. Given the unavoidable inaccuracies in this method of categorization, we focused solely on easy data and hard data for the CPT and SFT comparison experiments. More experimental design discussions can be found in the appendix C. The experimental groups were designed as follows:

- **Base1**: As described in Section 3. CPT with 48.3B general corpus and 14.7B math corpus.
- **Easy-SFT**: SFT using the easy data subset on top of Base1.
- **Easy-CPT**: CPT incorporating both the Base1 data and the easy data subset.
- **Hard-SFT**: SFT using the hard data subset on top of Base1.
- **Hard-CPT**: CPT incorporating both the Base1 data and the hard data subset.

**Results.** The results in the left half of Table 3, which is divided by vertical lines, show that CPT models consistently outperform SFT models, with some relative improvements specifically indicated. Notably, Hard-CPT exhibits greater relative enhancements compared to Easy-CPT, and these improvements are not limited to just the hard domain accuracy but are observed across all datasets. Moreover, regardless of whether it is SFT or CPT, training on Hard data consistently yields better results compared to training on Easy data. This suggests **Result 5: Providing hard multi-step problem-solving data enables more effective learning, and this advantage is particularly evident in CPT compared to SFT. This may be the primary source of the learning capability differences between CPT and SFT. Therefore, given limited computational resources, we recommend preparing more challenging problem-solving data for the CPT phase.**

| Model    | GSM8K | Math  | Gaokao | Zhongkao | Average | Easy           | Medium         | Hard         |
|----------|-------|-------|--------|----------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Base1    | 28.20 | 9.48  | 8.09   | 30.68    | 19.11   | 14.86          | 6.69           | 4.85         |
| Easy-SFT | 31.31 | 14.46 | 14.04  | 48.30    | 27.03   | 22.52 (+7.66)  | 10.68 (+4.00)  | 6.94 (+2.09) |
| Easy-CPT | 37.98 | 15.70 | 17.02  | 52.46    | 30.79   | 27.61 (+12.75) | 13.33 (+6.64)  | 6.27 (+1.42) |
| Hard-SFT | 31.39 | 17.40 | 15.32  | 54.55    | 29.66   | 24.37 (+9.51)  | 11.93 (+5.24)  | 6.84 (+1.99) |
| Hard-CPT | 45.79 | 23.96 | 26.38  | 69.89    | 41.51   | 35.78 (+20.92) | 20.17 (+13.48) | 9.32 (+4.47) |

Table 3: Performance comparison of CPT and SFT models on different difficulty levels. The table shows the evaluation metrics across various datasets (GSM8K, Math, Gaokao, Zhongkao) and their average performance, as well as specific performance on easy, medium, and hard data subsets.

The results in right half of Table 3 indicate that both SFT and CPT models achieve their highest improvements on Easy problems, with reduced gains as problem difficulty increases. For example, Easy-SFT and Easy-CPT show significant improvements of +7.66 and +12.75 on Easy problems, but only +2.09 and +1.42 on Hard problems, respectively. Similarly, Hard-SFT and Hard-CPT exhibit their largest gains on Easy problems (+9.51 and +20.92) compared to Hard problems (+1.99 and +4.47). These patterns suggest the **Regardless of the training data’s difficulty, both SFT and CPT primarily focus on learning to solve simpler, fewer-step problems.**

## 6 TRAINING A STRONG MATH-SPECIFIC MODEL

To further validate the effectiveness of our empirical results, we aimed to train a strong math-specific model based on the **LLaMa3-8B** (Dubey et al., 2024), named **JiuZhang-8B**. We followed the conclusions from the three RQs outlined earlier: (1) We maintained a **3:7 ratio** of mathematical corpus to problem-solving data; (2) We used synthesized data from Query Expansion, Response Diversification, and Tutorship Amplification, with a focus on expanding data using the most efficient Tutorship Amplification method; (3) We filtered and expanded the raw data by focusing on problems with more than five reasoning steps, using these as seed data to generate additional synthesized data. In addition, we incorporated newly released mathematical corpora (Han et al., 2024) into the training. Ultimately, we used 39.6B general corpus tokens, 46.7B mathematical corpus tokens, and 51.1B problem-solving data and synthesized data tokens to train **JiuZhang-8B** for 25,000 steps, with a global batch size of 1024 and a context length of 8192 tokens. The learning rate was warmed up to  $1e-4$  and then decayed to  $1e-5$  using a cosine schedule.

**Results.** As presented in Table 4, compared to the base model, we significantly enhanced the foundational capabilities of Llama3-8B, even surpassing larger models such as LLaMa3.1-70B and Qwen2-72B, which have over 70 billion parameters. Additionally, we evaluated our model using the Gao et al. (2024) on the MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020) benchmarks, achieving a score of 0.6222 compared to Llama3-8B’s 0.6211, demonstrating that it maintained its general knowledge capabilities.

Compared to math-specific base models, JiuZhang-8B outperforms DeepSeek-Math-7B-base (Shao et al., 2024) and Qwen2-Math-7B (Yang et al., 2024a), and exhibits capabilities comparable to Qwen2-Math-72B and the recently released Qwen2.5-Math-7B (Yang et al., 2024b). Compared to Qwen2.5-Math-7B, JiuZhang-8B was trained on only 140 billion tokens (100 billion of which are math-related), while Qwen2.5-Math-7B utilized 1 trillion tokens, as reported. Additionally, JiuZhang-8B starts from a weaker base model. These findings validate our proposed method as an efficient approach to enhancing mathematical capabilities compared to existing paradigms. Further discussions on related work can be found in Appendix F.

Since we did not perform a complete post-training process, we are releasing the base version of our model. This allows the research community to conduct further post-training to enhance its capabilities as needed.

## 7 CONCLUSION

In this study, we investigated the enhancement of mathematical reasoning capabilities in large language models (LLMs) through alternative pre-training strategies. Our findings led to the develop-

| Model                 | GSM8K        | Math         | Gaokao       | Zhongkao     | Average      |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>General Model</b>  |              |              |              |              |              |
| Meta-Llama-3-8B       | 58.38        | 17.04        | 13.62        | 42.61        | 32.91        |
| Meta-Llama-3-70B      | 82.34        | 38.42        | 28.09        | 64.02        | 53.21        |
| Meta-Llama-3.1-8B     | 56.79        | 19.70        | 11.49        | 44.70        | 33.17        |
| Meta-Llama-3.1-70B    | 81.73        | 39.66        | 31.06        | 64.77        | 54.31        |
| Qwen2-7B              | 80.44        | 47.82        | 27.23        | 70.45        | 56.49        |
| Qwen2-72B             | 86.58        | 56.88        | 45.11        | 73.67        | 65.56        |
| Qwen2.5-7B            | 84.61        | 53.22        | 45.53        | 80.30        | 65.92        |
| Qwen2.5-72B           | 90.60        | 59.38        | 56.60        | 82.95        | 72.38        |
| <b>Specific Model</b> |              |              |              |              |              |
| Llemma-7B             | 41.47        | 18.94        | 14.89        | 45.08        | 30.10        |
| Deepseek-Math-7B-Base | 65.73        | 33.40        | 23.83        | 62.69        | 46.41        |
| Qwen2-Math-7B         | 80.67        | 53.02        | 42.13        | 77.08        | 63.22        |
| Qwen2-Math-72B        | 88.63        | 61.88        | 51.91        | 81.25        | 70.92        |
| Qwen2.5-Math-7B       | 85.44        | 59.10        | 53.19        | 78.79        | 69.13        |
| Qwen2.5-Math-72B      | 88.70        | 67.10        | 53.62        | 81.63        | 72.76        |
| <b>(JiuZhang-8B)</b>  | <b>81.20</b> | <b>60.38</b> | <b>60.43</b> | <b>80.49</b> | <b>70.62</b> |

Table 4: Model Performance Metrics (General and Specific Models)

ment of JiuZhang-8B, a competitive model that outperforms most 7B models and exhibit comparable capabilities to much larger models despite being trained on fewer tokens. Future work should expand in two key areas. First, we need to refine data synthesis methods. While we have demonstrated the effectiveness of synthetic data, our current approaches are relatively naive. Second, we should explore the role and impact of alignment processes during post-training. Investigating these aspects will help further improve the mathematical reasoning capabilities of the model.

## REFERENCES

- Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Physics of Language Models: Part 3.1, Knowledge Storage and Extraction, December 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.14316>. arXiv:2309.14316 [cs].
- Zhangir Azerbayev, Hailey Schoelkopf, Keiran Paster, Marco Dos Santos, Stephen McAleer, Albert Q. Jiang, Jia Deng, Stella Biderman, and Sean Welleck. Llemma: An Open Language Model For Mathematics, November 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10631>. arXiv:2310.10631 [cs].
- Wenhu Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W Cohen. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12588*, 2022.
- Zui Chen, Yezeng Chen, Jiaqi Han, Zhijie Huang, Ji Qi, and Yi Zhou. An empirical study of data ability boundary in llms’ math reasoning, 2024.
- 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. Training verifiers to solve math word problems, November 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>.
- Together Computer. Redpajama: An open source recipe to reproduce llama training dataset, 2023. URL <https://github.com/togethercomputer/RedPajama-Data>.
- Hanze Dong, Wei Xiong, Bo Pang, Haoxiang Wang, Han Zhao, Yingbo Zhou, Nan Jiang, Doyen Sahoo, Caiming Xiong, and Tong Zhang. Rlhf workflow: From reward modeling to online rlhf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07863*, 2024.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Allonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Lauren Rantala-Yearly, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Papuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Celebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Rapparthi, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collet, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gonguet, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyin Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuwei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papanikos, Aaditya Singh, Aaron Grattafiori, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alex Vaughan, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Franco, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Barambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Changan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, Danny Wyatt, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, Dingkan Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Govind Thattai, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul,

- Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Karthik Prasad, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kushal Lakhota, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabba, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Maria Tsim-poukelli, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Ning Zhang, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratan-chandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Rohan Maheswari, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Kohler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vitor Albiero, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaoqian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xide Xia, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, and Zhiwei Zhao. The Llama 3 Herd of Models, July 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783v2>.
- Jiayi Fu, Lei Lin, Xiaoyang Gao, Pengli Liu, Zhengzong Chen, Zhirui Yang, Shengnan Zhang, Xue Zheng, Yan Li, Yuliang Liu, et al. Kwaiyiimath: Technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07488*, 2023.
- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muen-nighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lin-tang Sutawika, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation, 07 2024. URL <https://zenodo.org/records/12608602>.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yujiu Yang, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, Weizhu Chen, et al. Tora: A tool-integrated reasoning agent for mathematical problem solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17452*, 2023.
- Xiaotian Han, Yiren Jian, Xuefeng Hu, Haogeng Liu, Yiqi Wang, Qihang Fan, Yuang Ai, Huaibo Huang, Ran He, Zhenheng Yang, et al. Infimm-webmath-40b: Advancing multimodal pre-training for enhanced mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12568*, 2024.
- Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshua Jiahua Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Zhiting Hu. Reasoning with Language Model is Planning with World Model, October 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14992>. arXiv:2305.14992 [cs].
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset, November 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.03874>.

- Shengding Hu, Yuge Tu, Xu Han, Chaoqun He, Ganqu Cui, Xiang Long, Zhi Zheng, Yewei Fang, Yuxiang Huang, Weilin Zhao, Xinrong Zhang, Zheng Leng Thai, Kaihuo Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Yuan Yao, Chenyang Zhao, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Zhongwu Zhai, Ning Ding, Chao Jia, Guoyang Zeng, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. MiniCPM: Unveiling the Potential of Small Language Models with Scalable Training Strategies, June 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.06395>. arXiv:2404.06395 [cs].
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners, January 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.11916>. arXiv:2205.11916 [cs].
- Xin Lai, Zhuotao Tian, Yukang Chen, Senqiao Yang, Xiangru Peng, and Jiaya Jia. Step-dpo: Step-wise preference optimization for long-chain reasoning of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18629*, 2024.
- Katherine Lee, Daphne Ippolito, Andrew Nystrom, Chiyuan Zhang, Douglas Eck, Chris Callison-Burch, and Nicholas Carlini. Deduplicating Training Data Makes Language Models Better, March 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.06499>. arXiv:2107.06499 [cs].
- Jia LI, Edward Beeching, Lewis Tunstall, Ben Lipkin, Roman Soletskyi, Shengyi Costa Huang, Kashif Rasul, Longhui Yu, Albert Jiang, Ziju Shen, Zihan Qin, Bin Dong, Li Zhou, Yann Fleureau, Guillaume Lample, and Stanislas Polu. NuminaMath. [<https://huggingface.co/AI-MO/NuminaMath-CoT>] ([https://github.com/project-numina/aimo-progress-prize/blob/main/report/numina\\_dataset.pdf](https://github.com/project-numina/aimo-progress-prize/blob/main/report/numina_dataset.pdf)), 2024.
- Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Joel Lamy-Poirier, João Monteiro, Oleh Shli-azhko, Nicolas Gontier, Nicholas Meade, Armel Zebaze, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Jian Zhu, Benjamin Lipkin, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Nour Fahmy, Urvashi Bhat-tacharyya, Wenhao Yu, Swayam Singh, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Maxim Kunakov, Fedor Zhdanov, Manuel Romero, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jan Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Daniel Fried, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, and Arjun Guha. Starcoder: May the source be with you! *TMLR 2023*, December 2023.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.03983*, 2016.
- Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09583*, 2023.
- Swaroop Mishra, Matthew Finlayson, Pan Lu, Leonard Tang, Sean Welleck, Chitta Baral, Tanmay Rajpurohit, Oyvind Tafjord, Ashish Sabharwal, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. Lila: A Unified Benchmark for Mathematical Reasoning, March 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.17517>. arXiv:2210.17517 [cs] version: 2.
- Arindam Mitra, Hamed Khanpour, Corby Rosset, and Ahmed Awadallah. Orca-Math: Unlocking the potential of SLMs in Grade School Math, February 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.14830>. arXiv:2402.14830 [cs].
- OpenAI. Finding GPT-4’s mistakes with GPT-4, 2024. URL <https://openai.com/index/finding-gpt4s-mistakes-with-gpt-4/>.
- Keiran Paster, Marco Dos Santos, Zhangir Azerbayev, and Jimmy Ba. Openwebmath: An open dataset of high-quality mathematical web text, 2023.
- Fabio Petroni, Tim Rocktäschel, Patrick Lewis, Anton Bakhtin, Yuxiang Wu, Alexander H. Miller, and Sebastian Riedel. Language Models as Knowledge Bases?, September 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.01066>. arXiv:1909.01066 [cs].

- Adam Roberts, Colin Raffel, and Noam Shazeer. How Much Knowledge Can You Pack Into the Parameters of a Language Model?, October 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08910>. arXiv:2002.08910 [cs, stat].
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models, February 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03300>. arXiv:2402.03300 [cs].
- Tianqiao. Deepseek-7b-math-compare-answer, 2024. URL <https://huggingface.co/Tianqiao/DeepSeek-7B-Math-Compare-Answer>. Accessed: 2024-09-26.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, July 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*, 2023.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*, 2024a.
- An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Keming Lu, Mingfeng Xue, Runji Lin, Tianyu Liu, Xingzhang Ren, and Zhenru Zhang. Qwen2.5-Math Technical Report: Toward Mathematical Expert Model via Self-Improvement, September 2024b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2409.12122>. arXiv:2409.12122 [cs].
- Tian Ye, Zicheng Xu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zeyuan Allen-Zhu. Physics of Language Models: Part 2.2, How to Learn From Mistakes on Grade-School Math Problems, August 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2408.16293>. arXiv:2408.16293 [cs].
- Shuo Yin, Weihao You, Zhilong Ji, Guoqiang Zhong, and Jinfeng Bai. Mumath-code: Combining tool-use large language models with multi-perspective data augmentation for mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07551*, 2024.
- Huaiyuan Ying, Shuo Zhang, Linyang Li, Zhejian Zhou, Yunfan Shao, Zhaoye Fei, Yichuan Ma, Jiawei Hong, Kuikun Liu, Ziyi Wang, Yudong Wang, Zijian Wu, Shuaibin Li, Fengzhe Zhou, Hongwei Liu, Songyang Zhang, Wenwei Zhang, Hang Yan, Xipeng Qiu, Jiayu Wang, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. InternLM-Math: Open Math Large Language Models Toward Verifiable Reasoning, May 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.06332>. arXiv:2402.06332 [cs].
- Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12284*, 2023a.
- Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T. Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models, October 2023b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.12284>.

Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chengpeng Li, Guanting Dong, Keming Lu, Chuanqi Tan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Scaling relationship on learning mathematical reasoning with large language models, September 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.01825>.

## A DETAILED EXPERIMENT PREPARATION

### A.1 TRAINING DATA DETAILS

The training data utilized in our study is categorized into three distinct groups: **1) General corpus**, encompassing scientific texts from the ArXiv subset of RedPajama (Computer, 2023), code datasets from AlgebraicStack (Azerbayev et al., 2023) and StarCoder (Li et al., 2023), along with natural language datasets from the C4 and Wikipedia subsets of RedPajama (Computer, 2023). The inclusion of general data helps prevent the model from experiencing catastrophic forgetting, where it might lose previously acquired knowledge during specialized training. Moreover, maintaining a broad base of general knowledge ensures the stability and robustness of the model, enabling it to retain a well-rounded understanding and perform effectively across various tasks. **2) Mathematical corpus** is designed to enhance the model’s proficiency in mathematics, primarily comprising general mathematical content extracted from sources like CommonCrawl web pages. The main objective is to imbue the pre-trained model with foundational mathematical knowledge, including terminology, theorems, proofs, etc. To achieve this, we have directly utilized OpenWebMath (Paster et al., 2023), a resource shown to effectively improve mathematical capabilities, as demonstrated in (Azerbayev et al., 2023). **3) Problem-solving data**, which we believe can more efficiently enhance the model’s reasoning abilities. We collected 25 million pieces of problem-solving data, including those from open-source resources such as NuminaMath (LI et al., 2024) and Lila (Mishra et al., 2023), as well as proprietary data. Among them, 14 million pieces were used as seed data for augmentation to create our synthetic data. Overall, using the Llama2 (Touvron et al., 2023) to conduct experiments on RQs, we employed 48.3B tokens from the general corpus, 13.7B from the mathematical corpus, 7.2B from problem-solving data and 30.54B from synthetic data.

### A.2 BASE MODEL SELECTION

The selection of the base model is pivotal in shaping our conclusions, as it directly influences the reliability and applicability of our findings. To ensure that our exploration of research questions yields practically valuable insights, we have chosen to base our study on mainstream models. Considering that OpenWebMath may have been widely incorporated into recent LLMs, introducing this mathematical corpus might not produce the desired effect. Therefore, we selected Llama2 (Touvron et al., 2023), which was released prior to OpenWebMath (Paster et al., 2023), as our base model. This decision aims to enhance the robustness of our conclusions.

### A.3 EVALUATION DATSETS

Considering both the risk of dataset contamination and the scope of capabilities, we expanded the evaluation set to include GAOKAO and ZHONGKAO, in addition to GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) and MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021). The GAOKAO dataset comprises both GAOKAO-2023 and GAOKAO-2024, derived from the most recent Chinese National College Entrance Examinations. We converted the problem format into math word problems, translated the questions, and retained 235 items after review. Similarly, the ZHONGKAO dataset is sourced from the 2023 Chinese High-School Entrance Examination and includes 658 translated math word problems. Both GAOKAO and ZHONGKAO datasets were created after the release of Llama2 (Touvron et al., 2023), which strengthens our conclusion. These additional datasets provide coverage of different dimensions of ability compared to GSM8K and MATH. From the perspectives of general knowledge, math knowledge, and reasoning steps. GAOKAO is similar to MATH but demands more general knowledge, while ZHONGKAO is akin to GSM8K but may require more mathematical knowledge and fewer reasoning steps. Detailed ability dimensions can be found in Appendix B. We believe this expanded evaluation set will lead to a more comprehensive assessment and serve as a valuable reference for subsequent improvement.



#### A.4 DEDUPLICATION AND DECONTAMINATION

We used the MinHash deduplication Lee et al. (2022) framework to remove entire documents containing duplicate text that exceeds a certain threshold from the training data. Specifically, we set a threshold of 2048 bytes for deduplication to improve the quality of the training data. Additionally, we set a threshold of 100 bytes to remove any data from the training set that contains more than 100 bytes of overlapping text with subsets of the train and test sets in the evaluation data. We believe this can account for some contamination caused by simple paraphrasing. (Notably, in the case of Openwebmath (Paster et al., 2023), we removed 2594 contaminated documents, which had a significant impact on the conclusions during our initial experiments.)

#### A.5 EVALUATION METRICS

The evaluation process comprises three stages: model inference, answer comparison, and statistical scoring. During model inference, we utilize both zero-shot and few-shot prompt templates for each dataset. For the zero-shot approach, we employ a simple Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompt (Kojima et al., 2023). In the few-shot approach, we use 8-shot and 4-shot settings for the GSM8K and MATH datasets, respectively, and apply the same few-shot settings from GSM8K and MATH to the ZHONGKAO and GAOKAO datasets. For answer comparison, we use an answer comparison model (Tianqiao, 2024) to address issues related to the irregular output of the base models, such as inconsistent stopping criteria and extracting answers from CoT prompts. In the statistical scoring stage, we select the higher accuracy between the zero-shot and few-shot approaches for each dataset to ensure the reliability and robustness of the results, given that some models perform better in zero-shot settings while others prefer few-shot settings. Finally, we report the arithmetic mean of the accuracies across the four datasets as the average accuracy.

## B ABILITY DIMENSIONS OF THE FOUR EVALUATION SETS

GSM8K, MATH, ZHONGKAO, and GAOKAO, four evaluation sets, were introduced to enrich the dimensions of the evaluation, as shown in Table 5 with example problems.

To preliminarily understand the differences in capabilities across various dimensions of the evaluation process, we attempted to define three capability dimensions: general knowledge, math knowledge, and reasoning steps. As Table 6 illustrates, each capability dimension is divided into three levels, with requirements progressively increasing from Level 1 to Level 3. General knowledge describes the demands for understanding common sense, such as the fact that a day consists of 24 hours; math knowledge refers to the complexity of mathematical knowledge, including arithmetic, elementary, and advanced mathematics; reasoning steps describe the depth of reasoning. Figure 4 displays the performance of the four evaluation sets across different dimensions. Overall, GAOKAO and MATH represent similar capability dimensions, but GAOKAO might require some general knowledge for certain problems. ZHONGKAO and GSM8K both demand a higher level of general knowledge, but differ in their requirements for math knowledge and reasoning steps.

Furthermore, as shown in Figure 5, we analyzed the data distribution of problems in the datasets to clarify the data distribution of different evaluation sets and the impact of different data distributions on out-of-distribution (OOD) capabilities as discussed in Section 5.2. Specifically, we sampled up to 1,000 problems from the evaluation sets and used t-SNE for dimensionality reduction, with the visualization shown in 5(a) and the cosine similarity situation in 5(b). It is evident that MATH, ZHONGKAO, and GAOKAO have certain correlations, whereas GSM8K exhibits the largest distributional difference. This may also explain why different evaluation sets perform differently in terms of OOD capabilities, as discussed in Table 2 and related conclusions.

## C DISCUSSION ON EXPERIMENTAL SETTINGS

Our experimental design generally adheres to the principles of comparative experiments, forming control groups to test hypotheses by introducing variations. Below, we elaborate on the considerations behind the design of each experimental group.

| Dataset  | Problem  |
|----------|--|
| GSM8K    | Josh decides to try flipping a house. He buys a house for \$80,000 and then puts in \$50,000 in repairs. This increased the value of the house by 150%. How much profit did he make? |
| MATH     | How many vertical asymptotes does the graph of $y = \frac{2}{x^2+x-6}$ have?   |
| ZHONGKAO | What is the opposite number of 4?  |
| GAOKAO   | Given the sets $M = \{x x + 2 \geq 0\}$ , $N = \{x x - 1 < 0\}$ , what is $M \cap N = ?$   |

Table 5: Example problems from four evaluation sets

| Competency Dimension | Level | Definition  |
|----------------------|-------|---|
| General Knowledge    | 1     | Involves minimal General Knowledge                                  |
|                      | 2     | Less than 50% of the problems require General Knowledge             |
|                      | 3     | More than 50% of the problems require General Knowledge             |
| Math Knowledge       | 1     | Basic arithmetic operations   |
|                      | 2     | Requirements for the Chinese High School Entrance Examination       |
|                      | 3     | Requirements for the Chinese National College Entrance Examinations |
| Reasoning Steps      | 1     | Within 1-3 steps  |
|                      | 2     | Within 3-5 steps  |
|                      | 3     | More than 5 steps   |

Table 6: Definitions of Competencies Across Different Levels

**In Section 3**, to mitigate the influence of the total amount of math data used on the experimental conclusions, as described in the main text, we controlled the total amount of math data used in both the base group and the test groups to be the same. Specifically, the base group used the entire 14.7B math corpus as the math data, while for the test groups, we used 7.2B problem-solving data and split the remaining 7.5B math corpus to ensure that the total math data used was also 14.7B. Subsequently, in three test groups, we adjusted the math data mixture ratio to further verify the effectiveness of problem-solving data and determine the optimal mixture ratio for subsequent experiments. Specifically, based on the token ratio of 7.5B:7.2B, we started with a math data mixture ratio of 5:5. Then, we adjusted the ratio to 3:7, where the smaller 7.5B math corpus could be fully utilized within 10K steps and used more than twice within 25K steps. We believe this ensures the full utilization of data. Finally, we complemented the experiment with a reverse ratio of 7:3.

**In Section 4**, to delineate the impact of different synthetic data, we introduced a control group, Base2, which used the entire problem-solving data on top of Base1. The experimental group further incorporated synthetic data into this setup. We aimed to verify that the synthetic data contributed new value rather than merely substituting the original data.

**In Section 5.1**, we compared how the stage at which problem-solving data is introduced (CPT vs. SFT) significantly affects the model’s ultimate capabilities. First, we followed the setups of Base1 and Base2 and conducted SFT using the same data on Base1 to create a comparative experiment Base1-SFT. We hypothesized that Base1-SFT would benefit from enhanced instruction-following ability, which Base2 might lack. To validate this, we partitioned 1% of the data, assuming it had




Figure 4: Ability dimensions of four evaluation sets




Figure 5: (a) Data distribution of problems of the four evaluation sets. (b) Dataset similarity based on data distribution calculation.

limited impact on reasoning ability but contributed to instruction-following ability. Subsequently, we applied this 1% data for SFT on both Base1 and Base2 groups. By comparing Base1-1%SFT with Base1-SFT, we evaluated the reasoning ability gained from SFT, and by comparing Base1-1%SFT with Base2-1%SFT, we assessed the reasoning ability gained from CPT.

**In Section 5.2**, we primarily focused on differences in capabilities across the same evaluation dataset representing the data distribution at various training stages. To this end, Base1 was reused to define the improvement in the experimental groups' abilities and then we introduced two experimental groups, Middle-school-SFT and Middle-school-CPT, which used a Middle-school data subset from the training set for SFT and CPT, respectively, forming a comparison to evaluate the IND learning differences between SFT and CPT on a specific evaluation dataset. Additionally, the differences in OOD learning on other evaluation datasets were also analyzed. Subsequently, we replaced the Middle-school subset with a High-school subset in the training set, implementing two additional experimental groups and repeating the same experiments to strengthen the robustness of the conclusions.

**In Section 5.3**, the experimental design was similar to that in Section 5.2, with a key difference: we focused on variations in learning ability of training data with different difficulty levels at different training stages. Thus, besides comparing SFT and CPT using easy and hard subsets of the training




Figure 6: The average accuracy of the five groups varies with the number of steps.

| Model     | GSM8K | Math  | Gaokao | Zhongkao | Average |
|-----------|-------|-------|--------|----------|---------|
| Llama2-7b | 14.40 | 5.10  | 4.26   | 16.48    | 10.06   |
| Base1     | 28.20 | 9.48  | 8.09   | 30.68    | 19.11   |
| Test1     | 44.88 | 19.72 | 20.00  | 66.29    | 37.72   |
| Test2     | 48.29 | 20.78 | 23.40  | 67.05    | 39.88   |
| Test3     | 42.15 | 19.48 | 22.55  | 63.26    | 36.86   |
| Test4     | 40.11 | 25.12 | 29.79  | 68.18    | 40.80   |

Table 7: Accuracy of the all experimental groups across the four evaluation set.

data separately, we also contrasted the performance of different training subsets within the same training stage. Comparisons based on evaluation dataset distributions were used only as supplementary analysis.

#### D DETAILED RESULTS OF PROBLEM-SOLVING DATA EFFECTIVENESS EXPERIMENT

We hypothesized that simply performing CPT with the problem-solving data could be sufficient, and added an experimental group, Test4, which uses only problem-solving data as the math data, specifically:

- **Test4:** Using 48.3B general corpus and 7.2B problem-solving data, with data mixture ratio 4:6.

The results are shown in the figure 6. We found that even with a smaller amount of math data, the purple line corresponding to Test4 and the green line corresponding to Test2, which represent the experimental groups using the smallest math data mixture, demonstrated consistent or even superior performance. This strongly complements Result 1, highlighting the effectiveness of problem-solving data, which can even surpass the impact of adding a large number of new tokens.

The detailed results of Base1, Test1, Test2, Test3 and Test4 are in Table 7. Notably, when the math corpus is not used, the specific metrics of Test4 across the four evaluation datasets no longer align with those of Test1-3. This shift in data distribution undermines the improvement in GSM8K performance while enhancing the improvements in Math and Gaokao capabilities.

#### E DETAILED RESULTS OF COMPARISON OF ABILITIES ACQUISITION

The evaluation results across the four datasets are in Table 8. And the relationship between average accuracy and SFT data quantity is in Figure 7.

| Model        | GSM8K | Math  | Gaokao | Zhongkao | Average |
|--------------|-------|-------|--------|----------|---------|
| Base1        | 28.20 | 9.48  | 8.09   | 30.68    | 19.11   |
| Base1-1%SFT  | 31.08 | 12.10 | 12.34  | 39.39    | 23.73   |
| Base1-10%SFT | 32.37 | 13.74 | 11.49  | 42.42    | 25.01   |
| Base1-20%SFT | 34.65 | 16.26 | 13.62  | 46.40    | 27.73   |
| Base1-50%SFT | 36.92 | 19.34 | 14.04  | 57.20    | 31.88   |
| Base1-SFT    | 42.84 | 21.88 | 18.30  | 59.47    | 35.62   |
| Base2        | 47.84 | 20.12 | 22.98  | 67.05    | 39.50   |
| Base2-1%SFT  | 51.40 | 27.10 | 25.96  | 69.70    | 43.54   |

Table 8: Model Performance Metrics with SFT




Figure 7: The relationship between average accuracy and SFT data quantity.

## F RELATED WORK

We discuss the related work on math continue pre-training. Llemma (Azerbayev et al., 2023) initially focused on continuing pre-training to enhance mathematical reasoning capabilities, collecting open-source data including from OpenWebMath (Paster et al., 2023) and providing the Proof-Pile-2 dataset. They made preliminary attempts at continuous pre-training in the mathematics domain and shared their experiences. DeepSeekMath (Shao et al., 2024) advanced the effects of mathematical continuing pre-training by improving data quality, primarily training a fastText model to recall more OpenWebMath-like mathematical web pages and iterating this process, which also provided reliable experience for research beyond mathematical reasoning. InternLM-Math (Ying et al., 2024) utilized open-source datasets and internal datasets and trained a scoring model to identify high-quality

datasets. Qwen2-Math (Yang et al., 2024a) and the more recent Qwen2.5-Math (Yang et al., 2024b) have begun to focus on using synthetic data, effectively achieving significant improvements.

## G SYNTHETIC DATA PROMPT

### Response Diversification

You are a math teacher, please complete the following task using English.

**Your task is:** for the math problem below, in addition to the given solution, provide two more different solutions.

If you can provide two different solutions, start with `<response>accept</response>`, then present the additional solutions beginning with ‘Solution2:’ and ‘Solution3:’ respectively.

If you believe you cannot offer two different solutions or the solutions provided might be inaccurate, start with `<response>refuse</response>`.

**Please ensure the solutions are correct and distinct.** If you doubt the correctness of your solutions, or if it seems the problem does not allow for multiple solutions, directly indicate refusal by starting with `<response>refuse</response>`, and then explain the reason.

### Query Expansion

Your goal is to create different math word questions and their solutions from a given question and its solution. You should follow these steps:

1. Convert the question into a statement and fill in `<statement> FILL IN HERE </statement>`.
2. Create a new question based on the statement and fill in `<question> FILL IN HERE </question>`.
3. Provide a solution to the new question and fill in `<solution> FILL IN HERE </solution>`.
4. Check the solution and report `<check>Accept</check>` or `<check>Refuse</check>`. And then fill the reason in `<reason> FILL IN HERE </reason>`.
5. Repeat the process for a total of 2 questions and solutions.

### Tutorship Amplification

As a mathematics teacher, please check the solution to the following math problem.

If the solution is correct, please only reply `<check>correct</check>`.

If the solution is incorrect, please first respond with `<check>wrong</check>`, then identify the erroneous steps, correct the errors, and continue to provide the correct solution.

Please note that your response must include `<check>correct</check>` or `<check>wrong</check>` at the beginning of the response.