

# Error Classification of Large Language Models on Math Word Problems: A Dynamically Adaptive Framework

Yuhong Sun<sup>♡\*</sup> Zhangyue Yin<sup>◇\*</sup> Xuanjing Huang<sup>◇</sup> Xipeng Qiu<sup>◇†</sup> Hui Zhao<sup>♡♠†</sup>

<sup>♡</sup>Software Engineering Institute, East China Normal University

<sup>◇</sup>School of Computer Science, Fudan University

<sup>♠</sup>Shanghai Key Laboratory of Trustworthy Computing, Shanghai, China

sunyuhong@stu.ecnu.edu.cn yinzy21@m.fudan.edu.cn

{xpqiu,xjhuang}@fudan.edu.cn hzhao@sei.ecnu.edu.cn

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across various domains. Math Word Problems (MWP) serve as a crucial benchmark for evaluating LLMs' reasoning abilities. While most research primarily focuses on improving accuracy, it often neglects understanding and addressing the underlying patterns of errors. Current error classification methods rely on static and predefined categories, which limit their ability to capture the full spectrum of error patterns in mathematical reasoning. To enable systematic error analysis, we collect error samples from 15 different LLMs of varying sizes across four distinct MWP datasets using multiple sampling strategies. Based on this extensive collection, we introduce MWPEs-300K, a comprehensive dataset containing 304,865 error samples that cover diverse error patterns and reasoning paths. To reduce human bias and enable fine-grained analysis of error patterns, we propose a novel framework for automated dynamic error classification in mathematical reasoning. Experimental results demonstrate that dataset characteristics significantly shape error patterns, which evolve from basic to complex manifestations as model capabilities increase. With deeper insights into error patterns, we propose error-aware prompting that incorporates common error patterns as explicit guidance, leading to significant improvements in mathematical reasoning performance.

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have showcased remarkable capabilities across various domains, yet mathematical reasoning remains a notable challenge (Brown et al., 2020; Achiam et al., 2023; Team et al., 2023; Dubey et al., 2024; Jaech et al., 2024a, *inter alia*). Mathematical Word Problems

(MWPs) serve as a critical benchmark for evaluating LLMs' mathematical reasoning abilities, as they demand both natural language understanding and mathematical computation skills. Recent advancements, such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022) and specialized mathematical training (Yang et al., 2024; Shao et al., 2024), have shown promising progress in this domain. However, these improvements primarily focus on accuracy metrics while overlooking the critical aspect of understanding and addressing the underlying patterns of errors.

The analysis of LLM errors in mathematical reasoning has emerged as a vital research direction. Lightman et al. (2024) introduces PRM800K, a dataset featuring manually annotated solution steps to enhance model performance through pre-training. Building on this foundation, Zeng et al. (2023b) develops MR-GSM8K, which incorporates potentially erroneous reasoning paths and requires models to both evaluate solution correctness and pinpoint error locations. This approach aligns with Li et al. (2024)'s work, which requires models to not only identify but also correct errors.

However, current approaches to error analysis in mathematical reasoning face several fundamental deficiencies. Traditional error classification methods rely heavily on static, predefined categories that are based on human observation and empirical judgment. This approach proves inadequate for capturing the diverse and evolving nature of LLM errors, particularly when scaling to large datasets. The challenge is further complicated by the observation that different LLMs often generate distinct types of errors when solving the same problem, making static classification frameworks increasingly obsolete. For instance, GPT-3.5 and LLaMA-3.1-70B may produce entirely different types of errors when solving the same MWP, necessitating a more flexible classification approach.

Moreover, existing error taxonomies often em-

\* Equal contribution. Listing order is random.

† Corresponding Authors

ploy broad, ambiguous categories such as “Logic Error” or “Calculation Error” that lack the granularity needed for meaningful analysis. This oversimplification obscures the root causes of errors and hampers the development of targeted improvements. Additionally, current methodologies typically focus solely on identifying the first error in a solution path, overlooking the potential cascade of subsequent errors that could provide valuable insights into model behavior.

To facilitate systematic error analysis, we introduce MWPEs-300K(Math Word Problem Error Solutions), a comprehensive dataset containing 304,865,018 erroneous MWP solutions. Unlike existing error analysis datasets that focus on single dataset or synthetic errors, MWPEs-300K captures real error patterns by collecting model outputs across four diverse MWP datasets. Furthermore, we propose a novel framework for automated dynamic error classification in mathematical reasoning. Our approach adaptively evolves error categories based on observed model outputs, enabling fine-grained analysis of error patterns while reducing human bias and intervention. Moreover, we introduce an innovative error-aware prompting mechanism that explicitly guides models to avoid potential errors during problem-solving, substantially enhancing mathematical reasoning performance and demonstrating the potential for targeted improvement in model capabilities. Our main contributions are as follows:

- Development of the first automated framework for dynamic error classification in MWPs, capable of adapting to diverse error patterns across different LLMs and problem types.
- Introduction of MWPEs-300K, a comprehensive dataset containing 304,865 error samples collected from 15 different LLMs across 4 MWP datasets of varying difficulty levels using multiple sampling strategy, enabling robust analysis of error patterns and distribution.
- Implementation of an error-aware prompting mechanism that significantly improves mathematical reasoning performance by explicitly guiding models to avoid relevant error patterns through our framework.

## 2 Related Work

**MATH Capabilities Enhancement.** Research on enhancing LLMs’ mathematical capabilities can be broadly categorized into prompting-based and scaling-based approaches. Prompting techniques aim to better elicit the inherent reasoning abilities of LLMs (Kojima et al., 2022). Seminal works like Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), Tree-of-Thought (ToT) (Yao et al., 2023), and Graph-of-Thought (GoT) (Besta et al., 2024) propose sophisticated prompting strategies to guide models in planning and executing reasoning paths. Program-of-Thought (PoT) (Chen et al., 2023) and Program-Aided Language Models (PAL) (Gao et al., 2023) take a different approach by transforming reasoning processes into executable code. The Self-Consistency (Wang et al., 2023) improves reasoning performance by leveraging multiple samples and selecting answers based on marginal probabilities. In parallel, scaling-based approaches focus on enhancing mathematical capabilities through larger model size and extensive training data (Azerbaiyev et al., 2023). Minerva (Lewkowycz et al., 2022) employs a 540B parameter model trained on a vast corpus of scientific papers. More recently, OpenAI’s o1 model (Jaech et al., 2024b) extends scaling to test-time by incorporating external supervision during the generation process (Setlur et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024), further boosting performance on mathematical tasks. This approach demonstrates how scaling principles can be effectively applied not only during training but also during inference to enhance mathematical reasoning capabilities (Snell et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2024).

**Math Word Problems.** The development of math word problem datasets has played a pivotal role in assessing the mathematical capabilities of LLMs (Lu et al., 2023). The evolution of these datasets reflects the progressive advancement in problem complexity and diversity. Addsub (Hosseini et al., 2014) establishes a foundation with a collection of elementary addition and subtraction problems, which is subsequently expanded by Roy and Roth (2015) to encompass multiplication and division operations. Miao et al. (2020) further enriches the landscape by introducing a broader spectrum of text patterns and problem types, while SVAMP (Patel et al., 2021) innovatively applies systematic variations to existing problems to test model robustness. As model capabilities continue to advance, researchers re-

Dataset	Dataset Size	Injected Errors	Error Categories	Generator Count	Dataset Count
PRM800K	98,732	×	7	1	1
MathCritique-76k	76,000	✓	Unspecified	1	2
MathCheck-GSM	516	✓	4	1	1
MR-GSM8K	3,000	✓	Unspecified	1	1
EIC-Math	1,800	✓	9	1	2
<b>MWPES-300k(ours)</b>	<b>304,865</b>	×	<b>Dynamic</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>

Table 1: Comparison of MWP Datasets involving Error Analysis

spond by developing increasingly sophisticated datasets (Ahn et al., 2024a). GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) marks a significant step forward with its introduction of 8,500 linguistically diverse grade school math word problems. MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) substantially elevates the complexity threshold by presenting 12,500 competition-level mathematics problems that span multiple domains, including algebra, probability, calculus, and geometry. TAL-SCQ5K (TAL Education Group, 2023) contributes to this progression by constructing multiple-choice questions at both junior and senior high school levels. For advanced mathematical reasoning assessment, AQuA (Ling et al., 2017) and MathQA (Amini et al., 2019) extend the frontier to college-level mathematics by incorporating GRE questions into their collections.

**MATH Error Analysis.** Recent research has increasingly focused on analyzing and classifying errors in math word problems. Several datasets have emerged to facilitate this analysis, each employing distinct approaches to error generation and classification. MathCritique-76k (Xi et al., 2024) and EIC-MATH (Li et al., 2024) utilize LLM-based approaches to generate erroneous solutions, with the latter specifically employing GPT-4 to transform correct solutions into incorrect ones. REASONVAL (Xia et al., 2024) takes a more structured approach, introducing errors through six specific perturbation strategies, including step repetition, removal, swapping, and random modifications. PRM800K (Lightman et al., 2024) provides a comprehensive process supervision dataset with 800,000 step-level correctness labels for model-generated solutions. MR-GSM8K (Zeng et al., 2023a) and MathCheck-GSM (Zhou et al., 2024) focus on fine-grained step-by-step error annotation, with the former incorporating specialized data




Figure 1: Distribution of sample source datasets and model sources. The pie chart illustrates the relative proportion of samples from each dataset, while the bar chart depicts the sample distribution across source models.

augmentation strategies (POT and REVERSED) validated through human verification.

However, these existing approaches face several critical deficiencies. First, the relatively small scale of most datasets and their limited number of error generators restrict their generalizability. Second, the synthetic nature of error construction, often involving manual injection of errors into correct solutions, may not accurately reflect the natural failure modes of LLMs. Third, current error classification schemes typically lack granularity and precise criteria, leading to ambiguous categorizations that may not effectively capture the nuanced ways in which LLMs fail at mathematical tasks.

### 3 Data Construction

To address these deficiencies, we introduce MWPES-300K(Math Word Problem Error Solutions), a systematically constructed dataset con-

taining 304,865 erroneous MWP solutions. Figure 1 presents a detailed statistical analysis of the dataset’s composition and distribution. By harnessing real model outputs rather than manually injecting synthetic errors, MWPEs-300K more accurately mirrors the organic failure modes of LLMs and offers a broader coverage of error types. While existing error analysis datasets like PRM800K and MR-GSM8K focus on single datasets, MWPEs-300K spans four diverse MWP datasets, as detailed in Table 1. This multi-dataset approach enables more comprehensive analysis of error patterns across different problem types and difficulty levels. The overview of the dataset construction process is shown in Appendix A.1.

**Generation Method.** To efficiently construct a large-scale error sample dataset, we leverage a key property of MWPs: a solution deviating from the standard answer often indicates flaws in the reasoning process (Lightman et al., 2024). Therefore, in generating error data, we focus on the incorrect outcomes of model solutions rather than meticulously labeling errors at each step. By avoiding manual annotation of each reasoning step, we enhance the efficiency of data generation.

We select four widely used MWP datasets: SVAMP (Patel et al., 2021), GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) and AQuA (Ling et al., 2017), which cover elementary, middle school, high school, and college levels questions (Ahn et al., 2024b) as the data sources for MWPEs-300K. We employ 15 LLMs as solution generators. These LLMs possess notable natural language understanding and generation capabilities, enabling them to simulate potential errors in the problem-solving process. For each problem, we implement a multiple sampling approach where each LLM generates 10 distinct solutions. By comparing these solutions against ground truth answers, we identify erroneous solutions that capture various mistake types, including logical errors, computational mistakes, and methodological flaws.

**Data Filtering.** After the initial generation of the error sample set, we observe instances of misidentification. Some solutions with formatting deviations have correct reasoning and calculations. For example, an LLM might generate solutions like "Since he can only plant 6 and 3 rows respectively, then 6 \* 8 blue tulips and need 3 \* 6 red tulips." While the LLM accurately represents the computational steps, it fails to simplify "3 \* 6" to "18," leading




Figure 2: A scatter plot comparing GPT-4o and Claude-3.5 sonnet. “Original” (marked with “x”) represents the model’s performance on a fixed and ambiguous 9-class classification task. “Improved” (marked with “o”) represents the model’s performance on classification results using our framework. Each point represents the average accuracy and average normalized entropy  $1 - H(x)$  over 1000 questions.

to its misclassification as an incorrect solution in the initial screening. These format-related deviations do not represent genuine errors and therefore require removal from the error dataset.

To address this issue, we employ an automated checker, as detailed in Appendix A.2, to screen all solutions initially flagged as incorrect. This checker analyzes LLM outputs to determine whether the reasoning and calculations are correct, even if the format deviates slightly from the standard answer. If the checker confirms the solution’s logical validity, the corresponding sample is removed from the error sample candidate set.

Given the scale of MWPEs-300K, exhaustive manual verification is impractical. To validate our automated screening method, we conduct 10 random samplings, each examining 3% of the dataset through rigorous manual review. The average misclassification rate across these samplings remains consistently below 1%, validating the reliability of our automated approach. After applying all filtering stages described above, we obtain our final dataset MWPEs-300K.

## 4 Preliminary Experiment

After generating a substantial number of error samples, we need to categorize them to better understand the sources of model errors within the solution process. The most straightforward approach is to employ LLMs for automated error classification




Figure 3: An illustrative example of the automated framework for dynamic error classification.

based on model outputs.

However, we observe an interesting phenomenon. When attempting to guide LLMs to classify errors into predefined categories, the results are unsatisfactory. For each sample, we conduct 10 attempts and evaluate both the accuracy and entropy to measure the model’s classification precision and consistency. As shown in Figure 2, the LLMs struggle to accurately classify errors according to the categories specified in the prompts. Moreover, the models exhibit inconsistent classifications across multiple attempts with the same prompt.

We attribute this inconsistency to the vague and overly broad definitions of error types, which impede reliable classification. The absence of clear, context-specific criteria results in variable model judgments. Notably, while LLMs exhibit inconsistent performance in direct classification tasks, our analysis reveals their remarkably strong analytical capabilities when presented with both incorrect solution paths and correct answers. Detailed analysis of this phenomenon is presented in Appendix A.3.

## 5 Methodology

Drawing insights from our preliminary experiments on error classification patterns, we develop an automated framework that addresses the limitations of static error categorization. Our framework dynamically adapts to diverse error patterns while maintaining classification consistency across different LLMs and problem types. The architecture of this framework is illustrated in Figure 3.

**Data Source:** The dataset consists of a collection  $\mathcal{D} = \{(q_i, a_i, s_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ , where for each index  $i$ :  $q_i$

denotes the  $i$ -th question from the problem set,  $a_i$  represents its corresponding correct answer, and  $s_i$  denotes the erroneous solution.

**Error Analyzer:** The error analyzer takes a triplet  $(q_i, a_i, s_i)$  as input and outputs  $z_i$ , where  $z_i = [e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m]$  is a list structure containing  $m$  error analyses of error solution  $s_i$ , when providing question  $q_i$  and standard answer  $a_i$ .

**Embedding Model:** The embedding model takes the list  $z_i = [e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m]$  as input, and for each error analyses  $e_i$ , it outputs a corresponding vector  $v_i \in R^d$ , where  $d$  is the dimension of each vector.

**Clustering Algorithm:** The clustering algorithm takes a set of vectors  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  as input and outputs a set of  $k$  clusters, denoted as  $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k\}$ . Each cluster  $c_i$  contains a set of similar error analysis vectors.

**Error-Aware Prompting.** The Error-Aware Prompting algorithm aims to enhance the LLM’s ability by incorporating relevant errors of the question. This algorithm involves two main steps: **knowledge point labeling** and **relevant error summary retrieval**.

- **Knowledge Point Labeling:** Given a question  $q$ , an LLM is employed to generate a set of knowledge point labels  $K$ . These labels represent the relevant concepts or topics involved in the question.
- **Relevant Error Summary Retrieval:** For each knowledge point label  $k \in K$ , we first embed  $k$  into a vector  $v_k$ . We then iterate

---

**Algorithm 1** Error-Aware Prompting

---

- 1: **Input:** Question  $q$ , Cluster centroids  $C$ , error analysis  $z$ , similarity threshold  $\theta$ , similarity function  $\mathcal{F}$ .
  - 2: Use LLM to generate knowledge point labels  $K$  for  $q$ .
  - 3: Initialize relevant error summary set  $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ .
  - 4: **for all**  $k \in K$  **do**
  - 5:   Embed  $k$  into vector  $v_k$ .
  - 6:   **for all**  $c \in C$  **do**
  - 7:     **for all**  $v_e \in c.summarys$  **do**
  - 8:       Calculate  $\mathcal{F}(v_k, v_e)$ .
  - 9:       **if**  $\mathcal{F}(v_k, v_e) \geq \theta$  **then**
  - 10:         Add  $e$  to  $\mathcal{R}$ .
  - 11:       **end if**
  - 12:     **end for**
  - 13:   **end for**
  - 14: **end for**
  - 15: Construct prompt  $p$  by appending  $R$  to  $q$ .
  - 16: Generate response using  $p$  with LLM.
  - 17: **Output:** LLM response.
- 

through the clustering results  $C$ , where each cluster  $c_i \in C$  contains embedded error summaries. A similarity function  $\mathcal{F}(v_k, v_e)$  is used to determine the relevance between the knowledge point  $k$  and the error summary  $e$ . If  $\mathcal{F}(v_k, v_s) \geq \theta$ , where  $\theta$  is a predefined similarity threshold, the error summary  $s$  is added to a set of relevant summaries  $R$ .

An error-aware prompt  $p$  is constructed by appending the relevant summaries  $R$  to the original question  $q$ . This prompt is then fed into the LLM to generate a response. The detail of the algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1.

## 6 Experiment

We conduct extensive experiments to address the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How do different MWP datasets impact error patterns for a given model?
- **RQ2:** How do error patterns change as model capabilities improve?
- **RQ3:** How do error patterns change as the parameter size of LLM increases?

### 6.1 Experiment Setup

**Data Source:** We utilize the novel MWPEs-300K dataset developed in this research.

**Error Analyzer:** We employ GPT-4o to analyze the causes of errors in each solution path. The input is the error sample, and the output is a description and analysis of the error type. The prompt template used is detailed in the Appendix Table 13.

**Text Embedding:** To convert textual error descriptions into numerical vectors, we use OpenAI’s text-embedding-3-large (OpenAI, 2024).

**Clustering Algorithm:** We apply the K-means as the clustering algorithm. To determine the optimal number of clusters  $k$ , we adopt 3 methods: the Davies-Bouldin Index (Davies and Bouldin, 1979), Gap Statistic (Tibshirani et al., 2001), and the Elbow Method.

### 6.2 Main Result

**RQ 1: How do different MWP datasets impact error patterns for a given model?** We analyze the error patterns of two state-of-the-art models, GPT-4o and Claude-3.5-sonnet, across MATH, GSM8K, AQuA and SVAMP. Figure 4 illustrates the error patterns of GPT-4o across these four MWP datasets. Detailed results are provided in Appendix A.4.

**Dataset Difficulty Correlates with Increased Error Type Diversity.** Our analysis reveals a striking relationship between dataset difficulties and error patterns across LLMs. The MATH dataset is of similar difficulty to AQuA but has a higher difficulty than both GSM8K and SVAMP. The MATH dataset, encompassing advanced topics from algebra to calculus, consistently elicited both the highest error counts and most diverse error types from GPT-4o and Claude-3.5-sonnet. This contrasts sharply with SVAMP and GSM8K datasets, where the models’ error profiles are notably simpler and less frequent.

**Models Exhibit Common Error Types Across All Datasets.** Our analysis across four MWP datasets identifies common error patterns that transcend specific problem types. These consistently observed error categories include misinterpretation of problem requirements, algebraic manipulation errors, and incomplete constraint consideration. These persistent error types highlight the significant challenges MWPs present to LLMs. Interestingly, many errors in the SVAMP dataset are due to misinterpretation. The primary cause is ambiguous problem descriptions rather than model weakness.

**RQ 2: How do error patterns change as model capabilities improve?**

**Evolution of Core Mathematical Problem-Solving Capabilities.** The result is shown in Fig-



Figure 4: The error pattern distributions of GPT-4o across 4 MWP datasets. Each solution may make more than one errors.




Figure 5: The figure depicts error pattern distributions for 15 LLMs. The top stacked bar chart shows the distribution of error types per model, while the bottom bar chart shows the total error counts. A color-coded legend to the right shows error types descriptions.

Figure 5. Analysis of error patterns across model generations reveals significant improvements in fundamental mathematical reasoning capabilities. Within the GPT series, we observe a consistent reduction in low-level mathematical errors across successive models. For instance, in “Misunderstanding of problem requirements,” error rates decreased substantially from GPT-3.5-turbo (11.93%, 10907 errors) to GPT-4o (10.31%, 5976 errors) to GPT-o1-mini (4.83%, 1699 errors). A similar trend emerged in “Miscalculation during algebraic manipulation,” where error rates declined from GPT-3.5-turbo (8.88%, 8121 errors) to GPT-4o (6.85%, 3970 errors) to GPT-o1-mini (5.03%, 1769 errors). The Qwen series demonstrated comparable improvements, with “Miscalculation during algebraic manipulation” errors decreasing from Qwen2-7b-Instruct (11.30%, 13178 errors) to Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct (8.61%, 7397 errors), though showing a slight uptick in Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct (9.72%, 6756 errors). These patterns suggest a broad enhancement in basic mathematical reasoning capabilities across model generations.

**Evolution from Basic to Advanced Reasoning Errors.** Our analysis reveals a notable shift in error patterns across GPT model generations, suggest-

ing an evolution in their mathematical reasoning capabilities. While stronger models demonstrate improved basic computational skills, they make more complex errors. A striking example is the emergence of “Lacks thorough analysis of boundary conditions” errors, which are absent in GPT-3.5-turbo but appear in GPT-4o at a rate of 2.33%. **RQ 3: How do error patterns change as the parameter size of LLMs increases?** The result is shown in Figure 5. A detailed horizontal comparison across model families—Llama, Gemma-2, and Qwen2.5 reveals a consistent trend: as the model size increases, total error counts generally decrease, suggesting a direct correlation between model scale and performance.

Within the Llama series, the Llama-3.1-405b model (65401 total errors) outperforms Llama-3.1-70b (99028 errors) and Llama-3.1-8b (127696 errors) significantly, with a notable reduction in “Misunderstanding of problem requirements” errors from 17315 (13.56%) in the 8b model to 5614 (8.58%) in the 405b model. Similarly, the Gemma-2 series demonstrates improved performance moving from gemma-2-9b-it (88915 errors) to gemma-2-27b-it (68758 errors), with a reduction in “Insufficient understanding/consideration of problem

Model	CoT	Ours
gpt-4o	76.60%	79.22%(+2.62%)
claude-3.5-sonnet	71.10%	80.02%(+8.92%)
llama-3.1-70b	68.0%	78.48%(+10.48%)
llama-3.1-8b	51.90%	78.23%(+26.33%)

Table 2: Performance comparison of CoT baseline and Error-Aware prompting algorithm on the MATH.

constraints” errors, from 8316 (9.35%) to 5697 (8.29%). The Qwen2.5 models show an increase in performance going from Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct (85906 errors) to Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct (69510 errors), with the 72b model exhibiting fewer “Misunderstanding of problem requirements” errors.

In addition, as model sizes increase, certain errors like “Inconsistent Variable Substitutions” become almost non-existent, indicating a specific improvement in this error type. Finally, the larger models in each series tend to exhibit a more balanced distribution of error types, whereas the smaller ones have more skewed error distributions, implying that the larger models may not have prominent weaknesses in certain areas compared to smaller models.

### 6.3 Error-Aware Prompting

We evaluate the effectiveness of error-aware prompting algorithm on both in-distribution and out-of-distribution MWPs to investigate whether problem-specific error feedback could enhance LLM performance. Our experiments focuses on two challenging datasets: MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) and TAL-SCQ5K (TAL Education Group, 2023). For each problem, we employ the approach detailed in Algorithm 1 to retrieve relevant error summaries. These summaries, generated by the error analyzer, detailed the mistakes observed and are appended to the original prompt to guide the model’s reasoning process.

**In-Distribution Analysis** We evaluate four LLMs on the MATH dataset. As shown in Table 2, Error-Aware prompting significantly improved the accuracy across all models. For instance, llama-3.1-8b demonstrated a performance increase of over 25%, surpassing the CoT performance of gpt-4o. These findings highlight that Error-Aware prompting effectively helps LLMs avoid potential errors, leading to substantial improvements in performance.

**Out-of-Distribution Analysis** To further validate the effectiveness of Error-Aware prompting,

Model	CoT	Ours
gpt-4o	82.42%	89.43%(+7.01%)
claude-3.5 sonnet	80.11%	84.48%(+4.37%)
llama-3.1-70b	85.58%	87.42%(+1.54%)
llama-3.1-8b	75.76%	80.23%(+4.47%)

Table 3: Performance comparison of CoT baseline and Error-Aware prompting algorithm on the TAL-SCQ5K.

we conduct experiments on a new dataset, TAL-SCQ5K (TAL Education Group, 2023). An example of TAL-SCQ5K is shown in Appendix Figure 9. Crucially, the MWPEs-300K dataset contains no overlap with the TAL-SCQ5K dataset; therefore, it is an out-of-distribution (OOD) task. For each problem in the TAL-SCQ5K dataset, we extract its knowledge point route field which represents the hierarchical structure of mathematical concepts. For retrieving relevant error summaries, we employ TF-IDF vectorization to embed the knowledge point, followed by cosine similarity matching to calculate similarities. As shown in Table 3, the results demonstrate a consistent performance improvement across all LLMs. We observe that in OOD scenarios, more capable models utilize error information more effectively, with GPT-4 achieving performance improvements of over 7%. See Appendix A.5 for more details.

## 7 Conclusion

We introduce a dynamically adaptive framework for error classification in MWP solving. It automatically updates error categories based on observed outputs, rather than using static categories. We propose the MWPEs-300K dataset, with 304,865 error samples across 15 LLMs and 4 MWP datasets, enabling a thorough error analysis. Specifically, dataset complexity positively correlates with error diversity. As LLMs enhance their core mathematical skills, the errors they make tend to become more complex, reflecting challenges in advanced reasoning. Increased model parameter size correlates with reduced overall errors and more balanced distributions. Our Error-Aware prompting algorithm, leveraging categorized errors, significantly improves in and out-of-distribution performance on MATH and TAL-SCQ5K datasets. We suggest that a focus on error analysis can serve as a good way to develop more robust and reliable LLMs for mathematical reasoning tasks.

## Limitations

**Process-Answer Inconsistency** Our analysis focuses solely on solutions where both the final answer and solution process are incorrect, which ignores the phenomenon where LLMs arrive at correct answers through flawed reasoning processes. We leave the investigation of this type of error for future research.

**Domain Specificity** Although we demonstrate the effectiveness of our framework in the mathematical domain, its applicability to other domains remains unexplored. Our dynamic error classification approach could be adapted for tasks such as logical reasoning, scientific problem-solving, or code debugging. Future work will extend our framework and error-aware prompting algorithm to additional domains to analyze LLMs’ error patterns across different fields more comprehensively.

## Ethics Statement

The MW PES-300K dataset, carefully assembled to analyze error patterns in mathematical reasoning across different LLMs, comprises error samples collected from 15 distinct language models across four established mathematical word problem datasets. Each error sample is systematically processed through our automated dynamic error classification framework, ensuring consistent and unbiased analysis. To validate the framework’s effectiveness and ensure the quality of error classifications, we employ three mathematical experts with advanced degrees in mathematics, compensated at standard academic research rates, who conducted regular reviews of the automated classifications.

Throughout our research, we maintain strict adherence to ethical guidelines regarding model access and usage. All experiments with commercial LLMs are conducted in full compliance with their respective providers’ terms of service and API usage policies. For open-source models, we carefully follow the associated model licenses and usage restrictions. The four source MWP datasets are utilized in accordance with their original licenses, and all derived error samples maintain proper attribution to their source problems.

Our automated error classification framework is designed with careful consideration of potential biases. We implement rigorous testing procedures to ensure that the dynamic categorization system

does not inadvertently perpetuate or amplify existing biases in model outputs. The Error-Aware prompting mechanism is developed with explicit attention to maintaining model performance across diverse problem types and difficulty levels.

The MW PES-300K dataset will be released under the CC-BY-SA-4.0 license for research purposes only. We commit to maintaining an open channel for addressing any concerns regarding the dataset or its applications. While our research aims to improve mathematical reasoning capabilities in LLMs, we acknowledge the responsibility to ensure that these improvements do not inadvertently enable deceptive or harmful applications. We encourage researchers utilizing our dataset and framework to maintain high ethical standards and consider the broader implications of enhanced mathematical reasoning capabilities in AI systems.

## References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2303.08774.
- Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024a. [Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 225–237, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024b. [Large language models reasoning: Progresses and challenges](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 225–237, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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 *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2357–2367, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhangir Azerbayev, Hailey Schoelkopf, Keiran Paster, Marco Dos Santos, Stephen McAleer, Albert Q Jiang, Jia Deng, Stella Biderman, and Sean Welleck. 2023.

- Llemma: An open language model for mathematics. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2310.10631.
- Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Michal Podstawski, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, and Torsten Hoefler. 2024. [Graph of thoughts: Solving elaborate problems with large language models](#). In *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2024, Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2014, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 17682–17690. AAAI Press.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Wenhu Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W. Cohen. 2023. [Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- 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*, abs/2110.14168.
- David L Davies and Donald W Bouldin. 1979. A cluster separation measure. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, (2):224–227.
- 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*, abs/2407.21783.
- Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. [PAL: program-aided language models](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10764–10799. PMLR.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2103.03874.
- Mohammad Javad Hosseini, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Oren Etzioni, and Nate Kushman. 2014. [Learning to solve arithmetic word problems with verb categorization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 523–533, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. 2024a. [Openai o1 system card](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2412.16720.
- Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. 2024b. [Openai o1 system card](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2412.16720.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. [Large language models are zero-shot reasoners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Andreassen, David Dohan, Ethan Dyer, Henryk Michalewski, Vinay V. 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 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Xiaoyuan Li, Wenjie Wang, Moxin Li, Junrong Guo, Yang Zhang, and Fuli Feng. 2024. [Evaluating mathematical reasoning of large language models: A focus on error identification and correction](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11316–11360, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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 *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Wang Ling, Dani Yogatama, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. 2017. [Program induction by rationale generation: Learning to solve and explain algebraic word problems](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 158–167, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pan Lu, Liang Qiu, Wenhao Yu, Sean Welleck, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2023. [A survey of deep learning for](#)

- mathematical reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14605–14631, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shen-yun Miao, Chao-Chun Liang, and Keh-Yih Su. 2020. A diverse corpus for evaluating and developing English math word problem solvers. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 975–984, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- OpenAI. 2024. New embedding models and API updates.
- Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. 2021. Are NLP models really able to solve simple math word problems? In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2080–2094, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Subhro Roy and Dan Roth. 2015. Solving general arithmetic word problems. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1743–1752, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amrith Setlur, Chirag Nagpal, Adam Fisch, Xinyang Geng, Jacob Eisenstein, Rishabh Agarwal, Alekh Agarwal, Jonathan Berant, and Aviral Kumar. 2024. Rewarding progress: Scaling automated process verifiers for llm reasoning. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2410.08146.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. 2024. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models.
- Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. 2024. Scaling llm test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling model parameters, 2024. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2408.03314.
- TAL Education Group. 2023. TAL-SCQ5K: A mathematical competition dataset in english and chinese. <https://github.com/math-eval/TAL-SCQ5K>. Contact: matheval.ai@gmail.com.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, et al. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2312.11805.
- Robert Tibshirani, Guenther Walther, and Trevor Hastie. 2001. Estimating the number of clusters in a data set via the gap statistic. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 63(2):411–423.
- Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Zhihong Shao, Runxin Xu, Damai Dai, Yifei Li, Deli Chen, Yu Wu, and Zhifang Sui. 2024. Math-shepherd: Verify and reinforce LLMs step-by-step without human annotations. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9426–9439, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Yangzhen Wu, Zhiqing Sun, Shanda Li, Sean Welleck, and Yiming Yang. 2024. Inference scaling laws: An empirical analysis of compute-optimal inference for problem-solving with language models. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2408.00724.
- Zhiheng Xi, Dingwen Yang, Jixuan Huang, Jiafu Tang, Guanyu Li, Yiwen Ding, Wei He, Boyang Hong, Shihan Do, Wenyu Zhan, Xiao Wang, Rui Zheng, Tao Ji, Xiaowei Shi, Yitao Zhai, Rongxiang Weng, Jingang Wang, Xunliang Cai, Tao Gui, Zuxuan Wu, Qi Zhang, Xipeng Qiu, Xuanjing Huang, and Yu-Gang Jiang. 2024. Enhancing llm reasoning via critique models with test-time and training-time supervision.
- Shijie Xia, Xuefeng Li, Yixin Liu, Tongshuang Wu, and Pengfei Liu. 2024. Evaluating mathematical reasoning beyond accuracy. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2404.05692.
- 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. 2024. Qwen2.5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Zhongshen Zeng, Pengguang Chen, Haiyun Jiang, and Jiaya Jia. 2023a. Challenge llms to reason about

reasoning: A benchmark to unveil cognitive depth in llms. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2312.17080.

Zhongshen Zeng, Pengguang Chen, Shu Liu, Haiyun Jiang, and Jiaya Jia. 2023b. [Mr-gsm8k: A meta-reasoning benchmark for large language model evaluation](#).

Zihao Zhou, Shudong Liu, Maizhen Ning, Wei Liu, Jindong Wang, Derek F Wong, Xiaowei Huang, Qifeng Wang, and Kaizhu Huang. 2024. [Is your model really a good math reasoner? evaluating mathematical reasoning with checklist](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2407.08733.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Details of data construction

Figure 6 illustrates the data construction process. We curate a dataset by selecting 4 Math Word Problem (MWP) datasets (SVAMP, GSM8K, AQuA, and MATH) as our source. 15 LLMs from various vendors generated 10 solutions for each problem. These solutions are filtered based on consistency with expected answers, with inconsistent yet semantically correct data being discarded. We adopt GPT-4o as the automated checker. The remaining data are manually reviewed to create the final MWPEs-300k dataset.

### A.2 Automated Checker

Within the data filtering process, an automated checker plays a crucial role in refining the initially identified error sample set. This checker can take the form of any model designed to assess the validity of a MWP solving process. However, for simplicity and efficiency in this study, we utilize GPT-4o as our automated checker. The checker is prompted to evaluate only the final step of the solution, determining if it aligns semantically with the standard answer. Critically, the checker is instructed to disregard minor format or presentation differences, recognizing as correct those solutions that achieve the proper meaning despite such variations. This approach enables us to effectively filter out samples flagged due to superficial deviation.

### A.3 Details of Static Error Categorization

We design an experiment where an LLM performs repeated 9-class classifications on solutions containing only one error. These error types, as proposed by Li et al. (2024), are distilled from previous research, including numerical errors such as *calculation errors (CA)*, *counting errors (CO)*, and *unit conversion errors (UC)*; contextual errors like *context value errors (CV)* and *hallucinations (HA)*; and reasoning errors such as *operator errors (OP)*, *formula confusion errors (FC)*, *missing steps (MS)*, and *contradictory steps (CS)*.

To investigate the consistency and accuracy of LLMs in error classification, we choose two high-performance models, GPT-4o and Claude-3.5 sonnet, as error classifiers. We randomly sample 1,000 questions from the GSM8K, AQuA, and MATH datasets. And for each problem, we sample 10 solutions to examine output consistency. The experiment utilizes a consistent prompt shown in Table 14.

The results in Figure 2 indicate that LLM outputs are not invariably uniform for identical problem instances. Furthermore, accuracy in categorizing errors is low, especially when the distinctions between different error types lack clear demarcation. The detailed experimental result is shown in Figure 7 and 8.

We argue that this phenomenon is due to ambiguous error definitions. Vague and overly broad definitions of error types hinder consistent classification. The lack of clear, context-specific criteria leads to variable model judgments due to differences in training data and biases.

We observe that while LLMs perform inconsistently in direct classification tasks, their capability for error analysis is notably strong and highly accurate when explicitly informed that a solution path is incorrect and provided with the correct answer. This finding suggests that although LLMs may exhibit uncertainty and inconsistency in classification tasks, they can accurately identify and explain problems in specific error analysis scenarios.

To enable effective error identification and analysis, we employ GPT-4o as our error analyzer. An input template, as shown in Figure 13, guided GPT-4o to not only pinpoint errors but also to provide concise explanations. To validate its performance, we conducted an experiment, sampling 1,000 data points from the MWPEs-300k dataset for each (model, dataset) pair. We then manually evaluate GPT-4o’s error analysis accuracy, focusing on its error identification precision.

As detailed in Table 12, experimental results show that as model performance increases, it becomes more challenging for models to analyze complex errors. While high-performance models such as GPT-4o excel in overall accuracy, they sometimes struggle with complex or subtle errors, failing to provide correct analyses. Furthermore, as the dataset difficulty increases, the correction accuracy also tends to decrease, because error correction relies on a thorough analysis of the problem, which may be challenging for high-performance models on some problems. However, it is important to note that the overall error analysis accuracy of the models remains significantly high, suggesting their considerable potential and application value in error analysis tasks.

### A.4 Details of the Experiment Result

Tables 5 to 11 show the error pattern distribution of 15 LLMs across 39 error types. The error types




Figure 6: The overview of the dataset construction workflow.

and their abbreviations are shown in Table 4.

### A.5 Details of Out-of-Distribution Analysis

The experiments in OOD analysis utilize the TAL-SCQ5K dataset, which is available in both English (TAL-SCQ5K-EN) and Chinese (TAL-SCQ5K-CN) versions. Developed by TAL Education Group, each language version of TAL-SCQ5K comprises 5,000 multiple-choice math questions, divided into 3,000 training examples and 2,000 test examples. The questions span a wide range of mathematical topics, covering primary, junior high, and high school levels. This ensures a diverse and challenging benchmark for evaluating the performance of LLMs on mathematical reasoning tasks. The multiple-choice format allows for straightforward evaluation and comparison of model predictions.

An example of TAL-SCQ5K dataset is shown in Figure 9. Each example within the TAL-SCQ5K dataset includes a field named `knowledge-point-routes`. This field provides a concise description of the specific mathematical concepts and topics relevant to the question. This explicit representation of the knowledge hierarchy is critical for error summary retrieval.

In retrieving relevant error summaries, we employ a cosine similarity algorithm to identify the most related summaries based on the knowledge point route field. The cosine similarity score is a

continuous value between 0 and 1, where 1 indicates perfect similarity. In our retrieval process, we have set a similarity threshold of 0.3. This means that only error summaries with a cosine similarity of 0.3 or higher, compared to the input problem’s knowledge points, are considered for inclusion in the error-aware prompt.

To ensure the quality of the information and prevent repetition, we implement a deduplication step: If an error summary has already been added to the prompt, it will not be added again. Furthermore, to avoid overwhelming the model with excessive information and to mitigate potential interference, we restrict the maximum number of included error summaries to 5. This threshold helps to filter out irrelevant error summaries, focusing on the most relevant and helpful error information, while avoiding redundant information and keeping the prompt within reasonable length.

<b>Error Type</b>	<b>Code</b>
Misunderstanding of problem requirements	MOP
Lack of verification for final answer.	LOV
Miscalculation during the algebraic manipulation.	MAM
Insufficient understanding/consideration of problem constraints.	IUC
Ambiguous problem parameters.	APP
Misinterpreted conditions led to incorrect assumptions.	MCI
Incorrect application of mathematical formulas/concepts.	IAM
Inconsistent application of formulas.	IAF
Lack of logical reasoning in arriving at the answer.	LLR
Inconsistent Variable Substitutions	IVS
Misinterpretation of what the problem is asking for.	MWP
Lack of Simplification.	LOS
Incorrect equation setup due to misinterpreted conditions.	IES
Lacks thorough analysis of boundary conditions	LAB
Overcomplication by introducing irrelevant elements resulted in the wrong expression.	ORI
The notation used led to confusion in mathematical operations.	NCM
Misplaced focus on solving an unnecessary/unsolvable variable.	MFS
Miscalculation during the equation solving process.	MES
Unit Error.	UNE
Misinterpretation of rounding rules.	MRR
Irrelevant Content.	IC
Failure to consider all possible solutions.	FCS
Overreliance on assumptions instead of analysis.	ORA
Incorrect factorization/Confusion between different forms of number factorizations.	IFC
Incorrect calculation during simplification steps.	ICS
Improper application of multiplication relationships	IMR
Incorrect application of combinatorial principles.	ICP
Assumed independence of overlapping events.	AIO
Misapplication of the probability formula for independent events.	MPI
Failure to accurately apply speed formulas and conversions.	FAC
Misinterpretation of geometric relationships in the problem context.	MGR
Misapplication of perimeter and area formulas for rectangles.	MPA
Misinterpretation of scaling language led to errors in calculations.	MSC
Incorrectly assumed equivalence of different algebraic expressions.	IAE
Incorrect calculation of the least common multiple (LCM).	ILC
Misunderstanding of expected answer format.	MEF
Failure to distinguish between selling price and cost price.	FSP
Incorrect application of trigonometric functions.	ITF
Misapplication of modular reasoning.	MMR

Table 4: Error Types and Their Abbreviations

Model	MOP	LOV	MAM	IUC	APP	MCI
gpt-o1-mini	1699[4.83%]	2368[6.73%]	1769[5.03%]	2535[7.20%]	0[0.00%]	1630[4.63%]
gpt-4o	5976[10.31%]	5781[9.97%]	3970[6.85%]	4026[6.94%]	0[0.00%]	3482[6.01%]
gpt-3.5 turbo	10907[11.93%]	10643[11.64%]	8121[8.88%]	5656[6.19%]	0[0.00%]	5335[5.83%]
gemma-2-27b-it	7258[10.56%]	7843[11.41%]	7996[11.63%]	5697[8.29%]	0[0.00%]	4054[5.90%]
gemma-2-9b-it	12063[13.57%]	10893[12.25%]	8818[9.92%]	8316[9.35%]	933[1.05%]	4959[5.58%]
claude-3.5-sonnet	6366[9.99%]	5391[8.46%]	3789[5.95%]	4541[7.13%]	0[0.00%]	4040[6.34%]
claude-3.5-haiku	11353[11.29%]	8483[8.44%]	7717[7.67%]	7884[7.84%]	1908[1.90%]	4151[4.13%]
llama-3.1-405b	5614[8.58%]	8024[12.27%]	3928[6.01%]	6171[9.44%]	0[0.00%]	3664[5.60%]
llama-3.1-70b	12105[12.22%]	11339[11.45%]	8901[8.99%]	10378[10.48%]	1100[1.11%]	7550[7.62%]
llama-3.1-8b	17315[13.56%]	13944[10.92%]	10489[8.21%]	8929[6.99%]	4792[3.75%]	10517[8.24%]
Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct	5600[8.06%]	7174[10.32%]	6756[9.72%]	5461[7.86%]	0[0.00%]	4137[5.95%]
Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct	9375[10.91%]	5544[6.45%]	7397[8.61%]	3106[3.62%]	1212[1.41%]	7076[8.24%]
Qwen2-7b-Instruct	16995[14.57%]	10559[9.05%]	13178[11.30%]	9890[8.48%]	3789[3.25%]	7982[6.84%]
glm-4-9b-chat	21160[14.20%]	13707[9.20%]	11673[7.83%]	8985[6.03%]	3984[2.67%]	11311[7.59%]
chatglm3-6b	27261[14.60%]	21508[11.52%]	18555[9.93%]	8957[4.80%]	5293[2.83%]	10838[5.80%]

Table 5: Error Metrics (Part 1)

Model	IAM	IAF	LLR	IVS	MWP	LOS
gpt-o1-mini	3232[9.18%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]
gpt-4o	5266[9.08%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1212[2.09%]
gpt-3.5 turbo	4848[5.30%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	836[0.91%]	1059[1.16%]
gemma-2-27b-it	5558[8.08%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	947[1.38%]
gemma-2-9b-it	8929[10.04%]	0[0.00%]	599[0.67%]	432[0.49%]	1059[1.19%]	2285[2.57%]
claude-3.5-sonnet	4611[7.23%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]
claude-3.5-haiku	6951[6.91%]	0[0.00%]	780[0.78%]	0[0.00%]	2647[2.63%]	2967[2.95%]
llama-3.1-405b	3789[5.79%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	641[0.98%]
llama-3.1-70b	8609[8.69%]	404[0.41%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1546[1.56%]	975[0.98%]
llama-3.1-8b	6965[5.45%]	1351[1.06%]	2647[2.07%]	850[0.67%]	3566[2.79%]	0[0.00%]
Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct	3900[5.61%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1156[1.66%]
Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct	7355[8.56%]	933[1.09%]	933[1.09%]	961[1.12%]	2897[3.37%]	390[0.45%]
Qwen2-7b-Instruct	6213[5.33%]	1867[1.60%]	2507[2.15%]	1351[1.16%]	1894[1.62%]	1407[1.21%]
glm-4-9b-chat	8525[5.72%]	2786[1.87%]	5753[3.86%]	2048[1.37%]	8274[5.55%]	0[0.00%]
chatglm3-6b	12189[6.53%]	3106[1.66%]	11687[6.26%]	4736[2.54%]	8832[4.73%]	1379[0.74%]

Table 6: Error Metrics (Part 2)

Model	IES	LAB	ORI	NCM	MFS	MES
gpt-o1-mini	1686[4.79%]	2326[6.61%]	1867[5.30%]	0[0.00%]	460[1.31%]	557[1.58%]
gpt-4o	2675[4.61%]	1351[2.33%]	1323[2.28%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1073[1.85%]
gpt-3.5 turbo	5544[6.06%]	1087[1.19%]	905[0.99%]	0[0.00%]	766[0.84%]	5878[6.43%]
gemma-2-27b-it	3775[5.49%]	1365[1.99%]	780[1.13%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1142[1.66%]
gemma-2-9b-it	5447[6.13%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1226[1.38%]	1894[2.13%]
claude-3.5-sonnet	3371[5.29%]	1616[2.54%]	1546[2.43%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	3274[5.14%]
claude-3.5-haiku	5112[5.08%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	2326[2.31%]	4764[4.74%]
llama-3.1-405b	3524[5.39%]	1867[2.85%]	1240[1.90%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	2187[3.34%]
llama-3.1-70b	4402[4.45%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	696[0.70%]	0[0.00%]	3287[3.32%]
llama-3.1-8b	4876[3.82%]	0[0.00%]	1170[0.92%]	1644[1.29%]	1867[1.46%]	4555[3.57%]
Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct	2800[4.03%]	892[1.28%]	1630[2.34%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1240[1.78%]
Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct	2856[3.32%]	0[0.00%]	209[0.24%]	0[0.00%]	1546[1.80%]	2090[2.43%]
Qwen2-7b-Instruct	4499[3.86%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1073[0.92%]	1184[1.02%]	1393[1.19%]
glm-4-9b-chat	4876[3.27%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1365[0.92%]	0[0.00%]	7411[4.97%]
chatglm3-6b	5224[2.80%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	1811[0.97%]	0[0.00%]	3552[1.90%]

Table 7: Error Metrics (Part 3)

Model	UNE	MRR	IC	FCS	ORA	IFC
gpt-o1-mini	0[0.00%]	320[0.91%]	0[0.00%]	1992[5.66%]	557[1.58%]	404[1.15%]
gpt-4o	0[0.00%]	1365[2.35%]	0[0.00%]	1351[2.33%]	3552[6.13%]	1574[2.71%]
gpt-3.5 turbo	822[0.90%]	2758[3.02%]	0[0.00%]	2563[2.80%]	3204[3.50%]	1031[1.13%]
gemma-2-27b-it	0[0.00%]	989[1.44%]	0[0.00%]	1853[2.69%]	2326[3.38%]	446[0.65%]
gemma-2-9b-it	0[0.00%]	794[0.89%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	2995[3.37%]	1379[1.55%]
claude-3.5-sonnet	0[0.00%]	2006[3.15%]	0[0.00%]	1964[3.08%]	975[1.53%]	1114[1.75%]
claude-3.5-haiku	1853[1.84%]	1337[1.33%]	0[0.00%]	878[0.87%]	2034[2.02%]	0[0.00%]
llama-3.1-405b	0[0.00%]	3831[5.86%]	1240[1.90%]	2076[3.17%]	2048[3.13%]	599[0.92%]
llama-3.1-70b	0[0.00%]	2507[2.53%]	1867[1.88%]	975[0.98%]	1059[1.07%]	0[0.00%]
llama-3.1-8b	1240[0.97%]	3733[2.92%]	5558[4.35%]	0[0.00%]	2298[1.80%]	0[0.00%]
Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct	460[0.66%]	2382[3.43%]	0[0.00%]	2368[3.41%]	1797[2.59%]	0[0.00%]
Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct	1059[1.23%]	2382[2.77%]	0[0.00%]	474[0.55%]	0[0.00%]	752[0.88%]
Qwen2-7b-Instruct	1853[1.59%]	3106[2.66%]	2382[2.04%]	0[0.00%]	1825[1.56%]	0[0.00%]
glm-4-9b-chat	2145[1.44%]	2716[1.82%]	6101[4.09%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]
chatglm3-6b	2257[1.21%]	0[0.00%]	7968[4.27%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]

Table 8: Error Metrics (Part 4)

Model	ICS	IMR	ICP	AIO	MPI	FAC
gpt-o1-mini	850[2.41%]	0[0.00%]	1532[4.35%]	2076[5.90%]	1365[3.88%]	0[0.00%]
gpt-4o	1630[2.81%]	0[0.00%]	2688[4.64%]	2466[4.25%]	1811[3.12%]	0[0.00%]
gpt-3.5 turbo	3775[4.13%]	0[0.00%]	2173[2.38%]	2020[2.21%]	947[1.04%]	1087[1.19%]
gemma-2-27b-it	543[0.79%]	0[0.00%]	3873[5.63%]	1309[1.90%]	836[1.22%]	1295[1.88%]
gemma-2-9b-it	1073[1.21%]	0[0.00%]	4430[4.98%]	1950[2.19%]	515[0.58%]	683[0.77%]
claude-3.5-sonnet	1811[2.84%]	0[0.00%]	1908[2.99%]	1003[1.57%]	1240[1.95%]	1170[1.84%]
claude-3.5-haiku	2897[2.88%]	0[0.00%]	4290[4.27%]	1073[1.07%]	599[0.60%]	4806[4.78%]
llama-3.1-405b	1087[1.66%]	0[0.00%]	2549[3.90%]	752[1.15%]	1212[1.85%]	1254[1.92%]
llama-3.1-70b	1532[1.55%]	0[0.00%]	4597[4.64%]	864[0.87%]	613[0.62%]	1699[1.72%]
llama-3.1-8b	1365[1.07%]	1867[1.46%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	3120[2.44%]
Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct	1435[2.06%]	0[0.00%]	3399[4.89%]	1114[1.60%]	1254[1.80%]	1588[2.28%]
Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct	1908[2.22%]	724[0.84%]	6631[7.72%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	3761[4.38%]
Qwen2-7b-Instruct	1811[1.55%]	1588[1.36%]	2967[2.54%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	947[0.81%]
glm-4-9b-chat	2549[1.71%]	4040[2.71%]	1532[1.03%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	4862[3.26%]
chatglm3-6b	1825[0.98%]	4764[2.55%]	1087[0.58%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	4569[2.45%]

Table 9: Error Metrics (Part 5)

Model	MGR	MPA	MSC	IAE	ILC	MEF
gpt-o1-mini	1853[5.26%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	515[1.46%]	0[0.00%]
gpt-4o	1727[2.98%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	878[1.51%]	0[0.00%]
gpt-3.5 turbo	2647[2.89%]	0[0.00%]	947[1.04%]	599[0.66%]	1532[1.68%]	1379[1.51%]
gemma-2-27b-it	2493[3.63%]	794[1.15%]	557[0.81%]	933[1.36%]	961[1.40%]	0[0.00%]
gemma-2-9b-it	2410[2.71%]	1686[1.90%]	1365[1.54%]	0[0.00%]	432[0.49%]	0[0.00%]
claude-3.5-sonnet	3371[5.29%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]	2145[3.37%]	1713[2.69%]	2076[3.26%]
claude-3.5-haiku	2424[2.41%]	2173[2.16%]	2702[2.69%]	0[0.00%]	1867[1.86%]	1532[1.52%]
llama-3.1-405b	2716[4.15%]	710[1.09%]	0[0.00%]	460[0.70%]	975[1.49%]	683[1.04%]
llama-3.1-70b	1797[1.81%]	1825[1.84%]	1727[1.74%]	0[0.00%]	2939[2.97%]	334[0.34%]
llama-3.1-8b	975[0.76%]	2981[2.33%]	3970[3.11%]	0[0.00%]	738[0.58%]	1686[1.32%]
Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct	1309[1.88%]	1045[1.50%]	1114[1.60%]	1393[2.00%]	1672[2.40%]	0[0.00%]
Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct	2159[2.51%]	3134[3.65%]	1727[2.01%]	1797[2.09%]	850[0.99%]	1658[1.93%]
Qwen2-7b-Instruct	3232[2.77%]	3343[2.87%]	2535[2.17%]	0[0.00%]	696[0.60%]	1295[1.11%]
glm-4-9b-chat	1128[0.76%]	0[0.00%]	5015[3.36%]	0[0.00%]	306[0.21%]	4499[3.02%]
chatglm3-6b	794[0.43%]	5084[2.72%]	3343[1.79%]	0[0.00%]	446[0.24%]	6854[3.67%]

Table 10: Error Metrics (Part 6)

Model	FSP	ITF	MMR
gpt-o1-mini	0[0.00%]	2034[5.78%]	1574[4.47%]
gpt-4o	0[0.00%]	1658[2.86%]	1156[1.99%]
gpt-3.5 turbo	0[0.00%]	1128[1.23%]	1240[1.36%]
gemma-2-27b-it	961[1.40%]	1240[1.80%]	933[1.36%]
gemma-2-9b-it	1351[1.52%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]
claude-3.5-sonnet	0[0.00%]	1755[2.75%]	933[1.46%]
claude-3.5-haiku	3051[3.03%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]
llama-3.1-405b	0[0.00%]	1435[2.19%]	1128[1.73%]
llama-3.1-70b	2856[2.88%]	543[0.55%]	0[0.00%]
llama-3.1-8b	2688[2.11%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]
Qwen2.5-72b-Instruct	3873[5.57%]	1783[2.57%]	780[1.12%]
Qwen2.5-7b-Instruct	2382[2.77%]	627[0.73%]	0[0.00%]
Qwen2-7b-Instruct	3274[2.81%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]
glm-4-9b-chat	2285[1.53%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]
chatglm3-6b	2856[1.53%]	0[0.00%]	0[0.00%]

Table 11: Error Metrics (Part 7)

Model Name	Launch	Parameters	MATH	AQuA	SVAMP	GSM8K
GPT-4o	2024	/	88%	92%	98%	96%
o1-mini	2024	/	85%	89%	97%	99%
GPT-3.5-turbo	2022	/	91%	93%	96%	97%
Llama-3.1-8B	2024	8B	/	/	97%	96%
Llama-3.1-70B	2024	70B	93%	94%	98%	95%
Llama-3.1-405B	2024	405B	89%	92%	97%	97%
glm-4-9b-chat	2024	9B	/	/	96%	98%
Chatglm3-6b	2024	6B	/	/	97%	98%
Qwen2-7B-Instruct	2024	7B	/	/	98%	96%
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	2024	7B	/	/	97%	97%
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct	2024	72B	91%	90%	98%	96%
Gemma-2-9b-it	2024	9B	94%	95%	97%	97%
Gemma-2-27b-it	2024	27B	88%	91%	97%	98%
Claude-3.5 Sonnet	2024	/	91%	90%	98%	97%
Claude-3 Haiku	2024	/	93%	95%	98%	96%

Table 12: Error Analysis Accuracy of Various Models on Different Datasets

---

**Instruction:** You are an expert in reviewing math problem-solving steps. Your specialty is identifying errors in provided solution steps and summarizing them into abstract categories. You will receive information containing the original question, the solution steps and the correct answer.

1. Provide a concise explanation of the errors in the problem-solving process. If the response correctly solves the problem, output "Solution is right."

2. After the detailed explanation, please briefly summarize the core reasons for the mistake into abstract categories, avoiding details related to the specific problem. The abstract reasons should be listed with numbered points, and each line should not exceed 15 words. Try to minimize the number of reasons (less than 4).

The output should clearly separate the detailed error analysis from the summarized reasons.

---

Q: Uriah's book bag is getting too heavy for him. He needs to remove 15 pounds from it. His comic books weigh  $\frac{1}{4}$  pound each and his toys weigh  $\frac{1}{2}$  pound each. If he removes 30 comic books, how many toys does he need to remove?

R: Each comic book weighs  $\frac{1}{4}$  pound and Uriah needs to remove 15 pounds in total. So the number of comic books he needs to remove is  $15 / (\frac{1}{4}) = 15 * 4 = 60$  comic books. Since each toy weighs  $\frac{1}{2}$  pound, the number of toys you need to remove is  $60 \text{ toys} / (\frac{1}{2}) = 60 * 2 = 120$  toys. So the answer is 120.

A: 15

Analysis: The solution contains errors in the problem-solving process:

1. Misinterpretation of the Problem: The response incorrectly calculates the number of comic books to be removed. The problem states that Uriah removes 30 comic books, not that he needs to calculate how many to remove.

2. Incorrect Calculation for Toys: The response incorrectly calculates the number of toys to remove. After removing 30 comic books, the weight removed is  $(30 \times \frac{1}{4} = 7.5)$  pounds. Uriah still needs to remove  $(15 - 7.5 = 7.5)$  pounds.

3. Correct Calculation for Toys: To remove the remaining 7.5 pounds using toys that weigh  $\frac{1}{2}$  pound each, the number of toys to remove is  $(7.5 \div \frac{1}{2} = 15)$  toys.

The correct answer is 15 toys, not 120.

---

Q: I have 10 liters of orange drink that are two-thirds water and I wish to add it to 15 liters of pineapple drink that is three-fifths water. But as I pour it, I spill one liter of the orange drink. How much water is in the remaining 24 liters?

R: Each comic book weighs  $\frac{1}{4}$  pound and Uriah needs to remove 15 pounds in total. So the number of comic books he needs to remove is  $15 / (\frac{1}{4}) = 15 * 4 = 60$  comic books. Since each toy weighs  $\frac{1}{2}$  pound, the number of toys you need to remove is  $60 \text{ toys} / (\frac{1}{2}) = 60 * 2 = 120$  toys. So the answer is 120. The shore was 64 seconds away, so Julia rowed towards shore for a total of  $64/0.8 = 80$  units of 10 feet. For every 10 feet she rowed towards shore, the boat took on 2 liters of water. Therefore, the boat took on a total of  $80*2 = 160$  liters of water by the time Julia reached shore.

A: 15

Analysis: The solution contains multiple errors in its calculations:

1. Misinterpretation of the spill: When 1 liter of orange drink is spilled, it affects the amount of water contributed by the orange drink proportionately. The solution incorrectly subtracts 1 directly from the total water content, rather than calculating the water in the spilled 1 liter of orange drink and adjusting accordingly.

2. Incorrect total water computation: The orange drink is two-thirds water, so spilling 1 liter of it means  $(\frac{2}{3} \times 1 = \frac{2}{3})$  liters of water is lost. The correct adjustment requires subtracting  $(\frac{2}{3})$  liters of water from the total, not 1 liter as stated in the response.

3. Final calculation discrepancy: The total water content in the remaining mixture should be accurately recomputed after taking the spill into account. The response's claim of  $\frac{56}{3}$  liters of water is incorrect. The correct approach follows these steps:- Before the spill: - Water in orange drink:  $(\frac{2}{3} \times 10 = \frac{20}{3})$  liters. - Water in pineapple drink:  $\frac{3}{5} \times 15 = 9$  liters. - Total water in drinks:  $\frac{20}{3} + 9 = \frac{47}{3}$  liters.- After the spill: - Water lost from the spill:  $(\frac{2}{3})$  liters. - Remaining water:  $\frac{47}{3} - \frac{2}{3} = \frac{45}{3} = 15$  liters. Thus, there is 15 liters of water in the remaining 24 liters of the mixture.

The provided solution has calculation errors in considering the impact of the spill and in the final total. The correct answer is 15 liters, not  $(\frac{56}{3})$ .

---

Q: Simplify  $-3(1 + 4i) + i(-2 - i)$ .

R: Step 1: Simplify the first term of the expression. The first term is  $-3(1 + 4i)$ . Using the distributive property, we multiply  $-3$  by both 1 and  $4i$ , giving  $-3 - 12i$ . Step 2: Simplify the second term of the expression. The second term is  $i(-2 - i)$ . Again using the distributive property, we multiply  $i$  by both  $-2$  and  $-i$ , giving  $-2i + i^2$ . Since  $i^2 = -1$ , this simplifies to  $-2i - 1$ . Step 3: Combine the two simplified terms. We now combine the simplified terms from steps 1 and 2:  $-3 - 12i - 2i - 1$ . Combining like terms, we get  $-4 - 14i$ . The final answer is:  $-4 - 14i$ .

A:  $-2 - 14i$

Analysis: The solution contains multiple errors in its simplification and combination of terms:

1. Inaccurate combination of terms during final simplification: When combining all terms  $-3 - 12i - 2i - 1$ , the correct grouping and simplification should be  $(-3 - 1) + (-12i - 2i)$ , resulting in  $-4 - 14i$ . The solution claims the correct answer is  $-2 - 14i$ , which indicates an error in the way the terms were initially evaluated or combined. This shows a discrepancy in the simplification, where a constant term is incorrectly calculated.

2. Lack of careful evaluation of intermediate results: The error doesn't arise from just one step but rather from an incorrect final result. The intermediate calculations are correctly executed in part, leading up to step 2, but then incorrectly combined in step 3. This indicates a failure to carefully evaluate and correctly combine the terms for the final answer, particularly in the grouping of the real number constants.

In conclusion, the error lies in the misinterpretation of how to properly combine all the terms, which leads to an incorrect result.

---

Q:[Question]

R:[Error Response]

A:[Answer]

Analysis:

---

Table 13: Prompt for Mathematical Error Analysis and Summarization.

---

**Instruction:** You are an expert in identifying errors in mathematical problem-solving. Your task is to classify the type of error present in a given solution. Here are the 9 error types you need to choose from:

Calculation Errors (CA): Errors in arithmetic operations.

Counting Errors (CO): Errors in counting or enumeration.

Unit Conversion Errors (UC): Errors involving unit conversions.

Context Value Errors (CV): Errors using incorrect or missing context values.

Hallucinations (HA): Errors where the model invents false information.

Operator Errors (OP): Errors in selecting the correct mathematical operators.

Formula Confusion Errors (FC): Errors using the wrong formula or procedure.

Missing Steps (MS): Errors where necessary steps are missing in the solution.

Contradictory Steps (CS): Errors where the solution has contradictory statements.

For each solution I provide, identify the ONE error type that is present in it. Do not provide any other information.

---

Q: 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?

A: Josh bought the house for \$80,000 and spent \$50,000 on repairs. Therefore, his total cost was  $\$80,000 + \$50,000 = \$130,000$ . The repairs increased the value of the house by 150%. To find how much the value increased, we calculate 150% of the original value by multiplying \$80,000 by 1.5:

$$\$80,000 * 1.5 = \$120,000$$

So, the value of the house after the repairs is \$120,000.

To calculate the profit, we subtract the total cost from the value after the repairs:

$$\$120,000 - \$130,000 = -\$10,000$$

The result is negative, which means Josh did not make a profit. In fact, he had a loss of \$10,000.

Classification: Context Value Errors (CV).

---

Q: Julia's boat sprang a leak while she was out on the lake. The boat was taking on two liters of water for every ten feet she rowed back towards shore. It took her sixteen seconds to row twenty feet. The shore was 64 seconds away. How much water had the boat taken on by the time Julia reached shore?

A: To figure out how much water the boat took on, we need to determine how many times Julia rowed 10 feet towards shore.

We know that it took her 16 seconds to row 20 feet, so it would take her  $16/20 = 0.8$  seconds to row 10 feet.

The shore was 64 seconds away, so Julia rowed towards shore for a total of  $64/0.8 = 80$  units of 10 feet.

For every 10 feet she rowed towards shore, the boat took on 2 liters of water.

Therefore, the boat took on a total of  $80 * 2 = 160$  liters of water by the time Julia reached shore.

Classification: Unit Conversion Errors (UC).

---

Q: Melanie is a door-to-door saleswoman. She sold a third of her vacuum cleaners at the green house, 2 more to the red house, and half of what was left at the orange house. If Melanie has 5 vacuum cleaners left, how many did she start with?

A: Let's work backwards to find the answer. If Melanie has 5 vacuum cleaners left, that means she sold a certain number of vacuum cleaners. Let's call that number  $x$ .

If she sold a third of her vacuum cleaners at the green house, that means she sold  $x/3$  vacuum cleaners.

Then she sold 2 more to the red house, which means she sold  $x/3 + 2$  vacuum cleaners.

After selling to the red house, she had  $x - (x/3 + 2)$  vacuum cleaners left.

Then she sold half of what was left at the orange house, which means she sold  $(x - (x/3 + 2))/2$  vacuum cleaners.

After selling to the orange house, she had 5 vacuum cleaners left, so we can set up an equation:

$$x - (x/3 + 2) - (x - (x/3 + 2))/2 = 5.$$

Now we can solve for  $x$ :

Multiplying both sides of the equation by 6 to eliminate the fractions, we get:

$$6x - 2(x/3 + 2) - 3(x - (x/3 + 2)) = 30.$$

Simplifying the equation, we get:

$$6x - 2x/3 - 4 - 3x + 3(x/3 + 2) = 30.$$

Multiplying through by 3 to eliminate the fractions, we get:

$$18x - 2x - 12 - 9x + 9(x + 6) = 90.$$

Expanding and simplifying the equation, we get:

$$18x - 2x - 12 - 9x + 9x + 54 = 90.$$

Combining like terms, we get:

$$16x + 42 = 90.$$

Subtracting 42 from both sides of the equation, we get:

$$16x = 48.$$

Dividing both sides of the equation by 16, we get:

$$x = 3.$$

So Melanie started with 3 vacuum cleaners. Answer: 3.

Classification: Hallucinations (HA).

---

Q:[Question]

A:[Error Solution]

Classification:

---

Table 14: The prompt provided to the LLM for the 9-class error classification task.

ID	Problem Description	Error Solution Path	Kappa	Acc.
1	At Allan's house, there is twi...nolis Allan has in the house?	Charisma meditates for 15 minu...nThe answer is: 2040 minutes	0.53	0.7
2	Three friends: Mike, Jim, and ...a points had been distributed?	After 3 rounds:\n\n- Mike has ...64 = 104\n\nThe answer is: 104	0.62	0.8
3	An ice cream truck is travelin...n are now following the truck?	Initially, there are 5 childre...ck is 15.\n\nThe answer is: 15	0.86	0.9
4	The power goes out in Brianna'... using when the lights go out?	To find out how many candles a...nswer is:\n\nthe answer is: 40	0.2	0.4
5	It takes 20 minutes for the oi... oil to having cooked chicken?	First, let's calculate the tim...n\nThe answer is:\n51 minutes.	0.14	0.3
6	A bakery produces 60 loaves of...ead are sold in the afternoon?	To find out how many loaves of... conclude:\n\nThe answer is: 5	0.86	0.9
7	Josh decides to take up juggli... on stage with how many balls?	Josh starts with 3 balls in th...h 3 balls.\n\nthe answer is: 3	0.52	0.7
8	The girls are trying to raise ..., did they all raise in total?	First, we calculate how much e...80. \\\n\nThe answer is: 2180	0.86	0.9
9	Mike paid \$\\\$1.25\$ for a stam...e be offered in 12 more years?	Mike originally paid \\(\\$1....ered:\n\n\\boxed{20}\n\\)	0.02	0.1
10	If $\pi=3.1415926...$ , what i...r answer as a common fraction.	To find the exact value of \\(\dots{1423802857}\{1000000000}\n\\)	0.04	0.1
11	Square A and Square B are both... of a \$2009\$ by \$2009\$ square?	To solve this problem, we begi... square is \\(\boxed{503}\n\\).	0.04	0
12	Solve the inequality $\$-13(r+5...$ r answer in interval notation.	Let's solve the inequality ste...\\infty, \\frac{40}{17}\n\\)	0	0
13	Solve for the positive value o...\\sqrt{3}\{x^2 - 4x + 4\} = 16\$.	We start with the equation:\n... is:\n\n\\boxed{46}\n\\)	0	0
14	$\$a$ and $\$b$ are real numbers a...nd $\$a^2b=135\$$ . Compute $\$a+5b\$$ .	Let's tackle the given equatio... is:\n\n\\boxed{136}\n\\)	0	0
15	Two positive numbers $\$p\$$ and $\$...$ e as a factor. Find $\$a+b+c+d\$$ .	Given the conditions that \\(p...r is:\n\n\\boxed{117}\n\\)	0	0.1
16	A man nearing retirement wants...answer to the nearest dollar.)	To determine how much money th...s:\n\n\\boxed{74409}\n\\)	0.02	0
17	The sum of a 15-term arithmeti...What is the common difference?	To find the common difference ...r is:\n\n\\boxed{-3}\n\\)	0	0
18	Simplify $\$\\frac{3}{4}\{\\sqrt{5}\{...$ is the value of the sum $\$a+b\$$ ?	To simplify the given expressi...9\\)\n\n\\boxed{19}\n\\)	0.04	0
19	If $\$x\$$ and $\$y\$$ are positive in... = 115\$, then what is $\$x + y\$$ ?	To solve the problem, we begin... is:\n\n\\boxed{16}\n\\)	0.01	0.1
20	What is the sum of all integer... and less than $\$\\frac{3}{4}\{4\}$$ ?	We are given the inequalities:...m is:\n\n\\boxed{-3}\n\\)	0	0
21	Without looking at the labels,...r answer as a common fraction.	To solve this problem, we must...es is \n\n\\boxed{0}\n\\)	0	0.1
22	Mike draws five cards from a s...swer as a simplified fraction.	To determine the probability t...oxed{\frac{33463}{36096}}\n\\).	0	0
23	Three points are chosen random...than the radius of the circle?	To find the probability that a...s \\(\boxed{\frac{1}{4}}\n\\).	0.03	0
24	A deli sandwich consists of on...l suffer an allergic reaction?	To solve this problem, we need...n\n\\boxed{\frac{1}{11}\{12}\n\\)	0	0.1
25	Let $\$S\$$ be a set containing di...verage of the elements in $\$S,\$$	To find the smallest possible ...:\n\n\\boxed{1007.5}\n\\)	0.02	0.2
26	Find the number of ordered tri... $^4 + y^4 + z^4 - 4xyz = -1$ .\n\\)	To solve the problem, we need ... equation is \\(\boxed{2}\n\\).	0.05	0.1
27	Let $\$S\$$ be a set containing di...verage of the elements in $\$S,\$$	To find the smallest possible ... is:\n\n\\boxed{672}\n\\)	0.01	0.1
28	6 birds were sitting on the fe...irds are sitting on the fence?	Initially, there are 6 birds s... 18 birds\n\nThe answer is: 18	0.19	0.4
29	He then went to see the orange...each sack contains 50 oranges?	To find out how many oranges t...wer is:\n\nthe answer is: 3800	0.3	0.5
30	By himself, Jack can clean a y... ) 4 (B) 8 (C) 22 (D) 50 (E) 20	Jack can clean the whole yacht...work is:\n\nthe answer is: (D)	0.03	0

Figure 7: A breakdown example of GPT-4o's performance in classifying 9 distinct error types (CA, CO, UC, CV, HA, OP, FC, MS, CS) for 30 MWP.

ID	Problem Description	Error Solution Path	Kappa	Acc.
1	At Allan's house, there is twi...nolis Allan has in the house?	Charisma meditates for 15 minu...nThe answer is: 2040 minutes.	1	1
2	Three friends: Mike, Jim, and ...a points had been distributed?	After 3 rounds:\n\n- Mike has ...64 = 104\n\nThe answer is: 104	0.68	0.8
3	An ice cream truck is travelin...n are now following the truck?	Initially, there are 5 childre...ck is 15.\n\nThe answer is: 15	0.48	0.67
4	The power goes out in Brianna'... using when the lights go out?	To find out how many candles a...nswer is:\n\nthe answer is: 40	0.01	0.13
5	It takes 20 minutes for the oi... oil to having cooked chicken?	First, let's calculate the tim...n\nThe answer is:\n51 minutes.	0.12	0.2
6	A bakery produces 60 loaves of...ead are sold in the afternoon?	To find out how many loaves of... conclude:\n\nThe answer is: 5	0.72	0.9
7	Josh decides to take up juggli... on stage with how many balls?	Josh starts with 3 balls in th...h 3 balls.\n\nthe answer is: 3	0.01	0
8	The girls are trying to raise ..., did they all raise in total?	First, we calculate how much e...80. \\\n\nThe answer is: 2180	0	0
9	Mike paid \$\\\$1.25\$ for a stam...e be offered in 12 more years?	Mike originally paid \\(\\$1....ered:\n\n\\boxed{20}\n\\)	0.04	0
10	If $\pi=3.1415926...$ , what i...r answer as a common fraction.	To find the exact value of \\(\dots{1423802857}\{1000000000}\n\\)	0.02	0.07
11	Square A and Square B are both... of a \$2009\$ by \$2009\$ square?	To solve this problem, we begi... square is \\(\boxed{503}\n\\).	0.01	0.03
12	Solve the inequality $\$-13(r+5...$ r answer in interval notation.	Let's solve the inequality ste...\\infty, \\frac{40}{17}\n\\)	0.02	0
13	Solve for the positive value o...\\sqrt{3}\{x^2 - 4x + 4\} = 16\$.	We start with the equation:\n... is:\n\n\\boxed{46}\n\\)	0	0
14	$\$a$ and $\$b$ are real numbers a...nd $\$a^2b=135\$$ . Compute $\$a+5b\$$ .	Let's tackle the given equatio... is:\n\n\\boxed{136}\n\\)	0.02	0.03
15	Two positive numbers $\$p\$$ and $\$...$ e as a factor. Find $\$a+b+c+d\$$ .	Given the conditions that \\(p...r is:\n\n\\boxed{117}\n\\)	0	0.03
16	A man nearing retirement wants...answer to the nearest dollar.)	To determine how much money th...s:\n\n\\boxed{74409}\n\\)	0	0
17	The sum of a 15-term arithmeti...What is the common difference?	To find the common difference ...r is:\n\n\\boxed{-3}\n\\)	0	0.07
18	Simplify $\$\\frac{3}{4}\{\\sqrt{5}\{...$ is the value of the sum $\$a+b\$$ ?	To simplify the given expressi...9\\)\n\n\\boxed{19}\n\\)	0.02	0
19	If $\$x\$$ and $\$y\$$ are positive in... = 115\$, then what is $\$x + y\$$ ?	To solve the problem, we begin... is:\n\n\\boxed{16}\n\\)	0	0
20	What is the sum of all integer... and less than $\$\\frac{3}{4}\{4\}$$ ?	We are given the inequalities:...m is:\n\n\\boxed{-3}\n\\)	0	0
21	Without looking at the labels,...r answer as a common fraction.	To solve this problem, we must...es is \n\n\\boxed{0}\n\\)	0.02	0
22	Mike draws five cards from a s...swer as a simplified fraction.	To determine the probability t...oxed{\frac{33463}{36096}}\n\\).	0	0
23	Three points are chosen random...than the radius of the circle?	To find the probability that a...s \\(\boxed{\frac{1}{4}}\n\\).	0.03	0.03
24	A deli sandwich consists of on...l suffer an allergic reaction?	To solve this problem, we need...n\n\\boxed{\frac{1}{11}\{12}\n\\)	0	0
25	Let $\$S\$$ be a set containing di...verage of the elements in $\$S,\$$	To find the smallest possible ...:\n\n\\boxed{1007.5}\n\\)	0.01	0
26	Find the number of ordered tri... $^4 + y^4 + z^4 - 4xyz = -1$ .\n\\)	To solve the problem, we need ... equation is \\(\boxed{2}\n\\).	0	0
27	Let $\$S\$$ be a set containing di...verage of the elements in $\$S,\$$	To find the smallest possible ... is:\n\n\\boxed{672}\n\\)	0	0
28	6 birds were sitting on the fe...irds are sitting on the fence?	Initially, there are 6 birds s... 18 birds\n\nThe answer is: 18	0.32	0.5
29	He then went to see the orange...each sack contains 50 oranges?	To find out how many oranges t...wer is:\n\nthe answer is: 3800	0.11	0.3
30	By himself, Jack can clean a y... ) 4 (B) 8 (C) 22 (D) 50 (E) 20	Jack can clean the whole yacht...work is:\n\nthe answer is: (D)	0	0

Figure 8: A breakdown example of Claude-3.5-sonnet's performance in classifying 9 distinct error types (CA, CO, UC, CV, HA, OP, FC, MS, CS) for 30 MWP.

```

{
  "dataset_name": "prime_math_competition_en_single_choice_8K_dev",
  "dataset_version": "2023-07-07",
  "qid": "18",
  "queId": "0553053821bd4614aad7145eab4a8f0a",
  "competition_source_list": [],
  "difficulty": "0",
  "qtype": "single_choice",
  "problem": "What is the value of the digit  $7$  in the number  $32.679$ ? ",
  "answer_option_list": [
    [
      {
        "aovAl": "A",
        "content": "seven hundred "
      }
    ],
    [
      {
        "aovAl": "B",
        "content": "\\emph{seventy} "
      }
    ],
    [
      {
        "aovAl": "C",
        "content": "seven tenths "
      }
    ],
    [
      {
        "aovAl": "D",
        "content": "seven hundredths "
      }
    ],
    [
      {
        "aovAl": "E",
        "content": "seven thousandths "
      }
    ]
  ],
  "knowledge_point_routes": [
    "Overseas Competition->Knowledge Point->Number Theory Modules->Place Value and Number Bases->Numbers->Understanding Numbers and Digits"
  ],
  "answer_analysis": null,
  "answer_value": "D"
}

```

Figure 9: TAL-SCQ5K example