

MED-RLVR: EMERGING MEDICAL REASONING FROM A 3B BASE MODEL VIA REINFORCEMENT LEARNING

Sheng Zhang*, Qianchu Liu*, Guanghui Qin*, Tristan Naumann, Hoifung Poon
 Microsoft Research

ABSTRACT

Reinforcement learning from verifiable rewards (RLVR) has recently gained attention for its ability to elicit self-evolved reasoning capabilities from base language models without explicit reasoning supervisions, as demonstrated by DeepSeek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025). While prior work on RLVR has primarily focused on mathematical and coding domains, its applicability to other tasks and domains remains unexplored. In this work, we investigate whether medical reasoning can emerge from RLVR. We introduce MED-RLVR as an initial study of RLVR in the medical domain leveraging medical multiple-choice question answering (MCQA) data as verifiable labels. Our results demonstrate that RLVR is not only effective for math and coding but also extends successfully to medical question answering. Notably, MED-RLVR achieves performance comparable to traditional supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on in-distribution tasks while significantly improving out-of-distribution generalization, with an 8-point accuracy gain. Further analysis of training dynamics reveals that, with no explicit reasoning supervision, reasoning emerges from the 3B-parameter base model. These findings underscore the potential of RLVR in domains beyond math and coding, opening new avenues for its application in knowledge-intensive fields such as medicine.




Figure 1: An Overview of MED-RLVR (See Section 2 for the details).

* Equal contributions.




Figure 2: The training dynamics of MED-RLVR (See Section 4.2.1 for the details).

1 INTRODUCTION

Recent work on reinforcement learning from verifiable rewards (Lambert et al., 2024) has demonstrated promising results, particularly highlighted by DeepSeek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025) where they show that reasoning can emerge from performing RLVR alone from a base model. Subsequent efforts – such as studies in Yeo et al. (2025); Zeng et al. (2025); HuggingFace (2024); EvolvingLMs-Lab (2025) along with others focusing on synthetic datasets (e.g., countdown (Pan et al., 2025) and counting objects (Chen et al., 2025)) – have attempted to replicate and extend the initial findings on the promising direction of RLVR, underscoring both the interest in and challenges of this approach.

Despite these advances, the application of RLVR has predominantly been focused on domains such as mathematics (Lightman et al., 2023) and coding (Jain et al., 2024), leaving open the question of how to extend its benefits to areas without such data. One promising data source for extending RLVR beyond Math/coding is multiple-choice question answer pairs (MCQA) which provides abundant verifiable labels across many domains including medicine. However, there are essential differences between MCQA and math/coding tasks: the answer space of the latter tends to be large and open-ended whereas MCQA features a much smaller answer space. It is unclear whether the benefits observed in math and coding will translate to MCQA. This gap is particularly pronounced in the medical domain, where MCQA tasks—such as those found in the MedQA (Jin et al., 2021) dataset—require sophisticated reasoning with clinical knowledge and have consistently presented significant challenges (Nori et al., 2023).

To bridge this gap, we propose MED-RLVR (Figure 1), an initial exploration of RLVR leveraging MCQA data to elicit medical reasoning from a small base model without explicit reasoning supervision. Our findings are below:

1. RLVR is effective not just for math and coding, but also for multiple-choice medical questions.
2. MED-RLVR achieves comparable performance to traditional supervised finetuning (SFT) in in-distribution settings while demonstrating superior generalization to out-of-distribution scenarios with approximately **8 percentage points improvement in accuracy**.

3. We analyzed the training dynamics of MED-RLVR and observed the emergence of reasoning from the small 3B base model without any supervised reasoning data.

2 MED-RLVR

Reinforcement Learning (RL) is a machine learning algorithm that focuses on learning a policy for an agent to take actions in an environment to maximize cumulative rewards. At each step, the agent observes a state (S), selects an action (A) based on a policy (π), and receives a reward (R) while transitioning to a new state. RL has been affectively applied to language model post-training for aligning to human preference (Ouyang et al., 2022) and more recently to elicit reasoning without any supervisions (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025) for math and coding tasks.

We adopt Proximal policy optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017) as our RL algorithm. PPO works by optimizing a policy using multiple epochs of stochastic gradient ascent on minibatch updates, while ensuring updates do not deviate too much from the previous policy. It does this by using a clipped surrogate objective function, which prevents excessively large policy updates, improving training stability:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{J}_{PPO}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{q \sim P(Q), o \sim \pi_{\theta_{old}}(O|q)} \frac{1}{|O|} \sum_{t=1}^{|O|} \min & \left[\frac{\pi_{\theta}(o_t|q, o_{<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_t|q, o_{<t})} A_t, \right. \\
 & \left. \text{clip}\left(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(o_t|q, o_{<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_t|q, o_{<t})}, 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon\right) A_t \right] \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where π_{θ} and $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$ are the current and old policy models, and q, o are questions and outputs sampled from the question dataset and the old policy $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$, respectively. ϵ is a clipping-related hyperparameter introduced in PPO for stabilizing training. A_t is the advantage, which is computed by applying GAE (Schulman et al., 2015), based on the rewards $\{r_{\geq t}\}$ and a learned value function V_{ψ} . Thus, in PPO, a value function needs to be trained alongside the policy model and to mitigate over-optimization of the reward model, we follow Ouyang et al. (2022) to add a per-token KL penalty from a reference model in the reward at each token, i.e.,

$$r_t = r_{\phi}(q, o) - \beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(o_t|q, o_{<t})}{\pi_{ref}(o_t|q, o_{<t})},$$

where r_{ϕ} is the reward model, π_{ref} is the reference model, which we initialize with a base model, and β is the coefficient of the KL penalty.

Our training recipe follows the RLVR framework in Deepseek-R1-Zero (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025). RLVR refers to the RL training method where the reward model is a verification function instead of a learned reward model (Lambert et al., 2024). In our study, we use a simple rule-based reward function which computes reward based on the outcome. To ensure the model output is both correct and in its correct format, we first check the format of the output and assign a -1.0 penalty if the output does not have a valid format. The valid format should follow `<think>...</think> <answer>...</answer>`. Once the format check is passed, we check the correctness of the output and assign zero reward if the output answer is incorrect and gives a 1.0 reward if the output answer is correct. In other words, only an output that is both correct and is in the correct format will receive a positive reward. We determine if the answer is correct if the option letter in the answer output matches the gold option letter. Below is the pseudo code of the reward function:

```
def reward_fuction(response, answer):
    if not validate_format(response):
        return -1.0
    if extract_answer_choice(response) == answer:
        return 1.0
    else:
        return 0.0
```

We also compare it with alternative reward functions, including those that penalize incorrect answers. Through experiments, we find that penalizing incorrect answers leads to a slight decline in model performance. Additionally, we observe an increase in reward hacking behaviors, where the model directly gives a way the answer within the thinking step.

Note that we train MED-RLVR using only the question inputs and the answer labels, without additional supervision. To test if medical reasoning can emerge purely from RLVR in a similar way mathematical reasoning emerges from DeepSeek-R1-Zero, we perform RLVR directly on a base model without any instruction tuning and without any explicit reasoning supervision.

3 EXPERIMENTS

3.1 DATASET

For training, we use the MedQA-USMLE dataset (Jin et al., 2021), which consists of multi-choice questions sourced from professional medical board exams and covers a wide range of medical topics, requiring domain-specific knowledge and reasoning skills. Note that we do not use the popular “4_options” version of MedQA. Instead, we use the original version, which is more challenging as the questions have more than four options (including “None of the above”). Below is an example question from the dataset:

Question:
 A 23-year-old pregnant woman at 22 weeks gestation presents with burning upon urination. She states it started 1 day ago and has been worsening despite drinking more water and taking cranberry extract. She otherwise feels well and is followed by a doctor for her pregnancy. Her temperature is 97.7°F (36.5°C), blood pressure is 122/77 mmHg, pulse is 80/min, respirations are 19/min, and oxygen saturation is 98% on room air. Physical exam is notable for an absence of costovertebral angle tenderness and a gravid uterus. Which of the following is the best treatment for this patient? Answer with just one of the letters from the options below.

Options:
 A. Ampicillin B. Ceftriaxone C. Ciprofloxacin D. Doxycycline
 E. Nitrofurantoin F. None of the above

Answer: E

Table 1: An example question from MedQA-USMLE dataset which is used to train MED-RLVR. We only used the question and answer labels without any reasoning supervisions.

	MedQA-USMLE (# of questions)	MMLU-Pro-Health (# of questions)
Train	10,178	n/a
Development	1,272	not used
Test	1,273	818

Table 2: Data statistics

For evaluation, we test our model on the *in-distribution* test set of MedQA-USMLE. In addition, to test the generalizability of the models, we also perform evaluation on an *out-of-distribution* test set:

the health subset of MMLU-Pro (Wang et al., 2024) which consists of 818 challenging multiple-choice questions related to health care and medicine. Data statics are summarized in Table 2.

3.2 PROMPT

We adapt the prompt template from DeepSeek-AI et al. (2025), where `{input}` will be replaced with a multi-choice question. We do not force the assistant message to start with `<think>`, because we find that during training the model is able to learn to follow the format requirement quickly. Below is the prompt we used:

A conversation between User and Assistant. The user asks a question, and the assistant solves it. The assistant first thinks about the reasoning process in the mind and then provides the user with the answer. The reasoning process and answer are enclosed within `<think>` `</think>` and `<answer>` `</answer>` tags, respectively, i.e., `<think>` reasoning process here `</think>``<answer>` answer here `</answer>`.
 User: `{input}`
 Assistant:

3.3 TRAINING SETUP

We initialize MED-RLVR with Qwen2.5-3B (QwenTeam, 2024) and use OpenRLHF (Hu et al., 2024) framework to train RLVR with MedQA MCQA labels on the base model for 10 epochs on 4x40G8 A100 GPUs.

Baselines: We compare MED-RLVR against a SFT baseline using the question-answer pairs from the same MedQA training data. The SFT baseline was trained for 10 epochs and we performed grid search for learning rate [1e-5, 5e-6, 1e-6] to ensure competitive performance from this baseline. Notice that the SFT baseline can only directly output answers without reasoning as it was trained to do so. In addition, we also report the direct and chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting results of the Qwen2.5-3B base model.

4 RESULTS

4.1 MAIN RESULTS

Figure 3 below demonstrates that MED-RLVR effectively learns to solve medical multiple-choice question tasks starting from a base model. Compared to SFT, MED-RLVR achieves comparable performance on the in-distribution MedQA test set but outperforms SFT significantly on the out-of-distribution MMLU-Pro-Health task, with an improvement of approximately 8 absolute points in accuracy. This result suggests that while SFT is a strong baseline for in-distribution tasks, it likely relies on spurious correlations and shortcuts to achieve high performance without reasoning. In contrast, the reasoning capabilities acquired from MED-RLVR are more robust and generalizable across tasks. This finding is in line with some recent observations that RL generalizes better than SFT (Chu et al., 2025; Shen et al., 2025).

4.2 ANALYSIS ON THE EMERGING REASONING TRACES

4.2.1 SHIFTS IN REASONING PATTERNS

We conducted analysis and revealed distinct shifts in reasoning patterns throughout the training process. We categorized the process into the following six stages (also illustrated in Figure 2. Table 3 also shows the example reasoning traces for each stage.

Stage 1 (Format Failure): The model fails to follow the format requirements and produces brief, unstructured responses. In line with recent work such as Yeo et al. (2025), we observe that reasoning capabilities already exist in Qwen base models, but the models simply don’t adhere to the specified format instructions.




Figure 3: Comparing MED-RLVR and SFT on in-distribution and out-of-distribution tasks. Standard deviation from 1000 bootstrapping sampling procedures (Tibshirani & Efron, 1993) is reported as error bars.

Stage 2 (Verbose Formatter): The model begins following the format but becomes overly wordy.

Stage 3 (Concise Structurer): The model fully follows the format and begins reasoning more concisely.

Stage 4 (Direct Answer Hacker): The model learns to hack the reward by directly giving away the answer within the thinking step while drastically shortening the thinking length (for example, the model might start the thinking by stating “The correct answer is C” and then explain the reasoning). This intriguing behavior hasn’t been observed in tasks such as math or coding. One possible explanation is that it is unique to MCQA, where the inclusion of answer candidates in the prompt drastically narrows the answer space. During RLVR, the model finds a shortcut to obtain high rewards by leveraging samples that reveal the correct answer early in the thinking step.

We attempted to penalize this behavior, but the model exploited the flexibility of natural language to find alternative ways of revealing the answer early in its reasoning process. Similar patterns have also been observed in larger models such as Qwen2.5-7B. We suspect that employing more capable and larger base models or beginning with SFT models might help mitigate this issue. We leave this investigation for future work.

Stage 5 (Step-by-Step Exploit): The model learns to hack the reward through a different strategy: adding step-by-step reasoning before <think>, which leads to longer response length.

Stage 6 (Reintegrated Reasoning): The model returns to placing reasoning within the thinking step and uses more concise explanations, though it still exhibits reward hacking behavior for some examples.

4.2.2 NO “AHA-MOMENT” YET

In contrast to recent findings in math and coding, we did not observe any self-validation behaviors (i.e., “aha-moments”) in the generated responses for MCQA. Additionally, the overall length of the reasoning process was markedly shorter than what is typically seen in math and coding tasks. This difference might be attributed to the inherently lower reasoning demands of the MCQA task

Stages	Example Question	Example Output
Stage 1: Fails to follow format	27-year-old man presents to the emergency department...The patient is a known IV drug abuser but otherwise has an unknown past medical history...Which of the following is the best next step in management? A: Insulin, IV fluids, and potassium; B: Insulin, potassium, IV fluids, and glucose; C: IV fluids only; D: Oral rehydration; E: Supportive therapy and close monitoring	The patient's initial presentation suggests a hyperglycemic state, likely due to his IV drug abuse and the use of methadone, which can cause hyperglycemia. The subsequent improvement in laboratory values after treatment indicates that the patient's hyperglycemia has been resolved. Therefore, the best next step in management would be to continue supportive therapy and close monitoring, as the patient's hyperglycemia has been addressed. The other options involve interventions that are not necessary in this case.
Stage 2: Verbose Formatter	Two weeks after undergoing an emergency cardiac catheterization with stenting for unstable angina pectoris, a 61-year-old man has decreased urinary output and malaise. ..Which of the following is the most likely cause of this patient's symptoms? A: Renal papillary necrosis; B: Allergic interstitial nephritis; C: Cholesterol embolization; D: Eosinophilic granulomatosis with polyangiitis; E: Polyarteritis nodosa	<code><think></code> The patient's symptoms, including decreased urinary output, malaise, and mottled, reticulated purplish discoloration of the feet, along with laboratory findings such as elevated erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR), elevated creatinine, and abnormal renal biopsy results, suggest a possible vascular issue affecting the kidneys. The presence of intravascular spindle-shaped vacuoles in the renal biopsy further supports this diagnosis. Let's evaluate each option: A: Renal papillary necrosis - This condition typically presents with hematuria, flank pain, and sometimes hypertension. It does not usually present with mottled, reticulated purplish discoloration of the feet or elevated ESR and creatinine levels <code></think></code> <code><answer></code> C: Cholesterol embolization <code></answer></code>
Stage 3 Concise Structurer	A 65-year-old man is brought to the emergency department 30 minutes after the onset of acute chest pain. He has hypertension and asthma...In addition to aspirin, which of the following drugs should be added to this patient's medication regimen? A: Nifedipine; B: Enoxaparin C: Clopidogrel; D: Spironolactone; E: Propranolol	<code><think></code> The patient has acute coronary syndrome and a left ventricular ejection fraction of 58%. He should be treated with aspirin, clopidogrel, and beta-blockers. Nifedipine is a calcium channel blocker that can be used in patients with stable angina, but it is not the best choice for this patient. Enoxaparin is a low-molecular-weight heparin used for anticoagulation, but it is not the best choice for this patient. Spironolactone is a potassium-sparing diuretic, but it is not the best choice for this patient. Propranolol is a beta-blocker that can be used in patients with stable angina, but it is not the best choice for this patient. <code></think><answer></code> C <code></answer></code>
Stage 4: Direct Answer Hacker	A 35-year-old man comes to the physician because of itchy, watery eyes for the past week... Which of the following is the most appropriate treatment? A: Erythromycin ointment; B: Ketotifen eye drops; C: Warm compresses; D: Fluorometholone eye ;drops E: Latanoprost eye drops	<code><think></code> The most appropriate treatment for the patient's symptoms is Ketotifen eye drops. <code></think><answer></code> B <code></answer></code>
Stage 5: Step-by-Step Exploit	A 42-year-old woman comes to the emergency department because of a 2-day history of right upper abdominal pain and nausea. ...Which of the following is the most likely cause of this patient's symptoms? A: Autodigestion of pancreatic parenchyma; B: Hypomotility of the gallbladder; C: Fistula between the gallbladder and small intestine; D: Infection with a hepatotropic virus; E: Obstruction of the cystic duct	To solve this problem, let's go through each option step-by-step and evaluate its likelihood based on the given information... Based on the reasoning process, the most likely cause of the patient's symptoms is <code><think></code> Obstruction of the cystic duct <code></think><answer></code> E <code></answer></code>
Stage 6: Reintegrated Reasoning	A 65-year-old man is brought to the emergency department 30 minutes after the onset of acute chest pain...In addition to aspirin, which of the following drugs should be added to this patient's medication regimen? A: Nifedipine; B: Enoxaparin; C: Clopidogrel; D: Spironolactone; E: Propranolol	<code><think></code> The patient has acute coronary syndrome and a left ventricular ejection fraction of 58%, which suggests the need for antiplatelet therapy. Clopidogrel is a commonly used antiplatelet drug for patients with coronary artery disease. <code></think><answer></code> C <code></answer></code>

Table 3: Example output showing the emerging reasoning traces during the training of MED-RLVR

compared with math and coding. To address this, potential solutions include (1) penalizing responses with overly short chains-of-thought (CoT), and (2) fine-tuning the base models with long CoTs prior to RL.

5 DISCUSSION OF LIMITATIONS

Our initial exploration focuses on multiple-choice question answering (MCQA), a synthetic setting within the field of medicine. While MCQA provides a controlled environment to evaluate model performance, it does not fully represent the complexity and nuance of more practical medical tasks such as open-text question answering, report generation, or even conversational interactions. These tasks often involve richer contexts and require models to handle a wider variety of inputs and outputs, which could present additional challenges not captured in our current approach. Additionally, our exploration has been confined to a unimodal framework, leaving the multimodal setting — where integrating data from sources like images, text, and structured information could enhance diagnostic and decision-making capabilities — largely unexplored. Addressing these areas in future work will be crucial for developing more robust and versatile models for real-world medical applications. Our initial exploration focuses on multiple-choice question answering (MCQA), a synthetic setting within the field of medicine. While MCQA provides a controlled environment to evaluate model performance, it does not fully represent the complexity and nuance of more practical medical tasks such as open-text question answering, report generation, or even conversational interactions. These tasks often involve richer contexts and require models to handle a wider variety of inputs and outputs, which could present additional challenges not captured in our current approach. Additionally, our exploration has been confined to a unimodal framework, leaving the multimodal setting — where integrating data from sources like images, text, and structured information could enhance diagnostic and decision-making capabilities — largely unexplored. Addressing these areas in future work will be crucial for developing more robust and versatile models for real-world medical applications.

6 CONCLUSION

We introduced MED-RLVR, an initial study of Reinforcement Learning with Verifiable Rewards (RLVR) in the medical domain. Our results show that MED-RLVR matches supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on in-distribution tasks while significantly improving out-of-distribution generalization (+8 accuracy points). Notably, medical reasoning emerged without explicit supervision, though challenges like reward hacking were observed. While our study focuses on multiple-choice medical questions, future work should explore more complex medical reasoning tasks and multimodal integration to advance the potential of RL in the medical domain.

REFERENCES

- Liang Chen, Lei Li, Haozhe Zhao, Yifan Song, and Vinci. R1-v: Reinforcing super generalization ability in vision-language models with less than \$3. <https://github.com/Deep-Agent/R1-V>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-02-02.
- Tianzhe Chu, Yuexiang Zhai, Jihan Yang, Shengbang Tong, Saining Xie, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Sergey Levine, and Yi Ma. Sft memorizes, rl generalizes: A comparative study of foundation model post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17161*, 2025.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang,

- Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, T. Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wanjia Zhao, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. Deepseek-rl: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.12948>.
- EvolvingLMMS-Lab. Multimodal open rl. <https://github.com/EvolvingLMMS-Lab/open-rl-multimodal>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-02-13.
- Jian Hu, Xibin Wu, Zilin Zhu, Xianyu, Weixun Wang, Dehao Zhang, and Yu Cao. Openrlhf: An easy-to-use, scalable and high-performance rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11143*, 2024.
- HuggingFace. Open rl. <https://github.com/huggingface/open-rl>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-02-13.
- Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. Livecodebench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams. *Applied Sciences*, 11(14):6421, 2021.
- Nathan Lambert, Jacob Morrison, Valentina Pyatkin, Shengyi Huang, Hamish Ivison, Faeze Brahman, Lester James V Miranda, Alisa Liu, Nouha Dziri, Shane Lyu, et al. Tulu 3: Pushing frontiers in open language model post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15124*, 2024.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*, 2023.
- Harsha Nori, Yin Tat Lee, Sheng Zhang, Dean Carignan, Richard Edgar, Nicolo Fusi, Nicholas King, Jonathan Larson, Yuanzhi Li, Weishung Liu, et al. Can generalist foundation models outcompete special-purpose tuning? case study in medicine. *Medicine*, 84(88.3):77–3, 2023.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.
- Jiayi Pan, Junjie Zhang, Xingyao Wang, Lifan Yuan, Hao Peng, and Alane Suhr. Tinyzero. <https://github.com/Jiayi-Pan/TinyZero>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-01-24.
- QwenTeam. Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models, September 2024. URL <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2.5/>.
- John Schulman, Philipp Moritz, Sergey Levine, Michael Jordan, and Pieter Abbeel. High-dimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02438*, 2015.

- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Haozhan Shen, Zilun Zhang, Qianqian Zhang, Ruochen Xu, and Tiancheng Zhao. Vlm-r1: A stable and generalizable r1-style large vision-language model. <https://github.com/om-ai-lab/VLM-R1>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-02-15.
- Robert J Tibshirani and Bradley Efron. An introduction to the bootstrap. *Monographs on statistics and applied probability*, 57(1):1–436, 1993.
- Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, et al. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–2406, 2024.
- Edward Yeo, Yuxuan Tong, Morry Niu, Graham Neubig, and Xiang Yue. Demystifying long chain-of-thought reasoning in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03373*, 2025.
- Weihao Zeng, Yuzhen Huang, Wei Liu, Keqing He, Qian Liu, Zejun Ma, and Junxian He. 7b model and 8k examples: Emerging reasoning with reinforcement learning is both effective and efficient. <https://hkust-nlp.notion.site/simplerl-reason>, 2025. Notion Blog.