

Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners Benefit from Model Merging

Xiangchi Yuan¹, Chunhui Zhang², Zheyuan Liu³, Dachuan Shi¹,
Soroush Vosoughi², Wenke Lee¹

¹Georgia Institute of Technology, ²Dartmouth College, ³University of Notre Dame
{xyuan300, dshi77, wenke}@gatech.edu
{chunhui.zhang.gr, soroush}@dartmouth.edu
zliu29@nd.edu

Abstract

As scaled language models (LMs) approach human-level reasoning capabilities, self-improvement emerges as a solution to synthesizing high-quality data corpus. While previous research has identified model collapse as a risk in self-improvement, where model outputs become increasingly deterministic, we discover a more fundamental challenge: *the superficial self-improved reasoners phenomenon*. In particular, our analysis reveals that even when LMs show improved in-domain (ID) reasoning accuracy, they actually compromise their generalized reasoning capabilities on out-of-domain (OOD) tasks due to *memorization* rather than genuine *learning*. Through a systematic investigation of LM architecture, we discover that during self-improvement, LM weight updates are concentrated in less reasoning-critical layers, leading to superficial learning. To address this, we propose Iterative Model Merging (IMM), a method that strategically combines weights from original and self-improved models to preserve generalization while incorporating genuine reasoning improvements. Our approach effectively mitigates both LM collapse and superficial learning, moving towards more stable self-improving systems.

1 Introduction

The remarkable reasoning capabilities (Jaech et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2025) of large language models (LLMs) largely benefits from vast amounts of high-quality reasoning data. However, as the data corpus runs out (Sutskever, 2024) and increasingly powerful models approach human-level intelligence (DeepMind, 2024a,b), pressing issues emerge: (i) How to advance models’ reasoning capabilities despite data scarcity? (ii) How to obtain training data that exceeds human-level performance for next-generation models? A promising answer to both questions is model self-improvement or self-evolution, where models autonomously generate infinite high-quality data, which potentially




Figure 1: The Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners phenomenon is mitigated by iterative model merging. Our method improves ID and OOD reasoning performances.

surpasses human annotations, to continuously enhance their own performance.

Although self-improvement has achieved remarkable success in specific domains such as mathematics (OpenAI, 2025; DeepMind, 2024a), coding (Li et al., 2022), and games (Hu et al., 2024; Silver et al., 2018), recent studies reveal significant risks associated with using self-generated synthetic data for fine-tuning: in particular, model performance can degrade over multiple iterations of self-improvement, a phenomenon known as *model collapse*. (Shumailov et al., 2023). In current research, model collapse is primarily attributed to a reduction in sampling diversity (Shumailov et al., 2023; Alemohammad et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024). To mitigate this problem, several studies suggest refreshing synthetic data with real data (Bertrand et al., 2024; Alemohammad et al., 2024), accumulating data across training steps (Gerstgrasser et al., 2024), and incorporating data verifiers (Gillman et al., 2024) or correctors (Feng et al., 2025). However, by focusing solely on data quality and diversity, these approaches overlook a more critical question: whether self-improvement genuinely enhances reasoning capabilities or merely memorizes the training distribution. This distinction becomes

crucial when considering the model’s ability to generalize beyond its training data.

In this paper, we investigate a fundamental risk in model self-improvement for reasoning tasks that deepens the known challenge of model collapse. We identify a phenomenon we call *Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners*, where models appear to improve but actually fail to develop genuine reasoning capabilities. While these models show enhanced performance on in-domain (ID) reasoning tasks, they significantly underperform on out-of-domain (OOD) tasks, suggesting memorization rather than genuine reasoning improvement. To understand the mechanistic cause of this phenomenon, we perform a systematic analysis of the model architecture during self-improvement. By examining layer importance and parameter changes, we uncover a critical mismatch: the largest weight updates occur in layers that contribute least to reasoning, while reasoning-critical layers receive minimal updates. This mismatch explains why models tend to memorize training patterns rather than develop generalizable reasoning skills. To address this issue, we propose *Iterative Model Merging (IMM)*, a novel method that strategically combines weights from original and self-improved models. IMM specifically targets the layer misalignment problem by preserving the stability of reasoning-critical layers while allowing beneficial updates from self-improvement. As demonstrated in Figure 1, this approach effectively balances performance improvements with preserved generalization ability.

A summary of the contributions is given below:

- This work identifies the risk of self-improvement for reasoning: while the model enhances its reasoning capabilities, it still tends to memorize the training data, resulting in a loss of generalized reasoning ability. We refer to this phenomenon as *Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners*.
- We provide an explanation for the emergence of *Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners* by highlighting a mismatch between the reasoning-critical layers and the layers that undergo the largest weight changes during self-improvement.
- We propose **IMM** (*Iterative Model Merging*) to mitigate *Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners*. IMM offers an efficient approach to integrate the reasoning improvements of the self-improved model while preserving the generalization ability of the original model.

2 Related Work

LLMs for Reasoning LLMs have demonstrated remarkable success across various reasoning tasks, including mathematical problem-solving, code generation, common-sense reasoning, and multimodal understanding (Yu et al., 2024b; Lewkowycz et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2025a,b). Beyond leveraging sophisticated prompting techniques to enhance reasoning capabilities (Kojima et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2023; Yao et al., 2024), many methods focus on fine-tuning LLMs with reasoning datasets to create more robust reasoners (Lu et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2024b). For instance, approaches like SI (Huang et al., 2022), STaR (Zelikman et al., 2022), V-STaR (Hosseini et al., 2024), and rSTaR (Qi et al., 2025) fine-tune LLMs on task-specific datasets or synthesize reasoning data tailored for corresponding tasks. In addition to training models to generate correct answers, some studies introduce external verifiers (Cobbe et al., 2021; Lightman et al., 2023; Hosseini et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024a) that select the best answer from a set of candidate solutions.

LLM Self-Improvement Given the high cost of labeling data, it is increasingly common to leverage LLMs to generate synthetic responses for training student models. Traditionally, this process has focused on knowledge distillation from stronger teacher models (Yuan et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2024). More recently, studies have demonstrated that distilling from weaker models—referred to as *weak-to-strong knowledge distillation*—can be more beneficial for LLMs compared to distilling from stronger models, given the same computational budget (Bansal et al., 2024). Another emerging direction is LLM self-improvement, where models improve themselves using their own outputs (Huang et al., 2022; Gulcehre et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2023). In the context of reasoning tasks, various self-improvement methods have been proposed: SPO (Prasad et al., 2024) employs Self-Consistency Preference Optimization for self-improvement; Pang et al. (2024) iteratively generate and refine data to optimize the model’s reasoning ability; and Hosseini et al. (2024) utilize both correct and incorrect answers to improve reasoning performance through training an additional verifier.

Model Collapse As real-world data becomes increasingly scarce (Sutskever, 2024), synthetic data is playing a crucial role in training modern genera-




Figure 2: Superficial Self-improved Reasoners. The model’s performance is only improved on in-domain reasoning datasets while losing the generalized reasoning capabilities on out-of-domain reasoning datasets.

tive models due to its low cost and infinite availability. However, recent studies have revealed the risks associated with this "free lunch," a phenomenon known as model collapse (Shumailov et al., 2023). The model collapse has been extensively identified and analyzed in both computer vision (Hataya et al., 2023; He et al., 2022; Bohacek and Farid, 2023) and natural language processing (Alemohammad et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024; Gerstgrasser et al., 2024). Researchers have investigated its underlying causes from both empirical (Padmakumar and He, 2024; Dou et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2023) and theoretical perspectives (Yuan et al., 2024a; Bertrand et al., 2023; Seddik et al., 2024). Current approaches to mitigating model collapse predominantly focus on data-centric methods. Feng et al. (2025) show that imperfect verifiers can help prevent model collapse by selecting appropriate data. Shumailov et al. (2023) proposes mixing data from previous iterations to prevent performance degradation, while Gerstgrasser et al. (2024) demonstrates that accumulating synthetic data over iterations reduces the risk of collapse.

3 Superficial Self-improved Reasoners

A natural and critical question arises for LLM self-improvement: does learning from synthetic reasoning data generated by the model itself trade off generalization ability for improved reasoning performance because of learning from itself? Our study shows that the answer is yes. In this section, we first confirm that self-improvement enhances in-domain reasoning performance but degrades general reasoning capabilities. We then investigate the underlying cause of this phenomenon by analyzing the layer-wise importance of the model during reasoning and tracking weight changes throughout the self-improvement process. A detailed compar-

ison reveals a notable mismatch: the layers most crucial for reasoning experience relatively small weight updates, while less critical layers undergo more significant changes. This suggests that strong reasoning layers fail to substantially improve their reasoning ability through weight updates, whereas less important layers tend to overfit the training data rather than truly learning to reason.

3.1 Identify Superficial Self-improved Reasoners from OOD datasets

In this part, we identify Superficial Self-improved Reasoners by self-improving LLMs on the in-domain (ID) reasoning datasets and test them on out-of-domain (OOD) reasoning datasets.

Synthesizing Reasoning Data for Self-improvement We begin by establishing the self-improvement framework through the generation of reasoning data. Following prior work (Zelikman et al., 2022), we first synthesize reasoning data for fine-tuning. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(q_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_d}$ denote a training dataset containing n_d reasoning questions q_i and corresponding final answers a_i . We also use Chain-of-Thought prompting (Wei et al., 2022) with in-context examples in this process (details in Appendix A). In the second step, we sample multiple solutions for each q_i using non-zero sampling temperatures, resulting in a synthetic dataset $\mathcal{D}_S = \{(q_i, \{\hat{r}_{ij}, \hat{a}_{ij}\}_{j=1}^k)\}$, where k represents the number of sampled solutions. Here, \hat{r}_{ij} denotes the j -th reasoning path (i.e., rationale) generated by the model for q_i , and \hat{a}_{ij} is the model’s corresponding final answer. Incorrect solutions are then filtered out by comparing the sampled answers \hat{a}_{ij} with the ground-truth answers a_i . Finally, we fine-tune the model on the filtered dataset $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_G$ using supervised fine-tuning (SFT) to maximize the likelihood




Figure 3: The Layer Importance Scores of strong reasoning model Qwen2.5-1.5B-Math on BookCorpus (left) and MATH datasets (right). The middle layers are less important while the early and late layers are more important for reasoning (MATH). For non-reasoning task (BookCorpus) middle layers are more important.




Figure 4: The weight change for SFT Qwen2.5-1.5B with self-improvement MATH data (left) and fully post-training Qwen2.5-1.5B to Qwen2.5-1.5B-Math using real data with 700B tokens (right).

of generating reasoning paths r , optimizing the following objective:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(q,r,a) \sim \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_G} [\log p_{\theta}(r, a|q)]. \quad (1)$$

Loss of Generalized Reasoning Ability during Self-Improvement After applying the self-improvement framework to LLMs of various scales on in-domain (ID) datasets, we evaluate their performance on out-of-domain (OOD) reasoning datasets. The results, presented in Figure 2, reveal that while self-improvement enhances reasoning performance on ID datasets, it leads to a noticeable decline in performance on OOD datasets. This phenomenon suggests that although self-improvement improves metrics on ID reasoning tasks, it fails to enhance generalized reasoning capabilities and may even degrade them. We refer to this behavior as the emergence of *Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners*.

3.2 Investigating the Causes of Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners

While numerous studies on catastrophic forgetting focus on analyzing and addressing OOD performance degradation in continual learning for learning simpler tasks, our work specifically targets the more challenging domain of mathematical reasoning in LLMs, with an emphasis on understanding

the phenomenon of Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners. In this section, we identify the most critical layers for reasoning, analyze how their weights evolve during the self-improvement process, and provide an explanation for the emergence of Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners.

Layer Importance for Reasoning To identify the most important weights in LLMs for reasoning, our objective is to determine and remove the weights that have the greatest impact on the model’s prediction, which can be measured by the resulting change in loss. We denote the linear weight matrix as $\mathbf{W}^{k,n} = [W_{i,j}^{k,n}]$, where k represents the modules (e.g., a key projection in the multi-head attention (MHA) or an up-projection in the feed-forward network (FFN)) within the n -th LLM layer. We quantify the importance of each weight by measuring the error introduced when the corresponding parameter is removed. Given an in-domain reasoning dataset \mathcal{D} , the importance score $I_{i,j}^{k,n}$ for the weight $W_{i,j}^{k,n}$ is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{i,j}^{k,n} &= |\Delta \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})| \\ &= \left| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})}{\partial W_{i,j}^{k,n}} W_{i,j}^{k,n} - \frac{1}{2} W_{i,j}^{k,n} H_{kk} W_{i,j}^{k,n} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathcal{O}(\|W_{i,j}^{k,n}\|^3) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

However, due to the significant computational cost associated with the large number of parameters in LLMs, we approximate the Hessian matrix H_{kk} using the Fisher information matrix, following the approach in Ma et al. (2023). This allows us to approximate the second-order term $\frac{1}{2} W_{i,j}^{k,n} H_{kk} W_{i,j}^{k,n}$ as $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_j)}{\partial W_i^k} W_i^k \right)^2$. By omitting the second-order derivative, the importance score $I_{i,j}^{k,n}$ is simplified to: $I_{i,j}^{k,n} \approx \left| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})}{\partial W_{i,j}^{k,n}} W_{i,j}^{k,n} \right|$. To assess the contribution of each layer to reasoning, we define the layer importance score as:

$$I^n = \sum_{W_{i,j}^{k,n}} \left| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})}{\partial W_{i,j}^{k,n}} W_{i,j}^{k,n} \right|. \quad (3)$$

We leverage this layer importance score I^n to identify which layers contribute most significantly to reasoning tasks. As illustrated in Figure 3, the middle layers are less important while the early and late layers are more important for the reasoning (MATH) task. However, for the non-reasoning

Model	Reasoning-Critical Layer	Most Weight Change Layer	Generalized Reasoning Capability
Self-Improved	Early, late	Middle	✗
Fully Post-trained	Early, late	Early, late	✓

Table 1: Comparison of self-improved model and fully post-trained math model.

dataset BookCorpus, the middle layers are more important. This observation highlights the early and late layers as reasoning-critical layers, distinguishing their specialized function in reasoning.

Layer Weight Change after Self-Improvement

After fine-tuning the LLMs on reasoning data, the weights are updated, enabling the model to learn reasoning capabilities. We now analyze these weight changes. Let $\Delta \mathbf{W}^n$ represent the total weight change at the n -th layer after supervised fine-tuning (SFT), defined as:

$$\Delta \mathbf{W}^n = \sum_k \left\| \mathbf{W}^{k,n} - \mathbf{W}_{\text{SFT}}^{k,n} \right\|, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{W}^{k,n}$ denotes the original k -th weight matrix and $\mathbf{W}_{\text{SFT}}^{k,n}$ is the fine-tuned weight matrix. Figure 4 illustrates the weight change $\Delta \mathbf{W}^n$ across different layers. For the self-improved model, the largest weight change occurs in the middle layers. In contrast, for the math model which is fully post-trained with stronger generalized reasoning capability, the most significant weight changes are concentrated in the early and late layers.

Takeaway By analyzing Figure 3 and Figure 4 (left), we observe that the middle layers (reasoning-trivial layers) are the least important for the strong reasoning capabilities of LLMs, yet these layers undergo the most significant updates during the self-improvement process. This phenomenon highlights a contradiction in how reasoning ability is acquired. If the model were solely learning generalized reasoning, the most substantial weight updates would occur in the early and late layers (reasoning-critical layers), as observed in fully post-trained math models with strong generalized reasoning capabilities, rather than in the middle layers. This observation suggests that during self-improvement, the model does not exclusively enhance its reasoning ability but also exhibits a tendency to overfit the training data, effectively "memorizing" it. This overfitting behavior explains the improved performance on ID datasets while compromising the model’s generalization to OOD tasks. The performance comparison in Figure 2 further

supports this conclusion. We summarize all experimental findings in Table 1, which leads to the following key insights: (i) during self-improvement on reasoning tasks, LLMs may show improved reasoning performance on ID tasks but lose generalized reasoning ability on OOD tasks; (ii) This phenomenon arises from a mismatch between the reasoning-critical layers and the layers with significant weight changes, suggesting that the model memorizes the training data rather than truly learning generalized reasoning capability.

4 Superficial Self-improved Reasoners Benefit from Iterative Model Merging

Iterative Model Merging (IMM) In this section, we propose Iterative Model Merging (IMM) to mitigate the *Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners* phenomenon, as illustrated in Figure 5. In the first self-improvement iteration, we self improve the original base model and merge the resulting SFT model θ_{SFT}^0 with the base model θ to obtain the merged model θ_m^0 . In each subsequent iteration t ($t > 0$), we continue the self-improvement process by fine-tuning the previously merged model θ_m^{t-1} . The resulting self-improved model θ_{SFT}^t is then merged with the original base model to obtain the updated merged model θ_m^t . To formally describe this process, we define the parameter change δ^t during each SFT iteration as follows:

$$\delta^t = \begin{cases} \theta_{\text{SFT}}^t - \theta_m^t, & \text{if } t > 0, \text{ SFT merged model,} \\ \theta_{\text{SFT}}^t - \theta, & \text{if } t = 0, \text{ SFT base model.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

We then incorporate DARE (Yu et al., 2024a) to further process δ^t . DARE identifies parameter redundancy in LLMs, randomly masking parameter changes at a drop rate p while scaling the remaining updates to improve the performance of the merged model. Denoting $\mathbf{m} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$, DARE can be expressed as:

$$\tilde{\delta}^t = (1 - \mathbf{m}) \odot \delta^t, \quad \hat{\delta}^t = \tilde{\delta}^t / (1 - p).$$

By incorporating DARE into our iterative model merging framework, the final update for each iteration t is given by:

$$\theta_m^{t+1} = \alpha \theta + (1 - \alpha)(\theta^t + \hat{\delta}^t), \quad (6)$$

where α is a scaling parameter that controls the balance between the base model weights and the self-improved model weights.




Figure 5: The overall framework. **(a)** The model generates chain-of-thought (CoT) answers for the given questions, and incorrect answers are filtered out using the ground-truth. The remaining correct answers are used for supervised fine-tuning (SFT) to self-improve the model. **(b)** IMM iteratively SFT the model and merges the self-improved models with the base model to balance reasoning enhancement and generalization.

Insights for IMM The rationale behind model merging for generalized reasoning capability can be understood from two perspectives: *(i)* Based on the experimental observations in Section 3, the weights of reasoning-critical layers undergo significant changes during self-improvement, indicating that these layers are likely memorizing the training data. Given the blurred boundary between reasoning-critical and reasoning-trivial layers, it is plausible that middle layers also contribute to memorization, while late layers are partially involved in reasoning. As a result, excessive weight updates across all layers can lead to overfitting, especially when the training data is synthesized by the model itself. Model merging mitigates this overfitting by limiting weight changes. *(ii)* The base model retains strong generalization capabilities, while the self-improved model exhibits self-improved reasoning performance. Model merging combines the strengths of both, integrating the generalization ability of the base model with the reasoning improvements from the self-improved model.

5 Experiments

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed method. Specifically, our experiments aim to address the following research questions: *(i)* Can our method prevent model collapse on complex reasoning tasks during iterative self-improvement? *(ii)* How well does our method perform on OOD reasoning tasks? *(iii)* Can our method be extended from self-improvement to knowledge distillation from a stronger model?

5.1 Setup

Datasets We train the model on MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) and GSM-8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) datasets correspondingly to evaluate the in-domain reasoning ability of the model, while evaluate it on MAWPS (Koncel-Kedziorski et al., 2016), SAT-Math (Zhong et al., 2024) datasets to evaluate the out-of-domain reasoning ability.

Models We include three LLMs at different scales (Qwen2.5-0.5B-Instruct, Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct (Yang and et al., 2024) and Llama2-7B (Touvron et al., 2023)) for self-improvement training. For the distillation experiment we include stronger teacher models Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct for distillation.

Baselines We evaluate our method by comparing it with four baselines. First, we consider **Vanilla** (STaR (Zelikman et al., 2022)), which iteratively generates reasoning data following the procedure in Section 3 for self-improvement. Second, we include **Data Mixture** (Shumailov et al., 2023), which mitigates performance degradation by mixing a portion of data from previous iterations. Third, we compare with **Data Accumulation** (Gerstgrasser et al., 2024), which demonstrates that accumulating synthetic data across iterations can prevent model collapse.

Evaluation We evaluate the model performance by computing $\text{pass}@k = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_G} \left[1 - \frac{\binom{M-c}{k}}{\binom{M}{k}} \right]$, where c is the number of correct answers, out of total answer M and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_G}[\cdot]$ is the expectation for overall generated dataset \mathcal{D}_G . Therefore, $\text{pass}@k$ measures the fraction of unique questions that have




Figure 6: The model performances on in-domain (ID) datasets performance. SFT n and Merge n denote the SFT model and merged model in the n -th iteration cycle. The model collapse happens from the first or second iteration for baselines while our method avoids it and achieves the best performance after model merging.




Figure 7: The model performances on out-of-domain (OOD) datasets. SFT n and Merge n denote the SFT model and merged model in the n -th iteration cycle. Baselines' performances decrease on most datasets, while IMM can generally maintain the OOD performance compared with the original base model.

at least one correct answer when sampling k answers per question from the model.

We also provide the training and implementation details in Appendix B.

5.2 Main Results for Self-improvement

To answer the first research question, we conducted extensive experiments in a model collapse setting

(iterative self-improvement) using two mathematical reasoning datasets, GSM8K and MATH. The results, shown in Figure 6, highlight that across three self-improvement iterations with three different LLMs, model collapse occurs in the first or second iteration for the baseline methods. In contrast, our method successfully avoids model collapse and achieves the best performance after applying model




Figure 8: ID performance with different k for scaling up test-time-computing Pass@ k .

merging. Not only does our method significantly delay model collapse, but it also maintains superior performance across all iterations. Moreover, we observe that LLMs of all scales benefit from our model merging strategy, with smaller models suffering more severely from model collapse in the absence of this approach. Given the rising importance of test-time computing (Snell et al., 2024), we further evaluate our method by generating multiple answers and measuring pass@ k accuracy. As shown in Figure 8, our method consistently improves performance as k increases and outperforms both the base models and the SFT models.

5.3 OOD Generalization Results

To answer the second research question, We evaluate the checkpoints from Section 5.2 using two out-of-domain (OOD) math reasoning datasets: SAT Math and MAWPS. The results, presented in Figure 7, show that while all other baselines suffer significant OOD performance degradation after iterative self-improvement, our method consistently restores performance after each model merging step and, in some cases, even surpasses the original base model. The only exception is the Qwen2.5-0.5B-Instruct model on the MAWPS dataset. We hypothesize that this dataset closely resembles the in-domain data, where extensive ID training significantly improves performance (from 12.8% to 62.9%), which may cause a slight degradation during the model merging process. Overall, these results demonstrate the great potential of our method, as it successfully mit-

Student	Domain	Datasets	Base	SFT	Merged
Qwen2.5-1.5B Instruct	ID	GSM8K	<u>63.0</u>	54.4	71.6
		MATH	24.3	45.0	<u>42.6</u>
	OOD	SAT_Math	75.0	<u>75.0</u>	87.5
		MAWPS	90.0	<u>72.8</u>	24.5
Llama2-7B	ID	GSM8K	3.6	49.2	<u>38.8</u>
		MATH	3.6	<u>10.3</u>	12.5
	OOD	SAT_Math	<u>25.0</u>	18.8	28.1
		MAWPS	<u>64.1</u>	55.1	76.6

Table 2: Student models’ performance with distilling from stronger model setting. The best and runner-up accuracies are **bolded** and underlined respectively.

igates the generalization drop commonly observed during SFT on specific tasks or datasets. Additional OOD datasets results can be found in Appendix F.

5.4 Distillation from Stronger Models

Considering self-improvement may only one of paradigm for LLM distillation, we extend our method to a broader field to answer the third research question. We distill stronger Qwen2.5-7B-Instruction model into the weaker Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruction and Llama-2-7B models. The results in Table 2 demonstrate that the merged models consistently improve or maintain comparable performance on ID tasks, while often achieving significant improvements in OOD performance. This indicates that our method not only preserves task-specific performance but also enhances the model’s generalized reasoning ability when distilling from a stronger teacher model.

6 Conclusion

This study identifies that self-improved LLM reasoners still lack generalized reasoning capability on OOD datasets, although they have better ID reasoning performances. We refer to this phenomenon as Superficial Self-Improved Reasoners and investigate its underlying causes. Our analysis reveals that during the self-improvement process, the layer weights change order doesn’t match the order of importance layers. This mismatch suggests that instead of solely learning to reason, the model also memorizes the training data. To address this issue, we propose Iterative Model Merging and extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our method: it not only mitigates model collapse but also have a generalized reasoning capability.

Limitations

The proposed Iterative Model Merging (IMM) method currently employs a fixed-weight merging mechanism between the original and self-improved models. However, more advanced strategies, such as dynamic or layer-adaptive merging, could provide further improvements. Additionally, although IMM has proven to effectively maintain generalized reasoning capabilities, it doesn't investigate the strategy of mixing real and synthetic data appropriately, which could further enhance the trade-offs between reasoning improvement and generalization. We leave the exploration of advanced merging mechanisms and the optimal mixture ratio of real and synthetic data for future work.

References

- Sina Alemohammad, Josue Casco-Rodriguez, Lorenzo Luzi, Ahmed Imtiaz Humayun, Hossein Babaei, Daniel LeJeune, Ali Siahkoobi, and Richard Baraniuk. 2024. Self-consuming generative models go MAD. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Peter Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. Mathqa: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13319*.
- Hritik Bansal, Arian Hosseini, Rishabh Agarwal, Vinh Q Tran, and Mehran Kazemi. 2024. Smaller, weaker, yet better: Training llm reasoners via compute-optimal sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16737*.
- Quentin Bertrand, Avishek Joey Bose, Alexandre Duplessis, Marco Jiralerspong, and Gauthier Gidel. 2023. On the stability of iterative retraining of generative models on their own data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00429*.
- Quentin Bertrand, Joey Bose, Alexandre Duplessis, Marco Jiralerspong, and Gauthier Gidel. 2024. On the stability of iterative retraining of generative models on their own data. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Matyas Bohacek and Hany Farid. 2023. Nepotistically trained generative-ai models collapse. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12202*.
- 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, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>.
- Jeremy Cohen, Elan Rosenfeld, and Zico Kolter. 2019. Certified adversarial robustness via randomized smoothing. In *international conference on machine learning*.
- DeepMind. 2024a. Ai solves imo problems at a silver medal level. URL <https://deepmind.google/discover/blog/ai-solves-imo-problems-at-silver-medal-level/>.
- DeepMind. 2024b. Alphazero: Shedding new light on chess, shogi, and go. URL <https://deepmind.google/discover/blog/alphazero-shedding-new-light-on-chess-shogi-and-go/>.
- Guangyao Dou, Zheyuan Liu, Qing Lyu, Kaize Ding, and Eric Wong. 2024. Avoiding copyright infringement via machine unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10952*.
- Yunzhen Feng, Elvis Dohmatob, Pu Yang, Francois Charton, and Julia Kempe. 2025. Beyond model collapse: Scaling up with synthesized data requires verification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Matthias Gerstgrasser, Rylan Schaeffer, Apratim Dey, Rafael Rafailov, Tomasz Korbak, Henry Sleight, Rajashree Agrawal, John Hughes, Dhruv Bhandarkar Pai, Andrey Gromov, Dan Roberts, Diyi Yang, David L. Donoho, and Sanmi Koyejo. 2024. Is model collapse inevitable? breaking the curse of recursion by accumulating real and synthetic data. In *Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Nate Gillman, Michael Freeman, Daksh Aggarwal, Chia-Hong Hsu, Calvin Luo, Yonglong Tian, and Chen Sun. 2024. Self-correcting self-consuming loops for generative model training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Ksenia Konyushkova, Lotte Weerts, Abhishek Sharma, Aditya Siddhant, Alex Ahern, Miaosen Wang, Chenjie Gu, et al. 2023. Reinforced self-training (rest) for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08998*.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.
- Yanzhu Guo, Guokan Shang, Michalis Vazirgiannis, and Chloé Clavel. 2023. The curious decline of linguistic diversity: Training language models on synthetic text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09807*.
- Yanzhu Guo, Guokan Shang, Michalis Vazirgiannis, and Chloé Clavel. 2024. The curious decline of linguistic diversity: Training language models on synthetic text. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*.

- Ryuichiro Hataya, Han Bao, and Hiromi Arai. 2023. Will large-scale generative models corrupt future datasets? In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Ruifei He, Shuyang Sun, Xin Yu, Chuhui Xue, Wenqing Zhang, Philip Torr, Song Bai, and Xiaojuan Qi. 2022. Is synthetic data from generative models ready for image recognition? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07574*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*.
- 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. In *Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Arian Hosseini, Xingdi Yuan, Nikolay Malkin, Aaron Courville, Alessandro Sordani, and Rishabh Agarwal. 2024. V-star: Training verifiers for self-taught reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06457*.
- Lanxiang Hu, Qiyu Li, Anze Xie, Nan Jiang, Ion Stoica, Haojian Jin, and Hao Zhang. 2024. Gamearena: Evaluating llm reasoning through live computer games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.06394*.
- Jiaxin Huang, Shixiang Shane Gu, Le Hou, Yuexin Wu, Xuezhi Wang, Hongkun Yu, and Jiawei Han. 2022. Large language models can self-improve. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11610*.
- Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. 2024. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Subhro Roy, Aida Amini, Nate Kushman, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2016. MAWPS: A math word problem repository. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.
- Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Andreassen, David Dohan, Ethan Dyer, Henryk Michalewski, Vinay Ramasesh, Ambrose Slone, Cem Anil, Imanol Schlag, Theo Gutman-Solo, et al. 2022. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. 2022. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2023. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*.
- Zheyuan Liu, Guangyao Dou, Zhaoxuan Tan, Yijun Tian, and Meng Jiang. 2024. Towards safer large language models through machine unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10058*.
- Zimu Lu, Aojun Zhou, Houxing Ren, Ke Wang, Weikang Shi, Junting Pan, Mingjie Zhan, and Hongsheng Li. 2024. Mathgenie: Generating synthetic data with question back-translation for enhancing mathematical reasoning of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16352*.
- Xinyin Ma, Gongfan Fang, and Xinchao Wang. 2023. Llm-pruner: On the structural pruning of large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:21702–21720.
- 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*.
- OpenAI. 2025. Openai o3-mini. [URL https://openai.com/index/openai-o3-mini/](https://openai.com/index/openai-o3-mini/).
- Vishakh Padmakumar and He He. 2024. Does writing with language models reduce content diversity? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, He He, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason E Weston. 2024. Iterative reasoning preference optimization. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- 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*.
- Archiki Prasad, Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Jing Xu, Maryam Fazel-Zarandi, Mohit Bansal, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jason Weston, and Jane Yu. 2024. Self-consistency preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04109*.

- Zhenting Qi, Mingyuan MA, Jiahang Xu, Li Lyna Zhang, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. 2025. Mutual reasoning makes smaller LLMs stronger problem-solver. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. Zero: memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. SC.
- Mohamed El Amine Seddik, Suei-Wen Chen, Soufiane Hayou, Pierre Youssef, and Merouane Debbah. 2024. How bad is training on synthetic data? a statistical analysis of language model collapse. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05090*.
- Iliia Shumailov, Zakhar Shumaylov, Yiren Zhao, Yarin Gal, Nicolas Papernot, and Ross Anderson. 2023. The curse of recursion: Training on generated data makes models forget. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17493*.
- David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dhharshan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, et al. 2018. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and go through self-play. *Science*.
- Avi Singh, John D Co-Reyes, Rishabh Agarwal, Ankesh Anand, Piyush Patil, Xavier Garcia, Peter J Liu, James Harrison, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, et al. 2023. Beyond human data: Scaling self-training for problem-solving with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06585*.
- 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. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.03314>, 11.
- Ilya Sutskever. 2024. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks: what a decade. *Keynote at NeurIPS*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruiti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Aladin Virmaux and Kevin Scaman. 2018. Lipschitz regularity of deep neural networks: analysis and efficient estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Nghi DQ Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven CH Hoi. 2023. Codet5+: Open code large language models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07922*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Tianhao Wu, Weizhe Yuan, Olga Golovneva, Jing Xu, Yuandong Tian, Jiantao Jiao, Jason Weston, and Sainbayar Sukhbaatar. 2024. Meta-rewarding language models: Self-improving alignment with llm-as-a-meta-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.19594*.
- An Yang and et al. 2024. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2024. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Wenqian Ye, Yunsheng Ma, Xu Cao, and Kun Tang. 2023. Mitigating transformer overconfidence via lipschitz regularization. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*.
- Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2024a. Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng YU, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. 2024b. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. 2024a. Self-rewarding language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10020*.
- Xiangchi Yuan, Yijun Tian, Chunhui Zhang, Yanfang Ye, Nitesh V Chawla, and Chuxu Zhang. 2024b. Graph cross supervised learning via generalized knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- Xiangchi Yuan, Chunhui Zhang, Yijun Tian, Yanfang Ye, and Chuxu Zhang. 2024c. Mitigating emergent robustness degradation while scaling graph learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chengpeng Li, Guanting Dong, Keming Lu, Chuanqi Tan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Scaling relationship on learning mathematical reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01825*.
- Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah Goodman. 2022. Star: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Chunhui Zhang, Sean Dae Houlihan, Kwonjoon Lee, Nakul Agarwal, Zhongyu Ouyang, Soroush Vosoughi, and Shao-Yuan Lo. 2025a. *Scaling multi-modal theory-of-mind with weak-to-strong bayesian reasoning*.

Chunhui Zhang, Yiren Jian, Zhongyu Ouyang, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2024. Working memory identifies reasoning limits in language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

Chunhui Zhang, Yiren Jian, Zhongyu Ouyang, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2025b. Pretrained image-text models are secretly video captioners. In *Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.

Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Swaroop Mishra, Xinyun Chen, Heng-Tze Cheng, Ed H Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Take a step back: Evoking reasoning via abstraction in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06117*.

Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. 2024. AGIEval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*.

A Chain of Thought Prompting for Data Synthesize

We use chain-of-thought prompting (Wei et al., 2022) to generate answers. For MATH and GSM8K datasets, we both give 10 examples in the instructions for in-context generation. The prompting examples are given in Table 4.

B Training and implementation Details

We use NVIDIA RTX $8 \times$ A6000 to train the model with DeepSpeed (Rajbhandari et al., 2020) distributed training framework. The number of training epoch is 3 and per device training batch size is 4. The gradient accumulation steps is set to 4 and the learning rate is $2e-5$. The warm-up rate is 0.03. We use mixed precision training with bf16. We use DeepSpeed to distribute supervise finetuning model with ZeRO3 which partitions all three model states. We also use vLLM library (Kwon et al., 2023) to generate synthetic reasoning data with sampling temperature $\{0.2, 0.4, 0.6\}$ to balance the diversity and accuracy of generated answers. The Model merging parameter in Section 3 is set to 0.5 to balance the base model and self-improved model.

C Superficial Reasoning Finetuning Exists When Real Data is Limited

We also find that even using real but limited data, Superficial Reasoning Synthetic Finetuning still exists. As Figure 9 shows, the middle layers change most compared with the early and late layers, while Figure 3 already shows early and late layers are more important for reasoning. However, utilizing real data prevents the model from overfitting itself by using self-generated data. This is also verified by Figure 9: model’s reasoning layer (early and late layers) changed more (learn more reasoning capability) when training with real data, reasoning-trivial layers (middle layers)’s weight change is close to middle layers when training with synthetic data.

D A bitter Lesson: Not All LLMs Can Self-improve

During our experiment, we also find that not all the LLMs can self-improve on reasoning tasks. If LLM’s performance decreases after SFT, then our method may not let the merged model have a better performance compared with the original model and




Figure 9: The weight change over layers for (i) Finetuning Qwen2.5-1.5B with synthetic MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) dataset data and limited training data (7.5k real MATH training data)




Figure 10: The layer importance score for Qwen2.5-1.5B base model on reasoning dataset MATH.

the model after SFT. This usually happens when the original model already has a good performance (reasoning ability), and learned reasoning ability can’t offset the generalization loss. Unlike previous works that improve generalization and robustness via random smoothing (Cohen et al., 2019; Yuan et al., 2024c) or regularization (Virmaux and Scaman, 2018; Ye et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2024b), we utilize model merge to improve generalization and mitigate superficial self-improved reasoners phenomenon.

E The Connection to Catastrophic Forgetting

Catastrophic forgetting is a related but distinct phenomenon compared to superficial self-improved reasoners. Specifically, catastrophic forgetting refers to the loss of previously acquired knowledge when deep learning models are trained on

Model	Datasets	Base	SFT1	Merge1	SFT2	Merge2	SFT3	Merge3
Qwen2.5-0.5B-I	SVAMP	7.3	35.8	5.9	21.6	1.3	40.1	9.8
	ASDiv	8.7	51.4	3.7	30.7	2.8	46.7	17.6
	MathQA	37.9	29.5	38.2	25.7	35.4	19.9	33.8
	MMLU_stem	34.2	34.6	38.4	34.3	37.1	27.9	36.1
Qwen2.5-1.5B-I	svamp	77.7	59	69.2	58.6	58.2	60.2	64.7
	asdiv	82.8	72.5	76.4	64.8	59.6	70.8	73.4
	MathQA	62.5	24.9	57.3	33.4	54.1	12.8	53.4
	MMLU_stem	53.6	40.1	52.6	47.9	53.4	41.7	54.5
Llama2-7B	svamp	39.6	30.1	38.0	35.1	39.0	33.5	38.5
	asdiv	51.9	42.9	51.2	46.7	52.3	41.4	52.7

Table 3: OOD performance on additional reasoning datasets.

new data. This issue occurs because model parameters are optimized based on the most recent training data, causing earlier learned representations to be dramatically overwritten.

While both catastrophic forgetting and superficial self-improved reasoners result in degraded performance due to further fine-tuning, their effects differ. After fine-tuning on new data, catastrophic forgetting results in a performance loss on previously learned tasks, whereas superficial self-improved reasoners result in diminished generalization capabilities on out-of-domain (OOD) tasks. This discrepancy arises because in catastrophic forgetting, fine-tuning on data for new tasks causes the model to lose knowledge from previous tasks. In contrast, superficial self-improved reasoners do not lead to forgetting too much past information but instead shift towards overfitting due to potentially biased knowledge, which may self-enhance along with the iteration of synthesizing new data and fine-tuning on it.

F Additional Experiments

Here we provide the additional experiment results for evaluating the layer importance for Qwen2.5-1.5B base model on reasoning datasets MATH. Similar to stronger reasoning model Qwen2.5-1.5B-Math, the importance layer for reasoning is early and late layers, as demonstrated in Figure 10. We also provide OOD performance on additional datasets SVAMP (Patel et al., 2021), ASDiv (Miao et al., 2020), MathQA (Amini et al., 2019) and MMLU-stem Hendrycks et al. (2020). IMM keeps the OOD reasoning capability as shown in Table 3.

Prompt for Generating GSM8K Answers

Below is an instruction that describes a task.

Write a response that appropriately completes the request like given examples below:

Question: Angelo and Melanie want to plan how many hours over the next week they should study together for their test next week. They have 2 chapters of their textbook to study and 4 worksheets to memorize. They figure out that they should dedicate 3 hours to each chapter of their textbook and 1.5 hours for each worksheet. If they plan to study no more than 4 hours each day, how many days should they plan to study total over the next week if they take a 10-minute break every hour, include 3 10-minute snack breaks each day, and 30 minutes for lunch each day?

A: Let's think step by step.

Angelo and Melanie think they should dedicate 3 hours to each of the 2 chapters, $3 \text{ hours} \times 2 \text{ chapters} = 6 \text{ hours total}$.

For the worksheets they plan to dedicate 1.5 hours for each worksheet, $1.5 \text{ hours} \times 4 \text{ worksheets} = 6 \text{ hours total}$.

Angelo and Melanie need to start with planning 12 hours to study, at 4 hours a day, $12 / 4 = 3 \text{ days}$.

However, they need to include time for breaks and lunch. Every hour they want to include a 10-minute break, so $12 \text{ total hours} \times 10 \text{ minutes} = 120 \text{ extra minutes for breaks}$.

They also want to include 3 10-minute snack breaks, $3 \times 10 \text{ minutes} = 30 \text{ minutes}$.

And they want to include 30 minutes for lunch each day, so $120 \text{ minutes for breaks} + 30 \text{ minutes for snack breaks} + 30 \text{ minutes for lunch} = 180 \text{ minutes}$, or $180 / 60 \text{ minutes per hour} = 3 \text{ extra hours}$.

So Angelo and Melanie want to plan 12 hours to study + 3 hours of breaks = 15 hours total.

They want to study no more than 4 hours each day, $15 \text{ hours} / 4 \text{ hours each day} = 3.75$

They will need to plan to study 4 days to allow for all the time they need.

The answer is 4

Question: Mark's basketball team scores 25 2 pointers, 8 3 pointers and 10 free throws. Their opponents score double the 2 pointers but half the 3 pointers and free throws. What's the total number of points scored by both teams added together?

A: Let's think step by step.

Mark's team scores 25 2 pointers, meaning they scored $25 \times 2 = 50 \text{ points in 2 pointers}$.

His team also scores 8 3 pointers, meaning they scored $8 \times 3 = 24 \text{ points in 3 pointers}$

They scored 10 free throws, and free throws count as one point so they scored $10 \times 1 = 10 \text{ points in free throws}$.

All together his team scored $50 + 24 + 10 = 84 \text{ points}$

Mark's opponents scored double his team's number of 2 pointers, meaning they scored $50 \times 2 = 100 \text{ points in 2 pointers}$.

His opponents scored half his team's number of 3 pointers, meaning they scored $24 / 2 = 12 \text{ points in 3 pointers}$.

They also scored half Mark's team's points in free throws, meaning they scored $10 / 2 = 5 \text{ points in free throws}$.

All together Mark's opponents scored $100 + 12 + 5 = 117 \text{ points}$

The total score for the game is both team's scores added together, so it is $84 + 117 = 201 \text{ points}$

The answer is 201

Question: Bella has two times as many marbles as frisbees. She also has 20 more frisbees than deck cards. If she buys $2/5$ times more of each item, what would be the total number of the items she will have if she currently has 60 marbles?

A: Let's think step by step.

When Bella buys $2/5$ times more marbles, she'll have increased the number of marbles by $2/5 \times 60 = 24$

The total number of marbles she'll have is $60 + 24 = 84$

If Bella currently has 60 marbles, and she has two times as many marbles as frisbees, she has $60 / 2 = 30 \text{ frisbees}$.

If Bella buys $2/5$ times more frisbees, she'll have $2/5 \times 30 = 12 \text{ more frisbees}$.

The total number of frisbees she'll have will increase to $30 + 12 = 42$

Bella also has 20 more frisbees than deck cards, meaning she has $30 - 20 = 10 \text{ deck cards}$

If she buys $2/5$ times more deck cards, she'll have $2/5 \times 10 = 4 \text{ more deck cards}$.

The total number of deck cards she'll have is $10 + 4 = 14$

Together, Bella will have a total of $14 + 42 + 84 = 140 \text{ items}$

The answer is 140

Other 5 examples here ...

Instruction:

Natalia sold clips to 48 of her friends in April, and then she sold half as many clips in May. How many clips did Natalia sell altogether in April and May?

Response: Let's think step by step.

Table 4: The CoT prompting examples for generate training data.