

UNDO: UNderstanding Distillation as Optimization

Kushal Jain
UC San Diego
knjain@ucsd.edu

Piyushi Goyal & Kumar Shridhar
ETH Zurich
{pgoyal, shkumar}@ethz.ch

Abstract

Knowledge distillation has emerged as an effective strategy for compressing large language models’ (LLMs) knowledge into smaller, more efficient student models. However, standard one-shot distillation methods often produce suboptimal results due to a mismatch between teacher-generated rationales and the student’s specific learning requirements. In this paper, we introduce the UNDO: UNderstanding Distillation as Optimization framework, designed to bridge this gap by iteratively identifying the student’s errors and prompting the teacher to refine its explanations accordingly. Each iteration directly targets the student’s learning deficiencies, motivating the teacher to provide tailored and enhanced rationales that specifically address these weaknesses. Empirical evaluations on various challenging mathematical and commonsense reasoning tasks demonstrate that our iterative distillation method, UNDO, significantly outperforms standard one-step distillation methods, achieving performance gains of up to 20%. Additionally, we show that teacher-generated data refined through our iterative process remains effective even when applied to different student models, underscoring the broad applicability of our approach. Our work fundamentally reframes knowledge distillation as an iterative *teacher–student* interaction, effectively leveraging dynamic refinement by the teacher for better knowledge distillation.

1 Introduction

Knowledge distillation has emerged as an effective strategy for compressing large language models (LLMs) into smaller, more efficient student models (Hinton et al., 2015; Sanh et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2024). Initially, the primary approach involved aligning the student’s outputs with the soft logits of the teacher, enabling the student to approximate the teacher’s distribution. Recently, this paradigm has expanded to include *chain-of-thought* (CoT) reasoning, which seeks to instill smaller models with interpretable intermediate steps rather than simply matching final outputs (Shridhar et al., 2023; Hsieh et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Chenglin et al., 2024).

Despite these advancements, standard one-shot distillation methods frequently suffer from a distributional mismatch: the rationales generated by the teacher often do not align well with the student’s specific learning challenges (Agarwal et al., 2024; Adarsh et al., 2024). To overcome this limitation, we introduce the UNDO: UNderstanding Distillation as Optimization framework, an *iterative* distillation strategy that actively identifies and addresses the student’s errors by continuously prompting the teacher to generate refined, targeted rationales. In each iteration, the teacher’s generation and student’s responses are analyzed by the teacher, leading to tailored explanations that directly address the student’s learning gaps. This loop ensures that the training data becomes more personalized to the student’s specific needs, instead of simply reflecting generic teacher behavior.

Our iterative approach is inspired by educational concepts such as *scaffolding* (Wood et al., 1976) and *formative assessment* (Black et al., 2004), which highlight the importance of adaptive, targeted feedback in effective learning. Similar to a skilled teacher who adjusts instruction based on a learner’s struggles, our method dynamically identifies and addresses the stu-

dent’s errors, thereby maintaining the learner within their *zone of proximal development* (ZPD) (Cole et al., 1978).

Empirical evaluations conducted on challenging mathematical reasoning datasets, including MATH (Lightman et al., 2024) and MMLU Pro (Wang et al., 2024), demonstrate that our iterative distillation method significantly outperforms traditional one-shot distillation, delivering improvements of up to 20%. Furthermore, we show that iteratively refined teacher-generated data maintains its effectiveness across diverse student models, highlighting the robustness and generality of our method. Finally, we show that student models trained using our proposed approach outperform standard distilled models on out-of-domain tasks. Our work reframes knowledge distillation as a dynamic, iterative *teacher–student* interaction, leading to a better learning outcome for the student.

2 Related Work

Knowledge distillation Extensive research has explored knowledge distillation since Hinton et al. (2015) introduced the concept of training smaller student models using soft-label outputs (soft logits) from larger teacher models. Early influential models such as DistilBERT (Sanh et al., 2020) demonstrated substantial parameter reductions (40%) without significant performance losses. Subsequent advancements, like MiniLM (Wang et al., 2020), further refined this technique by focusing specifically on distilling the self-attention mechanism. More recent works, including Shum et al. (2024) and Timiryasov & Tastet (2023), explored selective training strategies by choosing essential samples from the teacher’s training set.

The integration of Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning (Wei et al., 2022) into distillation has sparked additional innovations. For example, Shridhar et al. (2023) trained student models to explicitly replicate the teacher’s CoT reasoning steps. Similarly, Li et al. (2023) generated diverse rationales for individual questions, while Chenglin et al. (2024) extended this by incorporating multiple reasoning styles. Zhu et al. (2024) distilled mathematical reasoning into structured equations and combined various reasoning modalities (text, code, equations). Further, Luo et al. (2025) leveraged reinforcement learning to fine-tune student models. Despite these advancements, most approaches remain one-directional, with teacher outputs independent of student-specific needs. In contrast, our method explicitly addresses the student’s learning gaps by encouraging teacher awareness and adaptation.

Surveys such as Gou et al. (2021) and Yang et al. (2024) have also comprehensively discussed the benefits and diverse applications of knowledge distillation across multiple domains, including computer vision and natural language processing.

Iterative distillation Our work draws significant inspiration from iterative forms of knowledge distillation. Previous research often emphasized the transfer of intermediate reasoning steps to smaller models, either sequentially (Hsieh et al., 2023; Magister et al., 2023; Shridhar et al., 2023) or concurrently integrating various reasoning strategies (Chenglin et al., 2024; Zhu et al., 2024; Jain et al., 2024). Notably, Wang et al. (2023) employed iterative interactions between students and black-box teachers, with teachers providing targeted feedback based on student failures. Similarly, Adarsh et al. (2024) combined iterative self-guided training and self-generated data to enhance reasoning in smaller models. Additionally, Agarwal et al. (2024) utilized on-policy training to better align student and teacher distributions by incorporating student-generated outputs. Self-distillation methods (Zelikman et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2024) involved models generating, filtering, and fine-tuning based on their own rationales. Reinforcement learning-based self-training was further explored by Gulcehre et al. (2023), where off-policy sampling informed dataset generation. Unlike these methods, our iterative approach uniquely emphasizes a dynamic, adaptive feedback loop where the teacher explicitly targets and rectifies the student’s learning challenges.




Figure 1: We compare UNDO: UNderstanding Distillation as Optimization(bottom) with Standard Distillation (top). The main difference lies in the iterative nature of UNDO where once a knowledge is distilled into the student, the teacher iteratively *identifies the learning gap, regenerate its reasoning chains and distill the knowledge again*.

3 Methodology

In this section, we first outline the standard knowledge distillation process and discuss its key limitations. We then introduce our proposed UNDO: UNderstanding Distillation as Optimization framework, which addresses these limitations by enabling the teacher to iteratively identify the student’s weaknesses and refine the knowledge being distilled accordingly.

Problem Setup. We consider a large teacher model p_L (LLM) and a smaller student model p_{sm}^θ (with learnable parameters θ). We have a dataset of math questions $\mathcal{D} = \{(q_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, and an associated held-out validation set $\mathcal{V} = \{(q_j, a_j)\}_{j=1}^m$ to monitor progress at each iteration. Our goal is to distill the teacher’s reasoning capabilities into the student iteratively by constantly moderating the errors made by the student and targeted refinements from the teacher.

3.1 Standard Knowledge Distillation

We begin with the standard knowledge distillation approach following [Shridhar et al. \(2023\)](#); [Magister et al. \(2023\)](#), where the teacher model p_L is prompted to produce a rationale (chain-of-thought) r_i for each question q_i . Let \hat{a}_i be the final numeric result in r_i . We only keep those samples for which \hat{a}_i matches the ground truth a_i . This produces a filtered dataset $\mathcal{D}_{LLM} = \{(q_i, r_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ of correct (question, rationale) pairs.

The student is then fine-tuned by maximizing the log-likelihood of these rationales:

$$\mathcal{L}_L(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(q_i, r_i) \sim \mathcal{D}_{LLM}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{M_i} \log p_{sm}^\theta(r_{i,t} \mid r_{i,<t}, q_i, I) \right],$$

where M_i is the number of tokens of the rationale, and I is an instruction used to elicit chain-of-thought. Minimizing $\mathcal{L}_L(\theta)$ via gradient descent adjusts θ so that the student mimics the teacher’s rationales. This is the baseline *one-step* standard knowledge distillation.

3.2 UNDO: UNderstanding Distillation as Optimization

Standard Knowledge Distillation often leads to a distributional mismatch between the teacher and the student, leading to suboptimal learning (Agarwal et al., 2024; Adarsh et al., 2024). To counter this, we propose an *iterative* distillation strategy UNDO that repeatedly identifies the student’s errors and lets the teacher produce improved rationales that focus on the *learning gaps* to improve the student’s performance. The setup is visualized in Figure 1.

We perform K such iterations, maintaining updated students’ parameters $\theta^{(k)}$ after each round. Each step is explained in more detail below:

1) Identify Student Learning Gaps & Incorporate in Teacher Prompt. At each iteration k , the student $p_{\text{sm}}^{\theta^{(k-1)}}$ answers each problem in the entire validation set \mathcal{V} . The student’s generation for question $q_j \in \mathcal{V}$ is denoted as $\tilde{r}_j^{(k,\text{student})}$. We compare the final numeric result within $\tilde{r}_j^{(k,\text{student})}$ to a_j and obtain an error signal (e.g., if correct, we provide a score of 1 and 0 otherwise). We collect these labeled pairs

$$(q_j, \tilde{r}_j^{(k,\text{student})}, \text{score}), \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

This collection from *all* past iterations (to track improvements over time) will be shown to the teacher in its prompt context, so the teacher can observe the student’s progress and mistakes.

2) Regenerate from the Teacher with Gap Analysis. Next, we consider the training dataset \mathcal{D}_{LLM} that we use to improve the student. For each $q_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{LLM}}$, we retrieve:

- The student’s *previous* generation $\tilde{r}_i^{(k-1,\text{student})}$ (if it exists) or $\tilde{r}_i^{(\text{init})}$,
- The teacher’s *previous* rationale $r_i^{(k-1,\text{teacher})}$ used in prior iteration,

and construct a prompt that highlights the *gap* between the teacher’s prior rationale and the student’s generation. The teacher p_L then produces a new rationale

$$r_i^{(k,\text{teacher})} \sim p_L\left(\cdot \mid q_i, \tilde{r}_i^{(k-1,\text{student})}, r_i^{(k-1,\text{teacher})}, \{\tilde{r}_j^{(k,\text{student})}, \text{score}_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{V}}\right),$$

explicitly aiming to fix or improve upon the student’s mistakes. We filter out any rationale whose final numeric result does not match a_i , retaining a curated set

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LLM}}^{(k)} = \left\{ (q_i, r_i^{(k,\text{teacher})}) : q_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{LLM}} \right\}.$$

3) Fine-tune the Student. We then use $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LLM}}^{(k)}$ to update the student parameters by minimizing the negative log-likelihood of the teacher’s new rationales:

$$\mathcal{L}_L^{(k)}(\theta) = - \mathbb{E}_{(q_i, r_i^{(k,\text{teacher})}) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{LLM}}^{(k)}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{M_i^{(k)}} \log p_{\text{sm}}^{\theta}(r_{i,t}^{(k,\text{teacher})} \mid r_{i,<t}^{(k,\text{teacher})}, q_i, I) \right],$$

where $M_i^{(k)}$ is the token length of $r_i^{(k,\text{teacher})}$. We obtain the updated parameters:

$$\theta^{(k)} = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_L^{(k)}(\theta).$$

Algorithm 1 UNDO: UNderstanding Distillation as Optimization

Require: Teacher: $p_L(r | q)$ **Student:** p_{sm}^θ **Train set:** $\mathcal{D} = \{(q_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ **Validation set:** $\mathcal{V} = \{(q_j, a_j)\}_{j=1}^m$ **Max Iterations:** K **Instruction:** I (prompt to elicit CoT).

- 1: **Initialize** $\theta^{(0)}$ (e.g., from one-step distillation or a pretrained checkpoint).
- 2: **for** $k \leftarrow 1$ to K **do**
- 3: **(1) Identify Student Errors & Incorporate in Teacher Prompt**
- 4: Evaluate $p_{\text{sm}}^{\theta^{(k-1)}}$ on each (q_j, a_j) in \mathcal{V} :
 - Generate student rationale $\tilde{r}_j^{(k, \text{student})}$.
 - Extract final answer, compare with a_j , and record score_j (e.g., 1 if correct, 0 if wrong).
- 5: Collect $\{(q_j, \tilde{r}_j^{(k, \text{student})}, \text{score}_j)\}_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$ for teacher prompts.
- 6: **(2) Regenerate from Teacher with Gap Analysis**
- 7: **for** each $(q_i, a_i) \in \mathcal{D}$ **do**
- 8: Retrieve $\tilde{r}_i^{(k-1, \text{student})}$ or $\tilde{r}_i^{(\text{init})}$, and $r_i^{(k-1, \text{teacher})}$ (if they exist).
- 9: Construct teacher prompt emphasizing *gaps*:
 prompt $\leftarrow (q_i, \tilde{r}_i^{(k-1, \text{student})}, r_i^{(k-1, \text{teacher})}, \{\tilde{r}_j^{(k, \text{student})}, \text{score}_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{V}})$.
- 10: Generate $r_i^{(k, \text{teacher})} \sim p_L(\cdot | \text{prompt})$.
- 11: If final answer in $r_i^{(k, \text{teacher})} \neq a_i$, **discard** the sample.
- 12: **end for**
- 13: Construct $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LLM}}^{(k)} = \{(q_i, r_i^{(k, \text{teacher})}) : q_i \in \mathcal{D} \text{ (filtered)}\}$.
- 14: **(3) Fine-tune the Student**
- 15: Update student parameters:

$$\theta^{(k)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\theta} - \mathbb{E}_{(q_i, r_i^{(k, \text{teacher})}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{LLM}}^{(k)}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{M_i^{(k)}} \log p_{\text{sm}}^\theta(r_{i,t}^{(k, \text{teacher})} | r_{i, < t}^{(k, \text{teacher})}, q_i, I) \right].$$
- 16: **(4) Convergence Check**
- 17: Evaluate $p_{\text{sm}}^{\theta^{(k)}}$ on \mathcal{V} . If performance (e.g., accuracy) saturates or $k = K$, **stop**.
- 18: **end for**

4) Convergence Check. We repeat Steps 1–3 until no further improvement is observed on the validation set or until we reach a maximum iteration K .

Algorithm 1 summarizes the proposed distillation as optimization strategy.

KL Divergence Perspective. Each iteration can be viewed as approximating the minimization of the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence between the teacher’s distribution $p_L(r | q, \text{gap info})$ and the student’s distribution $p_{\text{sm}}^\theta(r | q)$. If we denote the teacher’s new rationale for question q_i by $r_i^{(k, \text{teacher})}$, sampled according to $p_L(r | q_i, \Delta_i^{(k)})$ (where $\Delta_i^{(k)}$ encapsulates the gap information, e.g., old student and teacher rationales, validation errors, etc.), then the KL divergence is

$$\text{KL}(p_L(r | q_i, \Delta_i^{(k)}) \| p_{\text{sm}}^\theta(r | q_i)) = \mathbb{E}_{r \sim p_L(\cdot | q_i, \Delta_i^{(k)})} \left[\log p_L(r | q_i, \Delta_i^{(k)}) - \log p_{\text{sm}}^\theta(r | q_i) \right].$$

Since the term $\log p_L(r | q_i, \Delta_i^{(k)})$ is independent of θ , minimizing the KL is equivalent (up to constants) to maximizing $\mathbb{E}_{r \sim p_L} [\log p_{\text{sm}}^\theta(r | q_i)]$, which matches the negative log-likelihood objective used in Eq. (3.2) when we replace the teacher’s distribution by its empirical samples $r_i^{(k, \text{teacher})}$. Iteration-by-iteration, the teacher highlights gaps by conditioning on the student’s errors (*via* $\Delta_i^{(k)}$), so the newly generated rationales better target exactly where

p_{sm}^θ remains deficient. Consequently, with repeated minimization of this KL divergence for “hard” or incorrectly answered questions, the student’s distribution p_{sm}^θ is successively refined, thereby improving overall performance.

4 Experimental Details

4.1 Dataset

We utilized Numina Math dataset (LI et al., 2024) to fine-tune the student models. We filtered out only math-word-problem “question-type” and further did some preprocessing to remove samples where the answer was “proof”, “notfound”, empty or the problem/solution was invalid. Since it does not include a validation set, we partitioned the training set to create a held-out validation set. We used 20 samples sampled randomly from the training set to create a validation set. Note that since validation set is always kept in the context of the teacher model and grows linearly with the iterations, we kept the validation set to fit in the context window even after K iterations. For the test set, we aggregated test sets from various other mathematical datasets, including GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), MMLU Pro (Wang et al., 2024), MATH 500 (Lightman et al., 2024), and SVAMP (Patel et al., 2021). The dataset distribution is provided in Table 1. Finally, we also test our approach on two out-of-domain commonsense reasoning datasets of StrategyQA Geva et al. (2021) (687 test samples¹) and TheoremQA Chen et al. (2023) (800 test samples). We use 4-shot CoT for StrategyQA and 5-shot CoT for TheoremQA evaluation.

Dataset	Training Set (N = 550,000)		Test Set (N = 4170)	
	# Samples	Dist. (%)	# Samples	Dist. (%)
NuminaMath (LI et al., 2024)	550,000	100%	-	-
Math500 (Lightman et al., 2024)	-	-	500	12%
GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021)	-	-	1319	32%
MMLU PRO (Wang et al., 2024)	-	-	1351	32%
SVAMP (Patel et al., 2021)	-	-	1000	24%

Table 1: The distribution of datasets used in our work.

4.2 Models

We employed llama-3.2-70B (Dubey et al., 2024) as the teacher model and selected three student models—llama-3.3-1B, qwen-2.5-1.5B (Bai et al., 2023), and SmolLM2-1.7B (Allal et al., 2025). The student models were chosen for their diversity in size and performance. Across all experiments, the number of iterations (K) reached saturation at 4, meaning the optimal results were observed at $K = 3$. For each student model training run, we utilized 5 epochs for the initial iteration ($K = 1$) and reduced it to 3 epochs for subsequent iterations. Training each student model required approximately 10 GPU hours per epoch on H100 GPUs. Inference runs on the training data for the student models consumed approximately 240 GPU hours on GH200 GPUs, whereas generating data with the teacher model took approximately 2,800 GPU hours (GH200s) per iteration. The temperature was set at 0.7 and inference was done using the VLLM library (Kwon et al., 2023).

¹Test samples taken from this repo: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/ChilleD/StrategyQA>

Model	Iter.	GSM8K	MATH	MMLU PRO	SVAMP	Average
Qwen	1	50.95	32.80	14.51	76.70	43.14
	2	<u>53.22</u> (↑+2.27)	<u>35.80</u> (↑+3.00)	15.40 (↑+0.89)	<u>84.20</u> (↑+7.50)	<u>46.31</u> (↑+3.17)
	3	<u>55.04</u> (↑+4.09)	<u>39.00</u> (↑+6.20)	15.17 (↑+0.66)	<u>87.40</u> (↑+10.70)	<u>47.96</u> (↑+4.82)
SmolLM	1	53.60	30.60	13.47	85.50	45.49
	2	<u>55.72</u> (↑+2.12)	<u>34.20</u> (↑+3.60)	<u>15.03</u> (↑+1.56)	<u>87.20</u> (↑+1.70)	47.51 (↑+2.02)
	3	<u>56.93</u> (↑+3.33)	<u>38.00</u> (↑+7.40)	<u>16.21</u> (↑+2.74)	<u>87.20</u> (↑+1.70)	<u>48.70</u> (↑+3.21)
Llama	1	34.72	20.60	9.74	79.50	35.59
	2	<u>39.34</u> (↑+4.62)	<u>24.80</u> (↑+4.20)	<u>12.40</u> (↑+2.66)	78.50 (↓-1.00)	<u>38.27</u> (↑+2.68)
	3	<u>43.96</u> (↑+9.24)	<u>27.00</u> (↑+6.40)	<u>15.06</u> (↑+5.32)	80.50 (↑+1.00)	<u>40.95</u> (↑+5.36)

Table 2: Accuracy (maj@1) comparison for three student models (Qwen2.5 1.5B, SmolLM2 1.7B, and Llama-3.2 1B) over different iterations (Iter.). ↑ indicates the gain (or loss, ↓) relative to Iteration1 of the same model, which is the baseline standard distillation. Underline indicates statistical significance with $p < 0.05$ compared to the baseline.

5 Results and Discussion

Iterative distillation improves student performance. Table 2 presents the results of three different student models (**Qwen2.5 1.5B**, **SmolLM2 1.7B**, and **Llama-3.2 1B**) over three iterations (K) of our iterative distillation procedure UNDO. We report performance on four mathematical reasoning datasets: GSM8K, MATH, MMLU PRO, and SVAMP, along with an Average score across these tasks. We observe a consistent improvement over all datasets across all models. For instance, under **Qwen2.5 1.5B**, the performance on GSM8K increases from 50.95 at iteration 1 to 55.04 at iteration 3. A similar trend is observed for the MATH dataset, which improves from 32.80 → 39.00, and on SVAMP which increases from 76.70 → 87.40. SmolLM2 and Llama-3.2 also follow the same upward trajectory. Notably, **SmolLM2** gains +7.40 points on MATH by iteration 3 (from 30.60 → 38.00) and +2.74 points on MMLU PRO (from 13.47 → 16.21). **Llama-3.2** sees gains of +9.24 and +8.40 points on GSM8K and MATH, respectively, moving from 34.72 → 43.96 on GSM8K and 20.60 → 29.00 on MATH. Overall, each model consistently benefits from iterative distillation, achieving higher accuracy on each dataset from iteration 1 to iteration 3.

Deciding when to stop Figure 2 visualizes the performance of Qwen2.5 and SmolLM2 across four iterations on the same four benchmarks. From this plot, we see a strong upward trend through the first three iterations, aligning with the numerical gains reported in Table 2. However, at iteration 4, there is a slight decrease in accuracy for both models: Qwen2.5 drops from 55.04 → 53.60 on GSM8K, and SmolLM2 dips from 56.93 → 55.19 on the same dataset. Since these iteration 4 numbers are lower than iteration 3 results, we conclude that the model has converged and additional regeneration from the teacher is no longer beneficial, prompting us to stop further distillation steps at iteration 3.

Can standard distillation trained for same number of epochs perform similar to UNDO? Figure 3 illustrates that simply continuing to train Qwen (*standard distillation* approach) for more epochs beyond Iteration 1 results in diminished returns and overfitting. Concretely, the model trained for 10 epochs scores only 43.90% on GSM8k, 27.00% on MATH, 13.82% on MMLU PRO, and 72.90% on SVAMP, for an average of 39.41%—all lower than the baseline iteration 1 model. In contrast, our proposed approach UNDO improves performance in each iteration: on GSM8K, for instance, the student goes from 50.95% at Iter1 to 55.04% at




Figure 2: Accuracy (maj@1) for Qwen and SmolLM2 models on GSM8K, MATH, MMLU Pro and SVAMP datasets for 4 iterations.




Figure 3: Accuracy comparison of training standard distillation and UNDO for the equal number of epochs. Note that iteration 1 for UNDO is same as epoch 5 for standard distillation.

Iter3; on MATH from 32.80% to 39.00%; on MMLU PRO from 14.51% to 15.17%; on SVAMP from 76.70% to 87.40%; culminating in an average gain from 43.14% to 47.96%, all trained for the same number of epochs. These results confirm that simply increasing training epochs risks overfitting and declining performance, while iterative distillation actively pushes the student model toward the teacher’s reasoning distribution.

Does UNDO create a better teacher? Table 3 shows that once we complete our iterative distillation procedure and use the final teacher generated data to train student models as standard distillation for 5 epochs, we achieve substantial gains over the baseline. Specifically, Qwen trained on the final iteration teacher generations from a Qwen-Llama 70B interaction, improves by more than +5 points on GSM8K (from 50.95 → 56.10) and +9.80 points on SVAMP (from 76.70 → 86.50), culminating in an overall average increase of +5.52. Even when Qwen is trained on teacher generations of a SmolLM2-Llama 70B interaction, it still outperforms the baseline (e.g., +3.43 on average), though slightly less than with Qwen’s own teacher data. This suggests that the teacher model—refined through UNDO—produces data that is more *personalized* to the student’s weaknesses, thus effectively boosting final performance. We also observe similar trends for the SmolLM2 model, which gains up to +3.26 accuracy on GSM8K (from 53.60 → 56.86) and +1.53 on MMLU PRO (13.47 → 15.00) when trained on the teacher data from a SmolLM2-Llama 70B interaction. Similarly, SmolLM2 also benefits from teacher data of a Qwen-Llama 70B interaction gaining almost +2 points on average over the baseline. The improvements indicate that the teacher–student pair evolves into a tightly coupled relationship, outperforming a standard distillation baseline where the teacher lacks any prior knowledge of the student’s mistakes.

	Teacher	GSM8K	MATH	MMLU PRO	SVAMP	Average
Qwen	Baseline	50.95	32.80	14.51	76.70	43.14
	Qwen	<u>56.10</u> ($\uparrow+5.15$)	<u>39.40</u> ($\uparrow+6.60$)	15.98 ($\uparrow+1.47$)	<u>86.50</u> ($\uparrow+9.80$)	<u>48.39</u> ($\uparrow+5.52$)
	SmolLM2	<u>54.00</u> ($\uparrow+3.05$)	<u>34.00</u> ($\uparrow+1.20$)	14.35 ($\downarrow-0.16$)	<u>86.50</u> ($\uparrow+9.80$)	<u>46.57</u> ($\uparrow+3.43$)
SmolLM	Baseline	53.60	30.60	13.47	85.50	45.49
	Qwen	<u>56.86</u> ($\uparrow+3.26$)	<u>32.80</u> ($\uparrow+2.20$)	14.95 ($\uparrow+1.48$)	85.60 ($\uparrow+0.10$)	<u>47.29</u> ($\uparrow+1.80$)
	SmolLM2	<u>56.86</u> ($\uparrow+3.26$)	<u>33.60</u> ($\uparrow+3.00$)	<u>15.00</u> ($\uparrow+1.53$)	86.80 ($\uparrow+1.30$)	<u>47.72</u> ($\uparrow+2.23$)

Table 3: Comparison of maj@1 accuracy for Qwen and SmolLM across four benchmarks (GSM8K, MATH, MMLU PRO, SVAMP) and the resulting average score. Each model can be trained on data generated by its own teacher or a cross-teacher (e.g., Qwen data for SmolLM2). Gains (\uparrow or \downarrow) are shown relative to the baseline (standard distillation). Underline indicates statistical significance with $p < 0.05$ compared to the baseline.

Is training with UNDO make the student overfit to the task? We test if the student is overfitting when trained with UNDO compared to the standard distillation by testing on two out of domain datasets: StrategyQA (Geva et al., 2021) and TheoremQA (Chen et al., 2023). Table 4 shows that both Qwen and Smolm consistently improve their performance from Iteration 1 to Iteration 3 on the **StrategyQA** and **Theorem QA** benchmarks. For instance, Qwen increases by 2.50% on StrategyQA and 0.625% on Theorem QA, while Smolm gains 2.80% and 0.63% respectively. These consistent improvements across both datasets indicate that the models are not overfitted to the mathematical reasoning tasks. Rather, they have acquired better reasoning skills which are also transferrable to out-of-domain datasets.

Model	StrategyQA		Theorem QA	
	Standard Dist.	UNDO	Standard Dist.	UNDO
Qwen	12.50%	15.00% ($\uparrow+2.50$)	7.5%	8.125% ($\uparrow+0.625$)
SmolLM2	10.20%	13.00% ($\uparrow+2.80$)	5.62%	6.25% ($\uparrow+0.63$)

Table 4: Performance (%) on **StrategyQA** and **Theorem QA** benchmarks for Qwen and SmolLM2 models. Standard Distillation represents the results from Iteration 1 while UNDO represents the results from Iteration 3 from Table 2. Gains (\uparrow) are shown in parentheses.

6 Conclusion

We introduced an iterative distillation paradigm UNDO aimed at bridging the performance gap between large teacher models and smaller student models more effectively than conventional one-shot distillation. By repeatedly identifying the student’s errors, regenerating teacher rationales that address these *learning gaps*, and re-training the student on this tailored data, our method yields consistent improvements on challenging mathematical benchmarks. Experimental results indicate that UNDO not only avoids overfitting often seen in prolonged standard distillation, but also makes the teacher more attuned to student-specific weaknesses, effectively “personalizing” the teacher’s rationales.

Empirically, we observed that final teacher-generated data—after multiple rounds of iteration—significantly enhances student performance, with gains of upto 20% compared to the baseline. Even cross-teacher data (e.g., teacher data for one student used on another) shows improved results over standard approaches. These findings underscore that incorporating

iterative feedback loops between the teacher and the student leads to a more specialized and effective transfer of reasoning knowledge.

References

- Shivam Adarsh, Kumar Shridhar, Caglar Gulcehre, Nicholas Monath, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Siked: Self-guided iterative knowledge distillation for mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18574*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.18574>.
- Rishabh Agarwal, Nino Vieillard, Yongchao Zhou, Piotr Stanczyk, Sabela Ramos Garea, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Bachem. On-policy distillation of language models: Learning from self-generated mistakes. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3zKtaqxLhW>.
- Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Elie Bakouch, Gabriel Martín Blázquez, Guilherme Penedo, Lewis Tunstall, Andrés Marafioti, Hynek Kydlíček, Agustín Piqueres Lajarín, Vaibhav Srivastav, et al. Smollm2: When smol goes big—data-centric training of a small language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02737*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.02737>.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16609>.
- Paul Black, Christine Harrison, Clare Lee, Bethan Marshall, and Dylan Wiliam. Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom. *Phi delta kappan*, 86(1):8–21, 2004. URL https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44835745_Working_Inside_the_Black_Box_Assessment_for_Learning_in_the_Classroom.
- Wenhu Chen, Ming Yin, Max Ku, Pan Lu, Yixin Wan, Xueguang Ma, Jianyu Xu, Xinyi Wang, and Tony Xia. TheoremQA: A theorem-driven question answering dataset. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 7889–7901, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.489. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.489/>.
- Li Chenglin, Qianglong Chen, Liangyue Li, Caiyu Wang, Feng Tao, Yicheng Li, Zulong Chen, and Yin Zhang. Mixed distillation helps smaller language models reason better. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pp. 1673–1690, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.91. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.91/>.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>.
- Michael Cole, Vera John-Steiner, Sylvia Scribner, and Ellen Souberman. *Mind in society. Mind in society the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvjf9vz4>.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>.
- Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:346–361, 2021. doi: 10.1162/tacl.a.00370. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.tacl-1.21/>.

- Jianping Gou, Baosheng Yu, Stephen J. Maybank, and Dacheng Tao. Knowledge distillation: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 129(6):1789–1819, March 2021. ISSN 1573-1405. doi: 10.1007/s11263-021-01453-z. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11263-021-01453-z>.
- Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Ksenia Konyushkova, Lotte Weerts, Abhishek Sharma, Aditya Siddhant, Alex Ahern, Miaosen Wang, Chenjie Gu, Wolfgang Macherey, Arnaud Doucet, Orhan Firat, and Nando de Freitas. Reinforced self-training (rest) for language modeling, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.08998>.
- Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network, 2015. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.02531>.
- Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Chun-Liang Li, Chih-kuan Yeh, Hootan Nakhost, Yasuhisa Fujii, Alex Ratner, Ranjay Krishna, Chen-Yu Lee, and Tomas Pfister. Distilling step-by-step! outperforming larger language models with less training data and smaller model sizes. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 8003–8017, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.507. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.507/>.
- Kushal Jain, Moritz Miller, Niket Tandon, and Kumar Shridhar. First-step advantage: Importance of starting right in multi-step math reasoning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07945>.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, 2023. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3600006.3613165>.
- Jia LI, Edward Beeching, Lewis Tunstall, Ben Lipkin, Roman Soletskyi, Shengyi Costa Huang, Kashif Rasul, Longhui Yu, Albert Jiang, Ziju Shen, Zihan Qin, Bin Dong, Li Zhou, Yann Fleureau, Guillaume Lample, and Stanislas Polu. Numinamath. [<https://huggingface.co/AI-MO/NuminaMath-1.5>](https://github.com/project-numina/aimo-progress-prize/blob/main/report/numina_dataset.pdf), 2024.
- Liunian Harold Li, Jack Hessel, Youngjae Yu, Xiang Ren, Kai-Wei Chang, and Yejin Choi. Symbolic chain-of-thought distillation: Small models can also “think” step-by-step. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 2665–2679, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.150. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.150/>.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=v8L0pN6E0i>.
- Rongxing Liu, Kumar Shridhar, Manish Prajapat, Patrick Xia, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Smart: Self-learning meta-strategy agent for reasoning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.16128*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.16128>.
- Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jian-Guang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, Yansong Tang, and Dongmei Zhang. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mMPMHWOd0y>.
- Lucie Charlotte Magister, Jonathan Mallinson, Jakub Adamek, Eric Malmi, and Aliaksei Severyn. Teaching small language models to reason. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual*

- Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp. 1773–1781. Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2023. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-short.151>.
- Arkil Patel, S. Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. Are nlp models really able to solve simple math word problems? In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:232223322>.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.01108>.
- Kumar Shridhar, Alessandro Stolfo, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Distilling reasoning capabilities into smaller language models. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 7059–7073, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.441. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.441>.
- KaShun Shum, Minrui Xu, Jianshu Zhang, Zixin Chen, Shizhe Diao, Hanze Dong, Jipeng Zhang, and Muhammad Omer Raza. FIRST: Teach a reliable large language model through efficient trustworthy distillation. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 12646–12659, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.703. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.703/>.
- Inar Timiryasov and Jean-Loup Tastet. Baby llama: knowledge distillation from an ensemble of teachers trained on a small dataset with no performance penalty. In Alex Warstadt, Aaron Mueller, Leshem Choshen, Ethan Wilcox, Chengxu Zhuang, Juan Ciro, Rafael Mosquera, Bhargavi Paranjabe, Adina Williams, Tal Linzen, and Ryan Cotterell (eds.), *Proceedings of the BabyLM Challenge at the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pp. 279–289, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.conll-babyllm.24. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.conll-babyllm.24/>.
- Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Li Dong, Hangbo Bao, Nan Yang, and Ming Zhou. Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 5776–5788. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf.
- Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, Tianle Li, Max Ku, Kai Wang, Alex Zhuang, Rongqi Fan, Xiang Yue, and Wenhui Chen. MMLU-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=y10DM6R2r3>.
- Zhaoyang Wang, Shaohan Huang, Yuxuan Liu, Jiahai Wang, Minghui Song, Zihan Zhang, Haizhen Huang, Furu Wei, Weiwei Deng, Feng Sun, and Qi Zhang. Democratizing reasoning ability: Tailored learning from large language model. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rq4UfmpRA9>.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=_VjQIMeSB_J.

David Wood, Jerome S Bruner, and Gail Ross. The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*, 17(2):89–100, 1976. URL https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228039919_The_Role_of_Tutoring_in_Problem_Solving.

Chuanpeng Yang, Yao Zhu, Wang Lu, Yidong Wang, Qian Chen, Chenlong Gao, Bingjie Yan, and Yiqiang Chen. Survey on knowledge distillation for large language models: Methods, evaluation, and application. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, October 2024. ISSN 2157-6904. doi: 10.1145/3699518. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3699518>. Just Accepted.

Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah Goodman. STar: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=_3ELRdg2sgI.

Xunyu Zhu, Jian Li, Yong Liu, Can Ma, and Weiping Wang. Distilling mathematical reasoning capabilities into small language models. *Neural Netw.*, 179(C), November 2024. ISSN 0893-6080. doi: 10.1016/j.neunet.2024.106594. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2024.106594>.

A Appendix

Prompt file given to the teacher in the first iteration.

You are an AI tutor tasked with improving a student's understanding of mathematical problem-solving. You will be given a question, a teacher's answer, a student's answer, and a score. Your job is to analyze these inputs and create a new answer that will help the student learn better.

Here are some examples of the task:

question:

Jim spends 8 hours scuba diving. In that time he finds a treasure chest with 100 gold coins in it. He also finds some smaller bags that have half as much gold each. He finds 25 gold coins per hour. How many smaller bags did he find?

teacher answer:

Jim finds 25 gold coins per hour, and he spends 8 hours scuba diving, so he finds a total of $25 * 8 = 200$ gold coins.

He finds a treasure chest with 100 gold coins in it, so the remaining gold coins he finds are $200 - 100 = 100$ gold coins.

Since the smaller bags have half as much gold as the treasure chest, each smaller bag has $100 / 2 = 50$ gold coins.

Therefore, the number of smaller bags he finds is $100 / 50 = \boxed{2}$ smaller bags.

Final Answer: 2

student answer:

To determine how many smaller bags Jim found, we need to follow these steps:

1. **Calculate the total amount of gold coins Jim finds over the 8 hours:** Jim finds 25 gold coins per hour for 8 hours. $[25 \text{ coins/hour} \times 8 \text{ hours} = 200 \text{ coins}]$

2. **Determine the amount of gold coins in the smaller bags:** Let (x) be the number of smaller bags. Each smaller bag has half as much gold as a treasure chest. Since a treasure chest has 100 gold coins, each smaller bag has: $[\frac{100 \text{ coins}}{2} = 50 \text{ coins}]$ Therefore, the total amount of gold coins in the smaller bags is: $[50x \text{ coins}]$

3. **Set up the equation for the total gold coins found:** The total gold coins found by Jim is the sum of the gold coins in the treasure chest and the gold coins in the smaller bags. According to the problem, this total is 200 coins. $100 \text{ coins} + 50x \text{ coins} = 200 \text{ coins}$

4. **Solve for x :** Subtract 100 coins from both sides of the equation: $50x = 100$ Divide both sides by 50: $x = \frac{100}{50} = 2$ Thus, Jim found $\boxed{2}$ smaller bags.

Final Answer: 2

score:

1

-----similar such examples from the validation set-----

First, carefully analyze the student's answer. Compare it to the teacher's answer and identify any mistakes or areas where the student's reasoning could be improved. Consider the following:

1. Did the student understand the problem correctly?
2. Did they use the right approach to solve the problem?
3. Are there any calculation errors?
4. Is their reasoning clear and logical?
5. Did they miss any important steps?

Next, craft a new answer that addresses the student's misunderstandings or reinforces correct thinking. Your new answer should:

1. Use clear, step-by-step reasoning
2. Explain any concepts the student may have misunderstood
3. Provide additional context or examples if necessary
6. Use the same calculation format as the teacher's answer. If the teacher answer involves latex and involves terms like $\frac{1}{2}$, π make sure to extract the answer with the necessary latex keywords.
5. All the teacher's final answers end inside " $\boxed{}$ ". Ensure, that your answers also follow this format.
6. Lead to the correct final answer

Write your new answer using the following format:

new_answer

[Step-by-step reasoning with calculations in the format shown above]

Final Answer: [Correct numerical/latex answer]

Remember, your goal is to help the student learn and improve their problem-solving skills. Focus on explaining the reasoning clearly and addressing any specific issues in the student's original answer.

You are an AI tutor tasked with improving a student's understanding of mathematical problem-solving. You will be given a question, a teacher's answer, a student's answer, and a score. Your job is to analyze these inputs and create a new answer that will help the student learn better.

Here are some examples of the task:

question:

Jim spends 8 hours scuba diving. In that time he finds a treasure chest with 100 gold coins in it. He also finds some smaller bags that have half as much gold each. He finds 25 gold coins per hour. How many smaller bags did he find?

ITERATION 1:

teacher answer:

Jim finds 25 gold coins per hour, and he spends 8 hours scuba diving, so he finds a total of $25 * 8 = 200$ gold coins.

He finds a treasure chest with 100 gold coins in it, so the remaining gold coins he finds are $200 - 100 = 100$ gold coins.

Since the smaller bags have half as much gold as the treasure chest, each smaller bag has $100 / 2 = 50$ gold coins.

Therefore, the number of smaller bags he finds is $100 / 50 = \boxed{2}$ smaller bags.

Final Answer: 2

student answer:

To determine how many smaller bags Jim found, we need to follow these steps:

1. **Calculate the total amount of gold coins Jim finds over the 8 hours:** Jim finds 25 gold coins per hour for 8 hours. $[25 \text{ coins/hour} \times 8 \text{ hours} = 200 \text{ coins}]$

2. **Determine the amount of gold coins in the smaller bags:** Let (x) be the number of smaller bags. Each smaller bag has half as much gold as a treasure chest. Since a treasure chest has 100 gold coins, each smaller bag has: $[\frac{100 \text{ coins}}{2} = 50 \text{ coins}]$ Therefore, the total amount of gold coins in the smaller bags is: $[50x]$

3. **Set up the equation for the total gold coins found:** The total gold coins found by Jim is the sum of the gold coins in the treasure chest and the gold coins in the smaller bags. According to the problem, this total is 200 coins. $[100 \text{ coins} + 50x \text{ coins} = 200 \text{ coins}]$

4. **Solve for (x) :

** Subtract 100 coins from both sides of the equation: $[50x = 100]$

Divide both sides by 50: $[x = \frac{100}{50} = 2]$

Thus, Jim found $\boxed{2}$ smaller bags.

Final Answer: 2

score:

1

ITERATION 2:

teacher answer:

To determine how many smaller bags Jim found, we need to follow these steps:

1. **Calculate the total amount of gold coins Jim finds over 8 hours:** Jim finds 25 gold coins per hour for 8 hours. The total gold coins he finds is: $[25 \times 8 = 200 \text{ gold coins}]$

2. **Determine the amount of gold coins in the smaller bags:** The problem states that each smaller bag has half as much gold as a treasure chest. Since a treasure chest contains 100 gold coins, a smaller bag will have: $[\frac{100}{2} = 50 \text{ gold coins}]$

3. **Set up an equation to find the number of smaller bags (x) :** The total amount of gold coins found in the smaller bags over 8 hours should equal the total gold coins found minus the gold coins in the treasure chest. Let (x) be the number of smaller bags found. The total gold coins found in the smaller bags is: $50x$ This total must equal the remaining gold coins after subtracting the treasure chest: $50x = 200 - 100$ $50x = 100$

4. **Solve for (x) :** To find (x) , divide both sides of the equation by 50: $x = \frac{100}{50} = 2$ Thus, the correct answer is: $\boxed{2}$ Final Answer: $\boxed{2}$

Final Answer: 2

student answer:

To find the number of smaller bags Jim found, we first calculate the total amount of gold coins he has.

Since he finds 25 gold coins per hour for 8 hours, the total amount of gold coins he finds is $25 \times 8 = 200$ gold coins. Next, we determine the amount of gold coins in each smaller bag. Each smaller bag has half as much gold as a treasure chest, which is $\frac{100}{2} = 50$ gold coins.

Now, we divide the total amount of gold coins found by the amount in each smaller bag to find the number of smaller bags: $\frac{200}{50} = 4$. Therefore, Jim found $\boxed{4}$ smaller bags. Final Answer: $\boxed{4}$.

Final Answer: 4

score:

0

-----similar such examples from the validation set-----

First, carefully analyze the student's answer. Compare it to the teacher's answer and identify any mistakes or areas where the student's reasoning could be improved. Consider the following:

1. Did the student understand the problem correctly?
2. Did they use the right approach to solve the problem?
3. Are there any calculation errors?
4. Is their reasoning clear and logical?
5. Did they miss any important steps?

Next, craft a new answer that addresses the student's misunderstandings or reinforces correct thinking. Your new answer should:

1. Use clear, step-by-step reasoning
2. Explain any concepts the student may have misunderstood
3. Provide additional context or examples if necessary
6. Use the same calculation format as the teacher's answer. If the teacher answer involves latex and involves terms like $\frac{1}{2}$, π make sure to extract the answer with the necessary latex keywords.
5. All the teacher's final answers end inside " $\boxed{}$ ". Ensure, that your answers also follow this format.
6. Lead to the correct final answer

Write your new answer using the following format:

new_answer

[Step-by-step reasoning with calculations in the format shown above]

Final Answer: [Correct numerical/latex answer]

Remember, your goal is to help the student learn and improve their problem-solving skills. Focus on explaining the reasoning clearly and addressing any specific issues in the student's original answer.
