

# LexPam: Legal Procedure Awareness-Guided Mathematical Reasoning

Kepu Zhang<sup>\*1</sup>, Guofu Xie<sup>\*1</sup>, Weijie Yu<sup>2</sup>,  
Mingyue Xu<sup>2</sup>, Xu Tang<sup>2</sup>, Yaxin Li<sup>2</sup>, Jun Xu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence, Renmin University of China

<sup>2</sup>University of International Business and Economics

## Abstract

The legal mathematical reasoning ability of LLMs is crucial when applying them to real-world scenarios, as it directly affects the credibility of the LLM. While existing legal LLMs can perform general judicial question answering, their legal mathematical reasoning capabilities have not been trained. Open-domain reasoning models, though able to generate detailed calculation steps, do not follow the reasoning logic required for legal scenarios. Additionally, there is currently a lack of legal mathematical reasoning datasets to help validate and enhance LLMs' reasoning abilities in legal contexts. To address these issues, we propose the first Chinese legal Mathematical Reasoning Dataset, LexNum, which includes three common legal mathematical reasoning scenarios: economic compensation, work injury compensation, and traffic accident compensation. Based on LexNum, we tested the performance of existing legal LLMs and reasoning LLMs, and introduced LexPam, a reinforcement learning algorithm guided by legal procedural awareness to train LLMs, enhancing their mathematical reasoning abilities in legal scenarios. Experiments on tasks in the three legal scenarios show that the performance of existing legal LLMs and reasoning models in legal mathematical reasoning tasks is unsatisfactory. LexPam can enhance the LLM's ability in these tasks.

## 1 Introduction

When a large language model (LLM) serves legal scenarios, credibility is crucial (Yu et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2024b), and its mathematical reasoning ability directly affects the credibility of legal consultation results. For example, if a user asks, "In a certain situation, how much compensation should I bear in a traffic accident?" and the model only provides a direct numerical answer (e.g., "Compensa-

<sup>\*</sup>Equal Contribution.

Pre-print with preliminary results, work in progress.




Figure 1: Examples of responses for work injury compensation from the legal LLMs Hanfei (He et al., 2023), DISCLaw-LLM (Yue et al., 2023), and the reasoning model Deepseek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025).

tion: 83,452 yuan") without showing the reasoning process—such as liability ratio calculation, insurance coverage, and compensation breakdown—the user will be unable to verify the result, making it difficult to trust the LLM's output. Moreover, results obtained without step-by-step reasoning are less useful for negotiation and mediation, reducing the practical value of the LLM.

Current legal LLMs, such as fuzi.mingcha (Wu et al., 2023) and DISCLaw-LLM (Yue et al., 2023), achieve efficient domain knowledge integration through large-scale legal text fine-tuning, demonstrating outstanding performance in tasks like legal charge prediction. However, these models have two key limitations: 1) Their training paradigm overly emphasizes legal knowledge retention rather than mathematical logical reasoning. 2) During domain adaptation, they may encounter the issue of parameter overload—when a model's parameter space is heavily occupied by legal entity knowledge, its fundamental numerical computation abilities can

Question	Question	Question
XX joined Company A, which was registered on July X, 2004. On May 15, 2010, XX signed a labor contract with Company A and continued working there. After May 2017, XX stopped working there. A has been in arrears with part of XX's wages. Assuming XX's average monthly salary was 1,700.  How much compensation should Company A provide to XX?	XX was driving a car and hit pedestrian A on the roadside. ... a road accident determination report ..B.. covered by compulsory traffic insurance, and ..third-party liability insurance.... A reasonable losses include: medical expenses of 33,154.50; hospitalization meal allowance of 550; lost wages of 6,442.80; nursing fees of 6,784.80; nutrition expenses of 2,700; disability compensation of 22,393.60; mental distress compensation of 5,000; future medical expenses of 10,000; appraisal fees of 1,900. How much should B compensate A under the compulsory traffic insurance policy?	XX and B are mother and daughter. B passed away due to a traffic accident. ... The work-related injury determination document confirmed that B's death constituted a work-related injury. The average monthly wage in City A is 4,090, and the per capita disposable income is 31,195. B's funeral subsidy has been calculated as 10,300, and the one-time work-related death compensation is 48,140. A has already paid B's one-time work-related death compensation of 48,140. ... How much additional work-related death compensation should A pay to XX?
<i>Calculation and Answer</i> $1700 \times 14 = 23800$	<i>Calculation and Answer</i> $10000 + 6442.80 + 6784.80 + 5000 + 22393.60 = 50621.20$	<i>Calculation and Answer</i> $31195 \times 20 - 48140 = 575760$
(a) Economic compensation	(b) Work injury compensation	(c) Traffic accident compensation

Figure 2: The examples of the three datasets. These three scenarios all require the model to have the ability to understand the problem and calculate accurately. (a) For economic compensation, the model also needs to accurately calculate the number of months for which compensation is required. (b) For work injury compensation, the model also needs to know which costs should be included in the calculation and which costs are irrelevant to the issue. (c) For traffic accident compensation, the model also needs to understand which costs are reasonable and which costs should be excluded.

degrade significantly. Meanwhile, open-domain mathematical reasoning models (such as DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025) and OpenAI-o1 (Jaech et al., 2024)) can generate detailed calculation steps but face two major uncertainties in legal applications: 1) Lack of awareness of legal procedures, leading to reasoning paths misaligned with legal computation logic. For example, in traffic accident compensation cases, these models may directly calculate compensation based on losses while overlooking the legally required sequence of liability determination, insurance coverage, and supplementary payments. 2) Domain distribution shift, making it difficult for these models to handle legal-specific computational patterns effectively. Figure 1 illustrates the performance of the two aforementioned models. The top two graphs depict the results calculated by the legal LLM Hanfei and DISCLaw-LLM, respectively. It can be observed that they made errors in multiplication and addition calculations. The graph below shows the reasoning and results output by Deepseek-R1. It can be seen that its reasoning is lengthy and nonsensical, which is entirely different from the legal process.

Therefore, building a trustworthy legal reasoning LLM presents three main challenges: 1) Lack of legal mathematical reasoning data<sup>1</sup>. This scarcity makes it difficult for LLMs to adequately learn and improve their capabilities in legal mathematical reasoning. Additionally, annotated data that follows legal procedural awareness is crucial, as it helps the model reason in accordance with legal procedures. 2) Constructing legal mathematical

<sup>1</sup>The dataset of this paper mainly focuses on Chinese, but it is also beneficial for legal mathematical reasoning in other languages.

reasoning paths is challenging due to the high human annotation costs and the diverse nature of legal reasoning paths. 3) Ensuring both mathematical correctness and legal compliance. When performing legal mathematical reasoning, the LLM must not only adhere to mathematical accuracy but also align with legal regulations. This dual alignment enhances the model's credibility and reliability.

To address the aforementioned challenges, 1) we construct the first Chinese legal mathematical reasoning dataset, **LexNum**, which covers three high-frequency litigation scenarios: economic compensation, work-related injury compensation, and traffic accident compensation, as shown in Figure 2. We obtained raw cases from the puklaw<sup>2</sup>, extracted content related to legal mathematical reasoning using a LLM, and then ensured the quality of the data through dual verification by both the LLM and human experts. Based on LexNum, we tested the performance of legal LLMs and reasoning LLMs. 2) For the construction of reasoning paths, we employ reinforcement learning (RL) to enable the model to explore appropriate paths for legal mathematical reasoning on its own. 3) We propose a legal procedure-aware reinforcement learning framework (**LexPam**) to train LLMs, encouraging them to follow legal procedural awareness and conduct reasoning according to the specified legal calculation process.

We conducted experiments on the three legal-related mathematical reasoning datasets. The experiments found that the performance of legal LLMs was very poor, and even Deepseek-R1 was not always effective.

<sup>2</sup><https://www.puklaw.com>

Therefore, the contributions of this paper are:

- We construct the first dataset specifically designed for mathematical reasoning in Chinese legal scenarios, covering three key areas: economic compensation, workplace injury compensation, and traffic accident compensation. This dataset aims to facilitate future research on legal reasoning in LLMs.
- We propose using a reinforcement learning algorithm based on legal procedural awareness to train LLMs, enabling them to reason and obtain answers following a calculation process that conforms to legal procedures.
- We tested legal LLMs, open-domain LLMs, and reasoning LLMs. The experiments revealed that existing methods still have significant room for improvement in legal mathematical reasoning tasks. However, training LLMs with reinforcement learning based on legal procedural awareness can enhance their legal mathematical reasoning capabilities.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Legal LLM

Legal LLMs are fine-tuned from open-domain LLMs by leveraging a vast amount of data from the legal domain (Yue et al., 2023; Wu et al.; Liu et al., 2023; He et al., 2023), including legal documents, synthetic legal Q-A datasets generated by LLMs, and manually annotated datasets for legal-related tasks. This enables open-domain LLMs to retain knowledge of the legal field, allowing them to provide appropriate responses to users’ legal inquiries. There are numerous benchmark datasets for evaluating the capabilities of both general LLMs and legal LLMs in legal scenarios, such as LexEval (Li et al., 2024), LawBench (Fei et al., 2023), and CitaLaw (Zhang et al., 2024b), which assess LLM performance in the legal domain from different perspectives. Recently, some studies have explored legal reasoning (Yu et al., 2025; Deng et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024a), but they primarily focus on tasks such as legal judgment prediction and legal reading comprehension, rather than legal mathematical reasoning.

However, research on legal LLMs in legal scenarios faces two key issues. First, none of the existing legal LLMs have undergone specialized training for legal mathematical reasoning, making

their mathematical reasoning capabilities uncertain. As a result, when deployed in real-world scenarios, they may struggle to provide reliable answers to users’ legal math-related questions. Second, current benchmark datasets for evaluating LLMs in the legal domain do not focus on legal mathematical reasoning, which hinders progress in improving LLMs’ capabilities in this area. This paper introduces a dataset for legal mathematical reasoning and proposes an RL training approach guided by legal procedures to enhance LLMs’ legal mathematical reasoning abilities.

### 2.2 Reasoning LLM

With the introduction of reasoning-focused LLMs such as DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025) and OpenAI-o1 (Jaech et al., 2024), numerous studies on LLM reasoning have emerged. These include approaches aimed at controlling the length of LLM reasoning chains by designing rewards to prevent unnecessarily long reasoning processes (Aggarwal and Welleck, 2025; Luo et al., 2025), compressing reasoning by introducing efficient token predictions (Han et al., 2024), and enhancing mathematical reasoning abilities with minimal high-quality data (Muennighoff et al., 2025; Ye et al., 2025). Additionally, some studies leverage knowledge distillation (Li et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024), transferring reasoning capabilities from large LLMs to smaller models to improve their performance.

However, existing research on LLM reasoning primarily focuses on open-domain mathematical reasoning, while studies on mathematical reasoning in the legal domain remain scarce. This paper addresses this gap, advancing research on LLMs’ reasoning abilities in legal scenarios and facilitating future improvements in this area.

## 3 Dataset Construction

To construct LexNum, we collected several documents from pkulaw<sup>3</sup> covering three major types of litigation scenarios: economic compensation, work-related injury compensation, and traffic accident compensation. Each legal document includes case background, case description, legal process, and the final compensation amount. The documents published have already anonymized personal information such as names. We refined the data through data extraction and data quality assurance.

<sup>3</sup><https://www.pkulaw.com>

### 3.1 Data Extraction

The documents contain a lot of information, much of which is irrelevant to legal mathematical reasoning. We need to extract the content related to legal mathematical reasoning from the documents.

The most ideal way would be to hire legal professionals to manually extract the relevant information directly from the documents, which could achieve high accuracy but at a very high cost. Therefore, we considered model-based methods to initially extract the content related to legal mathematical reasoning. One approach is to leverage existing powerful reasoning models, which can conduct thorough reasoning analysis on the text to extract the relevant content. However, the reasoning time and cost of these models are also very high. The process of extracting information by LLMs does not require strong reasoning capabilities; it only needs to understand the text content to extract the information reasonably well. Therefore, we ultimately chose to use GPT-4o to extract the content related to legal mathematical reasoning from the documents.

Specifically, we provided GPT-4o with the documents, as well as relevant legal provisions and regulations related to legal mathematical reasoning, to have it extract the problems and answers of legal mathematical reasoning, as well as the reasoning process from the problem to the answer. This reasoning process is contained within the documents but may be scattered throughout.

### 3.2 Data Quality Assurance

We ensure the quality of the extracted data based on both LLMs and human efforts. Considering the cost, we first use LLMs to conduct an initial data screening to identify the data that needs human inspection. Specifically, we utilize the LLM to determine whether the question can lead to the answer, that is, to assess whether the information in the question is complete. We extract samples that contain incomplete questions. Here, we also use GPT-4o as the LLM.

After the LLM filtering, we manually inspect and correct this portion of the data. It is important to note that data deemed correct by the LLM may still contain errors. Therefore, human verification is also necessary here to further confirm the data quality.

## 4 Method

### 4.1 Task Setup

LexNum consists of three tasks: economic compensation, work injury compensation, and traffic accident compensation.

**Economic Compensation:** Based on the relevant provisions of the “Labor Contract Law of the People’s Republic of China”, this task involves determining eligibility for compensation, calculating the length of service and average monthly wage, and computing the economic compensation amount to ensure that employees receive lawful and reasonable compensation upon contract termination.

**Work Injury Compensation:** This task identifies the responsible party and, in accordance with the “Work Injury Insurance Regulations” and other relevant laws, calculates various compensation amounts to ensure that injured employees receive lawful and reasonable compensation.

**Traffic Accident Compensation:** This task determines liability, calculates reasonable damages based on relevant legal provisions, and determines the final compensation amount according to insurance coverage, ensuring that the injured party receives lawful and fair compensation.

Examples of these three tasks are shown in Figure 2. Economic compensation requires accurately determining the number of months for which compensation is due based on legal provisions, as well as the maximum amount that can be compensated. Work injury compensation requires identifying which costs in the problem are related to the specified compensation, while also understanding legal provisions. For example, the question in Figure 2 (b) asks about compensation related to compulsory insurance, which has a limit. Considering medical expenses and allowances, the maximum compensation is 10,000. Traffic accident compensation also requires distinguishing the contents included in different types of compensation. For example, the question in Figure 2(c) asks about compensation related to work-related death benefits, so funeral allowances should not be considered.

The input for these three tasks includes compensation-related expenses, amounts already paid, insurance-related information, and other relevant details. The output is the computed compensation amount.

## 4.2 Legal Procedure Awareness-Guided RL

In this section, we introduce our proposed RL training algorithm guided by legal procedural awareness.

Existing general reasoning models, such as DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025), can generate answers through chain-of-thought reasoning. However, their reasoning paths do not follow the structured logic of legal reasoning and instead adhere to standard mathematical reasoning, freely generating responses without considering the sequential nature of legal procedures. This lack of structured legal logic makes their reasoning process less convincing for users. To address this, we propose explicitly encoding legal procedures awareness into RL training, ensuring that the LLM’s reasoning path aligns with legal reasoning logic.

The LLM takes as input a user query regarding compensation calculations along with the relevant data required for the computation. The LLM then samples and generates both reasoning steps and responses. Specifically: The reasoning process is enclosed within “<think></think>”. The final computed result is enclosed within “boxed”.

We train the model using the GRPO algorithm (Shao et al., 2024). Our reward function consists of three main components:

- **Correctness Reward  $r_{\text{correct}}$ :** Evaluates whether the extracted result from boxed matches the correct answer. If correct,  $r_{\text{correct}} = 1$ , otherwise,  $r_{\text{correct}} = 0$ .
- **Legal Procedural Awareness Reward  $r_{\text{law}}$ :** Ensures that the model follows legal procedures. The reward  $r_{\text{law}}$  increases gradually as the LLM follows the appropriate legal procedure.
- **Format Correctness Reward  $r_{\text{format}}$ :** Ensures that the output correctly follows the predefined structure, including the presence of “<think></think>” for reasoning and “boxed” for the final result.

For  $r_{\text{law}}$ , different tasks require adherence to different legal processes: 1) Economic Compensation: Compensation Type, Month Calculation, Compensation Calculation. 2) Work Injury Compensation: Injury Recognition, Liability Determination, Benefit Calculation, Insurance, Compensation Calculation. 3) Traffic Accident Compensation: Liability

Determination, Insurance, Compensation Calculation.

The overall reward function is formulated as:

$$r_{\text{final}} = r_{\text{correct}} + \alpha r_{\text{law}} + \beta r_{\text{format}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are hyperparameters controlling the importance of procedural adherence and format correctness. For example, a larger  $\alpha$  places greater emphasis on following legal procedures.

**Note:** In legal mathematical reasoning, annotating high-quality reasoning paths is challenging. Therefore, instead of performing supervised fine-tuning (SFT) before RL, we directly conduct RL training on a distilled model based on DeepSeek following the process described above.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Settings

#### 5.1.1 Datasets and Metrics

We conduct experiments on the three proposed legal mathematical reasoning datasets: Economic Compensation (EC), Work Injury Compensation (WC), and Traffic Accident Compensation (TC). A detailed introduction to these tasks can be found in Section 3. Following commonly used evaluation metrics in open-domain mathematical reasoning (Cobbe et al., 2021; Muennighoff et al., 2025), we use accuracy to assess the correctness of mathematical reasoning.

#### 5.1.2 Evaluation Models

We selected both legal domain-specific LLMs and reasoning LLMs to investigate their performance on legal mathematical reasoning tasks.

For legal LLMs we chose seven models: **Zhihai** (Wu et al.), **fuzi.mingcha** (Wu et al., 2023), **DISC-LawLLM** (Yue et al., 2023), **LawGPT\_zh** (Liu et al., 2023), **Tailing**<sup>4</sup>, **LexiLaw**<sup>5</sup>, and **HanFei** (He et al., 2023). These models have been extensively trained on legal datasets and possess substantial knowledge of legal scenarios. For reasoning LLMs we selected DeepSeek-distilled LLMs as baselines for comparison, specifically DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B (**Deepseek-R1-1.5B**) and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B (**Deepseek-R1-7B**).

For our proposed method, we conducted continued RL training with method in Section 4.2 on

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/DUTIR-LegalIntelligence/Tailing>

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/CSHaitao/LexiLaw>

Category	Model	Scale	EC	WC	TC	Avg
Legal LLM	DISC-LawLLM	13B	7.67	3.59	6.06	5.78
	fuzi.mingcha	6B	5.87	2.56	7.07	5.17
	LexiLaw	6B	3.84	1.54	3.03	2.80
	Tailing	7B	9.26	6.67	11.11	9.01
	zhihai	7B	3.61	1.03	5.05	3.23
	LawGPT_zh	6B	1.81	1.54	2.02	1.79
	HanFei	7B	4.51	1.54	6.06	4.04
Reasoning LLM	Deepseek-R1-1.5B	1.5B	9.48	20.00	6.06	11.85
	Deepseek-R1-7B	7B	10.61	27.18	21.21	19.67
	LexPam (Ours)	1.5B	<b>16.25</b>	<b>46.67</b>	<b>23.23</b>	<b>28.72</b>

Table 1: Performance comparisons on the The performance of LPAMR and baselines on the three legal mathematical reasoning datasets. Bold indicates the best performance. Deepseek-R1-1.5B is short for DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B, Deepseek-R1-7B is short for DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B.




Figure 3: Cross-domain Results. LexPam refers to our model, which undergoes RL continual training on the current dataset. LexPam-TC is the model trained on the traffic compensation training dataset. LexPam-EC/WC represents the model trained on the economic compensation dataset applied to work injury compensation, or the model trained on the work injury compensation dataset applied to economic compensation. R1-1.5B and R1-7B correspond to DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B, respectively.

DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B denoted as **LexPam**.

### 5.1.3 Implementation Details

We conducted training and testing on dual A6000 GPUs. For GRPO training, we set the learning rate to  $1e-6$ , the number of generations (`num_generations`) to 6 or 8, and the maximum completion length to 768 or 1024. We used LoRA for efficient fine-tuning of the LLM, with LoRA parameters set to  $r$  is 16 and  $\alpha$  is 16. The hyperparameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  were both set to 0.1. For

testing, we set the temperature to 0 to ensure reproducibility. We trained the model using DeepSpeed ZeRO-2 (Rajbhandari et al., 2020) and accelerated inference with vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023).

## 5.2 Main Results

Table 1 presents the comparison results between our method and the baselines. From the table, we can draw the following conclusions:

**Our method achieves the best results.** As shown in the table, our method achieves the highest legal mathematical reasoning accuracy across all three datasets. Even with a 1.5B model size, our approach outperforms both 7B-scale reasoning models and all legal LLMs, demonstrating the effectiveness of our method. By leveraging legal procedure-aware RL training, our model enhances its ability in legal mathematical reasoning. This also highlights the potential of RL in boosting LLM reasoning capabilities, enabling models to learn how to reason more effectively.

**Legal LLMs perform poorly.** We observe that existing legal LLMs struggle significantly on legal mathematical reasoning tasks. This is likely because these models are extensively fine-tuned on large-scale legal datasets, allowing them to memorize legal knowledge but gradually losing their mathematical computation abilities. Furthermore, these models lack explicit training on legal mathematical reasoning tasks, which weakens their inference capabilities. Among legal LLMs, Tailing performs relatively better, possibly because its base model is Qwen, which has strong reasoning abilities—a choice also made by many modern reasoning models like Deepseek. Our analysis of legal LLMs’ reasoning and computation processes re-

veals that they struggle even with basic addition, further confirming our hypothesis that extensive legal fine-tuning diminishes their mathematical reasoning capabilities.

### 5.3 Cross-domain Results

The main experiment validated that LexPam is effective in in-domain scenarios. In this section, we explore its performance in cross-domain settings. Specifically, we select the work injury and economic domains and apply models trained on other domains to these two domains. The results are shown in Figure 3.

From the figure, we can see that applying models trained on the work injury and traffic compensation datasets to the economic compensation task, as well as applying models trained on the economic and traffic compensation datasets to the work injury compensation task, both achieve significant improvements over DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B. Moreover, their performance is comparable to that of DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B. This demonstrates that LexPam can effectively adapt to cross-domain scenarios. Even when data distributions differ across domains, LexPam still exhibits strong performance, highlighting its robust generalization ability.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we present the first Chinese legal Mathematical Reasoning Dataset, LexNum, which includes three common legal mathematical reasoning scenarios: economic compensation, work injury compensation, and traffic accident compensation. We propose LexPam, a reinforcement learning algorithm guided by legal procedural awareness to progressively enhance the LLM’s legal mathematical reasoning ability. In experiments on the three legal mathematical reasoning datasets in LexNum, we compare our method with 7 legal LLMs and 2 reasoning LLMs. The results show that there is still significant room for improvement in their performance, and they also validate the effectiveness of LexPam.

## References

Pranjal Aggarwal and Sean Welleck. 2025. L1: Controlling how long a reasoning model thinks with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.04697*.

Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.

Chenlong Deng, Kelong Mao, Yuyao Zhang, and Zhicheng Dou. 2024. Enabling discriminative reasoning in llms for legal judgment prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01964*.

Zhiwei Fei, Xiaoyu Shen, Dawei Zhu, Fengzhe Zhou, Zhuo Han, Songyang Zhang, Kai Chen, Zongwen Shen, and Jidong Ge. 2023. Lawbench: Benchmarking legal knowledge of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16289*.

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*.

Tingxu Han, Zhenting Wang, Chunrong Fang, Shiyu Zhao, Shiqing Ma, and Zhenyu Chen. 2024. Token-budget-aware llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.18547*.

Wanwei He, Jiabao Wen, Lei Zhang, Hao Cheng, Bowen Qin, Yunshui Li, Feng Jiang, Junying Chen, Benyou Wang, and Min Yang. 2023. Hanfei-1.0. <https://github.com/siat-nlp/HanFei>.

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*.

Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 611–626.

Chenglin Li, Qianglong Chen, Liangyue Li, Caiyu Wang, Yicheng Li, Zulong Chen, and Yin Zhang. 2023. Mixed distillation helps smaller language model better reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10730*.

Haitao Li, You Chen, Qingyao Ai, Yueyue Wu, Ruizhe Zhang, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. Lexeval: A comprehensive chinese legal benchmark for evaluating large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.20288*.

Hongcheng Liu, Yusheng Liao, Yutong Meng, and Yuhao Wang. 2023. Xiezhi: Chinese law large language model. [https://github.com/LiuHC0428/LAW\\_GPT](https://github.com/LiuHC0428/LAW_GPT).

Haotian Luo, Li Shen, Haiying He, Yibo Wang, Shiwei Liu, Wei Li, Naiqiang Tan, Xiaochun Cao,

- and Dacheng Tao. 2025. O1-pruner: Length-harmonizing fine-tuning for o1-like reasoning pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12570*.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Zitong Yang, Weijia Shi, Xiang Lisa Li, Li Fei-Fei, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, Percy Liang, Emmanuel Candès, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2025. s1: Simple test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.19393*.
- Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–16. IEEE.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Y Wu, et al. 2024. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*.
- Shiguang Wu, Zhongkun Liu, Zhen Zhang, Zheng Chen, Wentao Deng, Wenhao Zhang, Jiyuan Yang, Zhitao Yao, Yougang Lyu, Xin Xin, Shen Gao, Pengjie Ren, Zhaochun Ren, and Zhumin Chen. 2023. fuzi.mingcha. <https://github.com/irlab-sdu/fuzi.mingcha>.
- Yiquan Wu, Yuhang Liu, Yifei Liu, Ang Li, Siying Zhou, and Kun Kuang. *wisdominterrogatory*. Available at GitHub.
- Yixin Ye, Zhen Huang, Yang Xiao, Ethan Chern, Shijie Xia, and Pengfei Liu. 2025. Limo: Less is more for reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03387*.
- Weijie Yu, Zhongxiang Sun, Jun Xu, Zhenhua Dong, Xu Chen, Hongteng Xu, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. Explainable legal case matching via inverse optimal transport-based rationale extraction. In *Proceedings of the 45th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 657–668.
- Yaoyao Yu, Leilei Gan, Yinghao Hu, Bin Wei, Kun Kuang, and Fei Wu. 2025. Evaluating test-time scaling llms for legal reasoning: Openai o1, deepseek-r1, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16040*.
- Shengbin Yue, Wei Chen, Siyuan Wang, Bingxuan Li, Chenchen Shen, Shujun Liu, Yuxuan Zhou, Yao Xiao, Song Yun, Xuanjing Huang, and Zhongyu Wei. 2023. *Disc-lawllm: Fine-tuning large language models for intelligent legal services*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.11325.
- Kepu Zhang, Haoyue Yang, Xu Tang, Weijie Yu, and Jun Xu. 2024a. Beyond guilt: Legal judgment prediction with trichotomous reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14588*.
- Kepu Zhang, Weijie Yu, Sunhao Dai, and Jun Xu. 2024b. Citalaw: Enhancing llm with citations in legal domain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14556*.
- Xunyu Zhu, Jian Li, Can Ma, and Weiping Wang. 2024. Improving mathematical reasoning capabilities of small language models via feedback-driven distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.14698*.