

Understanding Aha Moments: from External Observations to Internal Mechanisms

Shu Yang^{1,2} Junchao Wu³ Xin Chen³ Yunze Xiao⁴ Xinyi Yang³
 Derek F. Wong³ and Di Wang^{*,1,2}

¹Provable Responsible AI and Data Analytics (PRADA) Lab

²King Abdullah University of Science and Technology

³University of Macau ⁴Carnegie Mellon University

Abstract

Large Reasoning Models (LRMs), capable of reasoning through complex problems, have become crucial for tasks like programming, mathematics, and commonsense reasoning. However, a key challenge lies in understanding how these models acquire reasoning capabilities and exhibit “aha moments” when they reorganize their methods to allocate more thinking time to problems. In this work, we systematically study “aha moments” in LRMs, from linguistic patterns, description of uncertainty, “Reasoning Collapse” to analysis in latent space. We demonstrate that the “aha moment” is externally manifested in a more frequent use of anthropomorphic tones for self-reflection and an adaptive adjustment of uncertainty based on problem difficulty. This process helps the model complete reasoning without succumbing to “Reasoning Collapse”. Internally, it corresponds to a separation between anthropomorphic characteristics and pure reasoning, with an increased anthropomorphic tone for more difficult problems. Furthermore, we find that the “aha moment” helps models solve complex problems by altering their perception of problem difficulty. As the layer of the model increases, simpler problems tend to be perceived as more complex, while more difficult problems appear simpler.

1 Introduction

Large reasoning models (LRMs), which can “think through” complex problems, are emerging as a new class of large-scale models that enhance reliability and performance in tasks such as programming, mathematics, and commonsense reasoning (Guo et al., 2025; Xu et al., 2025). Recent studies have shown that reasoning capabilities can be incentivized through reinforcement learning, leading to an “aha moment” where the model suddenly exhibits the ability to rethink a problem using an anthropomorphic tone. Additionally, these reasoning abilities can be distilled from a well-trained LRM into a smaller LLM (Guo et al., 2025; Meng et al., 2025). While we are all inspired by this, our understanding remains limited regarding how the “aha moment”—where the model allocates more thinking steps to a problem by reflecting on its initial solution with an anthropomorphic tone (as shown in Figure 1)—can help push the limits of reasoning ability.

To fill the gap, our work analyzes the mechanism of the “aha moment,” moving from surface-level linguistic patterns and uncertainty to deeper latent space exploration. We find that the “aha moment” influences the model’s external behavior in three key ways: (1) it leads to the emergence of more anthropomorphic linguistic patterns, (2) it enables the model to adjust its uncertainty based on the difficulty level of a given problem, promoting more self-reflection organized through anthropomorphic language, (3) it can prevent the model from falling into Reasoning Collapse, where the model fails to complete reasoning correctly due to language mixing, token sequence repetition, or repeated reasoning paths.

*Corresponding author.

Question What is the coefficient of x^2y^6 in the expansion of $(\frac{3}{5}x - \frac{y}{2})^8$? Express your answer as a common fraction.	
Original (no-aha) Model Response	Reasoning (aha) Model Response
<p>Qwen2.5-Math-1.5B: To find the coefficient of ..., we can use the binomial theorem. The binomial theorem states that: $(a + b)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k$. In this case, ..., so we need to find the term in the expansion... Simplifying this term, we get: ... So the coefficient of x^2y^6 in the expansion of $(\frac{3}{5}x - \frac{y}{2})^8$ is $\frac{63}{400}$. Let's confirm this with Python code... <python code and output> The coefficient of x^2y^6 in the expansion of $(\frac{3}{5}x - \frac{y}{2})^8$ is $\frac{63}{400}$, which is equivalent to 0.1575. So the final answer is: $\frac{63}{400}$.</p>	<p>DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B: <think> Okay, so I need to find the coefficient of x^2y^6... Hmm, alright, let me think about how to approach this. I remember something about... Yeah, the binomial theorem states that $(a + b)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k$. So, ... But wait, ... But that's okay because it's just ... , the term ... Okay, so I need to compute ... Now, simplify $\frac{252}{1600}$. Let me see if I can reduce this fraction. Wait, just to make sure I didn't make any mistakes in my ... **Final Answer** The coefficient of x^2y^6 is $\frac{63}{400}$. </think> To find the coefficient of ..., we use the binomial theorem. The binomial theorem states that: ... First, compute the binomial coefficient ... Next, compute ... Then, compute ... Now, multiply all Now, multiply all parts together ... Simplify the constants ... Thus, the coefficient of x^2y^6 is $\frac{63}{400}$.</p>
<p>Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct: To find the coefficient of x^2y^6 in the expansion of $(\frac{3}{5}x - \frac{y}{2})^8$, we can use the Binomial Theorem. The Binomial Theorem states that for any non-negative integer n and any real numbers a and b, we have $(a + b)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k$. In this case, we have $a = \frac{3}{5}x$, $b = -\frac{y}{2}$, and $n = 8$. We want to find the coefficient of x^2y^6, so we need to find the term in the expansion where the power of x is 2 and the power of y is 6. Using the Binomial Theorem, we have ... We want to find the term where $k = 6$, so we have ... so we have ... Evaluating this expression, we get ... Simplifying, we get ... Therefore, the coefficient of x^2y^6 in the expansion of $(\frac{3}{5}x - \frac{y}{2})^8$ is $\frac{252}{1600} = \frac{63}{400}$.</p>	<p>DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B: <think> Okay, so I need to find the coefficient of ... Hmm, let me think about how to approach this. I remember that ... binomial theorem ... In this case, the binomial is ..., so ... I need the term where the power of ... Let me denote the general term as ... Let me compute that term. First, calculate ... Next, calculate ... Then, calculate ... Now, multiply all these together: ... Wait, let me double-check my steps ... So, I think that's correct. **Final Answer** The coefficient of x^2y^6 is $\frac{63}{400}$. </think> To find the coefficient of ... we use the binomial theorem ... 1. Calculate the binomial coefficient ... 2. Calculate ... 3. Calculate ... 4. Multiply these ... 5. Simplify the fraction ... Thus, the coefficient of x^2y^6 is $\frac{63}{400}$.</p>

Figure 1: Example of an “Aha Moment.” We highlight the reasoning steps and anthropomorphic expressions separately. This example illustrates how the “aha moment” integrates structured reasoning with the emergence of anthropomorphic language patterns. The question is sourced from the GSM8K dataset.

Building on these observations, we propose the Reasoning-Anthropomorphic Separation Metric (RASM), a quantitative measure that captures the shift between anthropomorphic self-reflection and pure reasoning in model outputs. Our findings reveal that the “aha moment” is intrinsically linked to a model’s ability to dynamically adjust its thinking strategy based on task difficulty, with anthropomorphic traits becoming more pronounced as problems grow more complex. This suggests that incorporating human-like expressions can help enhance a model’s capacity with organized self-reflection and navigate challenging reasoning tasks. To gain deeper insight into how the “aha moment” aids LLMs in solving more complex questions, we analyze the internal mechanisms underlying these reasoning behavior shifts through latent space exploration. Our analysis of internal activations uncovers an interesting trend in R1-like models: while they initially distinguish problem difficulty levels clearly, deeper layers progressively *blur these boundaries*. This phenomenon contrasts sharply with standard reasoning processes, where a model’s understanding of problem difficulty typically becomes clearer as layer depth increases. This indicates that “aha moment” can help the R1-like model’s reasoning with processing simple problems in a more complex manner while interpreting complex problems as simpler ones. This finding further supports the “overthinking” phenomenon (Chen et al., 2024; Sui et al., 2025) in LRMs, where models tend to produce overly verbose and redundant responses even for simple questions. Overall, our results highlight the critical importance of investigating both reasoning strategies and anthropomorphic tendencies in R1-like models.

Our work inspires further exploration into optimizing R1-like models—not only by improving reasoning strategies but also by enhancing their anthropomorphic behaviors and refining their ability to recognize task difficulty.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Synthetic Puzzle Dataset

To avoid the influence of varying difficulties, task structures, and potential data leakage that could affect the fairness of our experiments and results, we generate synthetic reasoning tasks motivated by previous works (Xie et al., 2024; Pan et al., 2025). In the following tasks, we use

No-aha models	Corresponding aha models
Qwen2.5-Math-1.5B-Instruct	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B
Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B
Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B

Figure 2: No-aha models and their corresponding aha models we used.

n to define the difficulty level of the puzzles. Specifically, for common sense reasoning, we employ Knights and Knaves (K&K) puzzles; for mathematical reasoning, we use the Count Down puzzle. Next, we provide examples and a detailed description of these two tasks.

Knights and Knaves (K&K) (Johnson-Laird & Byrne, 1990) is a classic logical puzzle that requires determining which individuals are telling the truth and which are lying based on the statements of n people, and then identifying their true identities.

An example of a K&K puzzle ($n = 3$)

Problem: A very special island is inhabited only by knights and knaves. Knights always tell the truth, and knaves always lie. You meet 3 inhabitants: Penelope, David, and Zoey. Penelope noted, "David is a knight if and only if David is a knave". David told you that "Zoey is a knave if and only if Zoey is a knight". According to Zoey, "If Penelope is a knave then David is a knave". So who is a knight and who is a knave?

Solution: Penelope is a knave, David is a knave, and Zoey is a knight.

Count Down (Pan et al., 2025) is a preprocessed dataset for the countdown task, where the goal is to generate equations to reach a given target number using n provided numbers.

An example of a Count Down puzzle ($n = 3$)

Problem: Using the numbers $\{2, 26, 38\}$, create an equation that equals 90. You can use basic arithmetic operations (+, -, *, /) and each number can only be used once.

Solution: $2*26+38$

Compared to K&K, where the model heavily relies on understanding and distinguishing the given information, the Count Down task provides much more limited information. As a result, the model must continuously explore and engage in mathematical reasoning to arrive at the correct answer.

2.2 The "Aha Moment" Phenomenon

A recent breakthrough in LRMs, DeepSeek R1 (Guo et al., 2025), demonstrated that reinforcement learning (RL) can enhance a model’s reasoning abilities without requiring any supervised reasoning data. The most intriguing aspect of their findings is the discovery of an "aha moment"—when applying RL with a rule-based reward, the model autonomously developed advanced problem-solving strategies by reflection and self-correction in an *anthropomorphic tone* (as shown in Figure 1), leading to improved performance on reasoning tasks.

Inspired by this phenomenon, numerous studies have attempted to reproduce the R1-Zero-like training paradigm. Most of these works observed that after RL training, LLMs began exhibiting self-reflection behaviors when answering a question. However, Liu et al. (2025) found instances where self-reflection occurred as early as epoch 0, suggesting that "achieving an aha moment" cannot simply be defined based on reflection behavior. Similarly, in Xie et al. (2025)’s replication of R1-like training, the model demonstrated complex self-correct reasoning behaviors during training but did not explicitly verbalize an anthropomorphic tone (e.g., "Wait, wait. Wait. That’s an aha moment...") as observed in Guo et al. (2025). Based on this exploration, to better understand the mechanisms underlying the aha moment, we need not only to learn about different reasoning behaviors but also to explore the role of anthropomorphic tone in reasoning tasks. Therefore, we analyze both model behavior and internal latent space representations using two syntactic puzzle datasets, K&K and Count Down, as detailed in § 2.1.

"Aha" and "no-aha" models In this paper, we use the DeepSeek-R1-Distill models ranging from 1.5B to 14B as the "aha models," which are distilled from the DeepSeek-R1 model and retain certain R1-like characteristics. Correspondingly, we use their respective Instruct models released by the Qwen or Llama team (Team, 2024; Grattafiori et al., 2024) as the "no-aha models," rather than the base models before distillation fine-tuning. This choice prevents potential unfairness in evaluation, as using the base models before instruction

fine-tuning could result in an inability to properly follow our provided questions. Table 2 lists the aha models alongside their corresponding no-aha models.

3 Analyzing the “Aha Moment” through Linguistic Pattern and Uncertainty

To investigate how the “aha moment” helps models in completing a reasoning task, we first analyze the differences in linguistic patterns between aha and no-aha model pairs in Table 2 (§ 3.1). We then explore the profound significant impact of these linguistic patterns on LLMs from an uncertainty perspective, which is highly related to self-reflection or self-correction behaviors (§ 3.2). Finally, we further discover that “aha moment” can prevent models from falling into “reasoning collapse,” where they struggle to reach a final answer due to “language mixing,” “language repetition,” and “reasoning path repetition” (§ 3.3). This suggests that more anthropomorphism and uncertainty may help models escape from reasoning failure.




Figure 3: The beginning token distribution of no-aha model and aha model pairs

3.1 Different Beginning Token Distribution of Aha Model and No-aha Model

Previous research has highlighted a strong correlation between the beginning token of generated text and model performance. By providing appropriate prefix tokens, the model’s decision space can be effectively constrained, enhancing specific capabilities (Zhan et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024). In the context of reasoning tasks, Ji et al. (2025) found that the beginning tokens of different logical steps in multi-solution generation exhibit high consistency and can be leveraged for efficient fine-tuning. This underscores the critical role these beginning tokens play as an important linguistic pattern in shaping the model’s reasoning performance. Inspired by this, we analyze the beginning tokens in the output of the aha models and their corresponding no-aha models. As shown by the example in Figure 1, the output of the no-aha model typically unfolds with *fixed reasoning structures* like “To find the...”, while the aha model more often employs *anthropomorphic tone expressions* such as “Okay, so I need...”, forming two well-distinct linguistic patterns. To systematically analyze these differences, we sample 100 questions from each difficulty level of the K&K and Count Down puzzle datasets and compute the distribution of beginning tokens in each sentence of both model types’ outputs. To ensure a more meaningful comparison, we exclude high-frequency stop words common to both models such as “**” and “**\n”.

The results, shown in Figure 3, reveal significant differences in linguistic patterns between aha and no-aha models. Aha models tend to adopt conversational and emotional expressions (e.g., “Wait,” “Alright,” “Hmm,” “Okay,”), making their linguistic style more similar to natural human expression. They exhibit strong internal thinking patterns and display anthropomorphic characteristics. Especially, aha models prefer to use “I” instead of “we” compared to no-aha models, suggesting greater self-awareness. In contrast, no-aha models emphasize logical and structured expressions (e.g., “Combining,” “According,” “Determine,” “First”) that directly relate to the problem-solving process, resulting in a more mechanical response. We also observed that, despite being of nearly the same scale, the Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct and LLaMA-3.1-8B-Instruct models exhibit different preferences in linguistic patterns. Specifically, the LLaMA-3.1-8B-Instruct model tends to use personal names such as “Divide” and “James” more frequently as sentence-beginning tokens (or as the subjects of the sentence) compared to the Qwen model. This phenomenon has also been noted by Cheng et al. (2024), suggesting that LLaMA-3.1-8B-Instruct demonstrates a potential *tendency* toward anthropomorphism. However, all no-aha models consistently fail to demonstrate the obvious self-awareness characteristic as their aha counterparts, allowing us to identify this anthropomorphic tone (or self-awareness) as a distinguishing feature between paired “aha” and “no-aha” models.

3.2 Aha Models Dynamically Adjust their Uncertainty to Difficulty Levels




Figure 4: Response examples from DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B in solving different tasks, Count Down (a) and K&K (b). Cooler colors indicate lower probability (higher uncertainty), while warmer colors indicate higher probability (lower uncertainty).

Having examined the distinct linguistic patterns between “aha” and “no-aha” models in §3.1, this section investigates how these models express uncertainty in their inference process and how this uncertainty relates to increased self-reflection. We segment the LLMs’ solution into individual sentences and compute the average probability of each sentence, as illustrated in Figure 4. We can find that when solving the Count down problem, the probability of output sentences gradually increases. Sentences containing an anthropomorphic tone or self-reflective expressions tend to have lower probabilities, indicating higher uncertainty. This pattern reflects the model’s reasoning process when tackling a mathematical problem with less information: it progressively refines its understanding through self-reflection, thereby increasing confidence in the final answer. However, when solving the K&K problem, which




Figure 5: Average probability of LLMs’ output across different task and difficulty level.

involves numerous pieces of evidence in the input, the model frequently refers back to the provided information. Sentences that restate given details tend to have higher probabilities, indicating lower uncertainty. In contrast, sentences involving human-like self-reflection, such as “Is that possible?” or “Wait,” generally exhibit higher uncertainty. We provide a more detailed analysis of the most probable yet uncertain sentences for each model in Appendix B.1.

In Figure 5, we present the average probability of each model across different tasks and difficulty levels. Our analysis reveals that, as difficulty increases, the probability of sentences generated by the no-aha model does not exhibit a clear modified trend. Moreover, except for the performance of Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct on the Count Down task, the no-aha model consistently maintains higher probability values than its corresponding aha model. This suggests that the no-aha model has lower uncertainty and may even struggle to identify the difficulty of a question, let alone dynamically adjust its reasoning path based on the difficulty level. In contrast, the uncertainty of the aha models follows a more consistent trend as difficulty varies. Specifically, in the K&K task, the uncertainty of the aha model gradually decreases with increasing difficulty levels. This may be because the model repeatedly reiterates the conditions provided in the problem during reasoning, as illustrated in Figure 4b. For the Count Down task, the uncertainty of the aha model increases with difficulty, suggesting that aha models are capable of recognizing problems of varying difficulty or tasks and adjusting their responses accordingly.

3.3 The “Reasoning Collapse” of Aha and No-aha models




Figure 6: Reasoning Collapse: examples (a) and occurrence probabilities across different model types and difficulty levels (b).

We also find that as problem difficulty increases, models exhibit more instances of reasoning collapse, which can be broadly categorized into three types: “language mixing,” “language repetition,” and “reasoning path repetition.” As illustrated in Figure 6a, “language mixing” can be defined as after generating several tokens, the model begins to produce a mixture of languages, sometimes including non-English characters or even emojis. “Language repetition” refers to cases where the model continuously repeats a sequence of tokens until it reaches the maximum output length. Finally, “reasoning path repetition” describes a situation in which the model becomes trapped in a fixed pattern of reasoning, unable to break out of the loop, leading to repetitive thought processes until the output reaches its maximum length. We use non-English character detection to identify language repetition, consecutive repeated token and sequence detection for language repetition, and high-similarity phrase matching to capture reasoning path repetition. To quantify the likelihood of reasoning collapse, we calculate the occurrence probability of these patterns across 200 test samples at each difficulty level.

In Figure 6b we can demonstrate that aha models effectively suppress language mixing and reasoning path repetition, with both rates approaching zero, especially for the difficulty level 3-6. Additionally, when the problem difficulty level is low, the language repetition rate of aha models is larger than that of no-aha models. However, when the problem difficulty exceeds 5, aha models gradually gain an advantage. This may be because aha models are

more prone to overthinking simple problems (Chen et al., 2025; Sui et al., 2025), leading to repeated descriptions of the same step, which results in higher language repetition. To further investigate the underlying reasons behind these phenomena in both the aha and no-aha models, we explore the “aha moment” through their latent space in the next section.

4 Investigating the Aha Moment through Latent Space Exploration

In § 3, we examined the differences in linguistic patterns, uncertainty and “reasoning collapse” between aha and no-aha models during inference. In this section, we further investigate the “aha moment” by exploring the latent space of these models to understand how anthropomorphic features are activated (§ 4.1) and how these models differ in reasoning the difficulty level of problems (§ 4.2).

4.1 Reasoning-Anthropomorphic Separation Metric




Figure 7: Comparison of RASM across different difficulty levels n between aha and no-aha model pairs. We fit the score distributions for both models using Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) with a bandwidth selection method.

In § 3.1, we observed that aha models consistently utilize a small set of anthropomorphic tokens (e.g., “Wait” and “Hmm”) to start their self-reflection, search, and verification behaviors. This observation enables us to efficiently evaluate a model’s expressive changes by examining its next-token probability distribution, rather than relying on external evaluators as in Cheng et al. (2024) or LLM-as-evaluator approaches (Gu et al., 2024). To evaluate the change formally for each model, we manually identify a set of anthropomorphic beginning tokens, denoted as \mathcal{A} , selected from tokens most likely to signal the aha model’s shift to an anthropomorphic tone. Additionally, we define a set of pure reasoning beginning tokens like “Calculate”, “First”, \mathcal{R} , which models frequently use when performing direct reasoning or computational steps. The selection principle is based on our results in § 3.1 and is detailed in Appendix A.2. We can then estimate the probability of anthropomorphic versus pure reasoning responses as the sum of the probabilities at the beginning of a sentence assigned to tokens in \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{R} , respectively. Given a vector of next-token probabilities $\mathbf{p} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|\mathcal{V}|}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$, where \mathcal{V} denotes the model’s vocabulary, we define

$P_A(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{A}} p_t$ and $P_R(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{R}} p_t$. We calculate the log odds ratio between these probabilities to form our Reasoning-Anthropomorphic Separation Metric (RASM):

$$\text{RASM}(\mathbf{p}) = \log \left(\frac{P_A(\mathbf{p}) + \epsilon}{P_R(\mathbf{p}) + \epsilon} \right) = \log \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{A}} p_t + \epsilon \right) - \log \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{R}} p_t + \epsilon \right),$$

where $\epsilon = 1e-10$ is added for numerical stability.

We run all the models listed in Table 2 on the K&K and Count Down test sets across different difficulty levels, computed the RASM at the beginning position of each sentence in the responses, and then displayed the RASM density for all models in Figure 7. Additionally, we include the statistical distribution measures such as the Mean, Skewness, Kurtosis, and Bimodality Coefficient in Appendix B.2, Figure 9. We observe that both aha and no-aha models show an increasing trend in average RASM as task difficulty rises. However, Figure 9 shows that no-aha models consistently maintain a mean RASM below zero, indicating their preference for pure reasoning. In contrast, aha models exhibit a sharper rise, eventually surpassing zero, reflecting a stronger shift toward anthropomorphic expression. Also, the aha models exhibit a stronger bimodal distribution, can be evidenced by the rising bimodality coefficient in Figure 2. This phenomenon suggests a sophisticated linguistic mechanism where the models develop a clearer separation between reasoning and anthropomorphic self-reflection compared to no-aha model. As task difficulty increases, the aha models gradually symmetrize their linguistic approach, balancing anthropomorphic insights with pure reasoning. Notably, their initially right-skewed distribution shifts toward zero, indicating that the models are not merely adding anthropomorphic elements arbitrarily, but are strategically integrating them to enhance problem-solving capabilities.

This finding suggests that the emergence of the ‘‘aha moment’’ is more than a stylistic linguistic pattern; it signifies a deeper refinement of reasoning ability. By fostering a distinct separation between anthropomorphic and reasoning features, aha models enable a more adaptive and flexible problem-solving framework, particularly as task complexity increases.

4.2 Contrastive Analysis in Latent Space

To further explore how the ‘‘aha moment’’ influences the way models handle complex reasoning problems of varying difficulty, this section analyzes the behavior of the aha and no-aha models in the latent space of each layer.

For each model \mathcal{M} in Table 2, we run them on the K&K and Count Down training datasets and project the activations of its l -th layer corresponding at the last token position for each difficulty level using PCA, inspired by Rimsky et al. (2024). While it is evident that activations can always be separated across different tasks, our goal is to investigate further how these models encode features at varying difficulty levels, building on previous findings. We surprisingly find that, unlike the no-aha models such as Qwen2.5-Math-1.5B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct (Figure 8), where difficulty clustering becomes progressively clearer as the layer depth increases, the aha models, including DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B, exhibit a well-defined difficulty clustering pattern in the early layers. However, as layer depth increases, this clustering pattern becomes increasingly blurred. To quantify this observation, we use the silhouette score (S) (Rousseeuw, 1987) as a measure of this clustering quality. In the no-aha models, the silhouette score gradually improves across layers, starting from $S = -0.0103$ (Qwen2.5-Math-1.5B-Instruct) and $S = -0.0101$ (Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct), reaching their respective peaks at layer 22 with $S = 0.0067$ and $S = 0.0103$, indicating an increasing separation of difficulty levels. In contrast, for the aha models, the silhouette score declines with depth, suggesting a loss of cluster separability. DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B starts at $S = -0.0053$ (layer 2) and decreases to $S = -0.0291$ (layer 27), while DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B drops from $S = 0.0071$ (layer 2) to $S = -0.045$ (layer 27). This trend suggests that while early layers in aha models already encode distinct difficulty-related representations, deeper layers increasingly mix them, blurring the clustering.

Furthermore, we demonstrate that the no-aha model exhibits a more symmetrical separation of difficulty features, as seen in Figure 8. The PC2 projections in no-aha models remain




Figure 8: Difficulty level clustering of different models, with S representing the silhouette score (Rousseeuw, 1987) for clustering based on the second principal component (PC2). A higher S indicates better clustering and feature separation performance.

largely symmetric across layers, with a balanced distribution of data points along the positive and negative ranges of the PC2 axis. In contrast, for the aha model, the scale of the projections in the simple difficulty direction gradually surpasses that of the hard direction as the model depth increases. For instance, in DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B at layer 27, the positive range of the PC2 axis is significantly larger than the negative range, and more difficult problem samples are projected in the same direction as simpler problems, compared to Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct. Additionally, for easier problems—such as those at difficulty levels 3–4—the aha model projects them across a wider range rather than strictly separating them within a limited space, as seen in no-aha models. This suggests that the aha model may inherently treat simpler problems as requiring more complex processing, potentially incorporating more nuanced reasoning even at lower difficulty levels.

These findings indicate that the “aha moment” influences the model’s ability to recognize the difficulty of a problem in its early layers. Then it appears to help the model learn to approach simpler problems with greater complexity while trying to simplify harder problems to support reasoning, potentially mitigating issues such as the Reasoning Collapse discussed in § 3.3

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we conduct a comprehensive study of the “aha moment” to explore how it helps the model perform complex reasoning. We demonstrate that the outputs of the “aha model” exhibit more anthropomorphic characteristics, and as the difficulty increases, these anthropomorphic traits become more frequent. Moreover, it is closely tied to the model’s expression of its uncertainty. Furthermore, we find that the probability of “reasoning collapse” in the “aha model” significantly decreases when answering complex problems, suggesting that the “aha moment” helps the model complete reasoning successfully rather than getting stuck in repetition or reasoning loops. Additionally, by analyzing the model’s latent space, we discover that, unlike the “no-aha model,” which progressively deepens its understanding of problem difficulty layer by layer, the “aha model” can effectively

recognize the problem's difficulty at earlier layers. However, it tends to blur the boundaries of difficulty in later layers, offering an explanation for the "overthinking" issue in LRMs.

References

- Xingyu Chen, Jiahao Xu, Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Jianhui Pang, Dian Yu, Linfeng Song, Qiuzhi Liu, Mengfei Zhou, Zhuosheng Zhang, et al. Do not think that much for $2+3=?$ on the overthinking of o1-like llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.21187*, 2024.
- Xingyu Chen, Jiahao Xu, Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Jianhui Pang, Dian Yu, Linfeng Song, Qiuzhi Liu, Mengfei Zhou, Zhuosheng Zhang, Rui Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. Do not think that much for $2+3=?$ on the overthinking of o1-like llms, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.21187>.
- Myra Cheng, Kristina Gligorić, Tiziano Piccardi, and Dan Jurafsky. Anthroscore: A computational linguistic measure of anthropomorphism. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 807–825, 2024.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>.
- Jiawei Gu, Xuhui Jiang, Zhichao Shi, Hexiang Tan, Xuehao Zhai, Chengjin Xu, Wei Li, Yinghan Shen, Shengjie Ma, Honghao Liu, et al. A survey on llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15594*, 2024.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- Ke Ji, Jiahao Xu, Tian Liang, Qiuzhi Liu, Zhiwei He, Xingyu Chen, Xiaoyuan Liu, Zhijie Wang, Junying Chen, Benyou Wang, et al. The first few tokens are all you need: An efficient and effective unsupervised prefix fine-tuning method for reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.02875*, 2025.
- P.N. Johnson-Laird and Ruth M.J. Byrne. Meta-logical problems: Knights, knaves, and rips. *Cognition*, 36(1):69–84, 1990. ISSN 0010-0277. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(90\)90054-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(90)90054-N). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/001002779090054N>.
- Zichen Liu, Changyu Chen, Wenjun Li, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, and Min Lin. There may not be aha moment in r1-zero-like training — a pilot study. <https://oatllm.notion.site/oat-zero>, 2025. Notion Blog.
- Congda Ma, Tianyu Zhao, Makoto Shing, Kei Sawada, and Manabu Okumura. Focused prefix tuning for controllable text generation. *Journal of Natural Language Processing*, 31(1): 250–265, 2024.
- Fanqing Meng, Lingxiao Du, Zongkai Liu, Zhixiang Zhou, Quanfeng Lu, Daocheng Fu, Botian Shi, Wenhai Wang, Junjun He, Kaipeng Zhang, Ping Luo, Yu Qiao, Qiaosheng Zhang, and Wenqi Shao. Mm-eureka: Exploring visual aha moment with rule-based large-scale reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.07365>.
- Jiayi Pan, Junjie Zhang, Xingyao Wang, Lifan Yuan, Hao Peng, and Alane Suhr. Tinyzero. <https://github.com/Jiayi-Pan/TinyZero>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-01-24.
- Nina Rimsky, Nick Gabrieli, Julian Schulz, Meg Tong, Evan Hubinger, and Alexander Turner. Steering llama 2 via contrastive activation addition. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 15504–15522, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.828. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.828/>.
- Peter J. Rousseeuw. Silhouettes: A graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. *Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 20:53–65, 1987. doi: 10.1016/0377-0427(87)90125-7.

- Yang Sui, Yu-Neng Chuang, Guanchu Wang, Jiamu Zhang, Tianyi Zhang, Jiayi Yuan, Hongyi Liu, Andrew Wen, Shaochen, Zhong, Hanjie Chen, and Xia Hu. Stop overthinking: A survey on efficient reasoning for large language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.16419>.
- Qwen Team. Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models, September 2024. URL <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2.5/>.
- Chulin Xie, Yangsibo Huang, Chiyuan Zhang, Da Yu, Xinyun Chen, Bill Yuchen Lin, Bo Li, Badih Ghazi, and Ravi Kumar. On memorization of large language models in logical reasoning. 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.23123>.
- Tian Xie, Zitian Gao, Qingnan Ren, Haoming Luo, Yuqian Hong, Bryan Dai, Joey Zhou, Kai Qiu, Zhirong Wu, and Chong Luo. Logic-rl: Unleashing llm reasoning with rule-based reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.14768>.
- Fengli Xu, Qianyu Hao, Zefang Zong, Jingwei Wang, Yunke Zhang, Jingyi Wang, Xiaochong Lan, Jiahui Gong, Tianjian Ouyang, Fanjin Meng, et al. Towards large reasoning models: A survey of reinforced reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09686*, 2025.
- Runzhe Zhan, Xinyi Yang, Derek F. Wong, Lidia S. Chao, and Yue Zhang. Prefix text as a yarn: Eliciting non-english alignment in foundation language model. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting, August 11-16, 2024*, pp. 12131–12145. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. doi: 10.18653/V1/2024.FINDINGS-ACL.722. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.722>.

A Further Experiment Details

A.1 Chat templates

The chat templates used in all experiments are presented in Table 1, and all are aligned with the default settings of the Hugging Face generation.

Model Family	Corresponding Chat Templates
DeepSeek-R1-Distill	"< begin_of_sentence >< User >{QUERY}< Assistant ><think>\n"
Qwen2.5-Math-Instruct	"< im_start >user\n{QUERY}< im_end >\n< im_start >assistant\n"
Llama-3.1-Instruct	"< begin_of_text >< start_header_id >system< end_header_id >\n\nCutting Knowledge Date: December 2023 \nToday Date: 26 Jul 2024\n\n< eot_id >< start_header_id >user< end_header_id >\n\n{QUERY}< eot_id >< start_header_id >assistant< end_header_id >\n\n"

Table 1: Model families and their corresponding chat templates. The term **QUERY** refers to the question or puzzle provided to the model to solve, while **post-query sequence** denotes the sequence that follows the query, as applied by the model’s chat template.

A.2 Reasoning-Anthropomorphic token selection

Aha token and no-aha token separation strategy. To systematically examine the differences in capabilities between the two models, we segmented the output texts into sentences and analyzed the first token of each sentence. We defined the initial token in the output of the no-aha model as the “no-aha token” and the initial token in the output of the aha model as the “aha token”.

To further separate the two types of tokens, we calculate and rank the contrast probability for each token. The contrast probability $P_{\text{contrast}}(t)$ is defined as follows:

For aha tokens:

$$P_{\text{contrast}}(t) = P_{\text{aha}}(t) - P_{\text{no-aha}}(t)$$

For no-aha tokens:

$$P_{\text{contrast}}(t) = P_{\text{no-aha}}(t) - P_{\text{aha}}(t)$$

Where:

- $P_{\text{aha}}(t)$ is the frequency proportion of token t among all aha tokens;
- $P_{\text{no-aha}}(t)$ is the frequency proportion of token t among all no-aha tokens.

The sign and magnitude of the contrast probability quantify the bias of each token toward the style of one model: $P_{\text{contrast}}(t) > 0$ indicates that the token is more characteristic of the current category, while $P_{\text{contrast}}(t) < 0$ suggests that it is more representative of the other category. Ranging the contrast probabilities helps to identify the most distinctive tokens for each style.

Detailed statistical results of Aha token and no-aha token distribution. The statistical results, as shown in Figure 3, reveal significant differences in the linguistic styles of aha tokens and no-aha tokens. Specifically, Aha tokens tend to adopt conversational and emotional expressions (e.g., ‘wait’, “Alright,” “Hmm,” “So,” “Maybe”), making their linguistic style more similar to natural human expression when they are thinking. They exhibit strong interactivity and display anthropomorphic characteristics. This anthropomorphic style is preserved across models of different sizes and becomes more flexible as the size of the model increases.

In models (1.5B), Aha tokens frequently use anthropomorphic expressions (e.g. “Alright,” “I,” “Then”); in medium-scale models (7B), they gradually incorporate more logical and

summarizing expressions (e.g., “Finally,” “Thus”); and in large-scale models (14B), a better balance is achieved between anthropomorphism and logic. Additionally, more hypothetical expressions (e.g., “Suppose,” “Perhaps”) are introduced, further enhancing the diversity and flexibility of the linguistic style.

In contrast, no-aha tokens emphasize logical and structured expressions (e.g. “Let,” “However,” “To,” “This”), resulting in a linguistic style that appears more mechanical. Although it is clear and well organized, it lacks the natural and emotional qualities of human expression. As model size increases, the linguistic flexibility of no-aha tokens improves but remains focused on rigorous logical reasoning. For example, in small-scale models (1.5B), no-aha tokens frequently use operational and logical expressions (e.g., “Let,” “To,” “Subtract”), leading to a relatively uniform style where reasoning relies heavily on explicit logical frameworks. In medium-scale (7B) and large-scale (14B) models, logical guiding expressions (e.g. “Notice,” “Based”) are increasingly used, making the logical structure clearer. However, even in large-scale models (14B), their linguistic style continues to lack interactivity.

Anthropomorphic and reasoning token selection strategy. Based on the above statistical results and findings, we manually selected anthropomorphic tokens and reasoning tokens by observing the linguistic styles and contextual usage patterns of the tokens, ensuring that the results align with the distinctions between aha tokens and no-aha tokens. The results are shown in Table 2, where these lists capture the different linguistic tendencies of the two models and are used for the calculation of our RASM metrics and analysis.

Anthropomorphic Tokens	Reasoning Tokens
“Aha”, “I”, “Hmm”, “Oh”, “Umm”, “Well”, “alright”, “we”, “Wait”, “wait”, “Alternatively”, “Case”, “Okay”, “okay”, “Perhaps”, “Still”, “we”, “We”, “Let”, “Alright”, “Good”, “Consider”, “Adjust”, “Attempt”, “Notice”, “Try”, “Test”, “Using”, “Oh”, “Oops”, “Break”, “Looking”, “Attempting”, “Again”, “Like”, “Assume”, “Maybe”	“This”, “To”, “Instead”, “Therefore”, “So”, “As”, “Because”, “Since”, “Thus”, “However”, “Calculate”, “Notice”, “Finally”, “Multiply”, “Divide”, “Next”, “Another”, “First”, “Second”, “Third”, “Final”, “Simplifying”, “Correct”, “Incorrect”, “Error”, “combining”, “Add”, “Start”, “Finally”, “Conclusion”, “Fourth”, “Calcul”

Table 2: Selected anthropomorphic and reasoning tokens.

B Additional Results

B.1 Most probable yet uncertain sentences for each model

We extracted and showcased the top 5 most uncertain sentences (with the lowest probability) for each model during the generation process, as shown in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6. For sentences that appear multiple times, we only consider the single instance with the lowest probability.

B.2 Additional results for Reasoning-Anthropomorphic Separation

In Figure 9, we present the additional metric for Reasoning-Anthropomorphic Separation (RASM) discussed in Section 4.1.

<i>n</i>	Qwen2.5-Math-1.5B-Instruct		DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-1.5B	
	Sentences	Probability	Sentences	Probability
K&K Task				
3	Identify and verify each... Therefore, the solution is... This implies:\n- However,... Based on the analysis:\n...	0.526006 0.632516 0.665774 0.676434 0.698401	Hmm. That fits. That works. Or maybe not. Maybe just list each one...	0.054014 0.152014 0.174358 0.200675 0.268039
4	Elizabeth said that ... We will use logical reasoning... Here’s the reasoning:\n\n... Final Conclusion: all... Harper’s statement\n	0.514754 0.580071 0.596774 0.620608 0.622434	Good. Hmm. That’s settled. Is there another case? So, that seems to...	0.032638 0.120880 0.249905 0.268122 0.287400
6	Let’s consider these cases... Then:\n- This means Benjamin cannot be... Let’s check the implications... Amelia’s identity (k...	0.416611 0.511978 0.630602 0.633654 0.667910	Hmm. Let’s check back. Maybe they’re different people... But let’s see:\n\n... Maybe I need to represent...	0.058834 0.196249 0.210393 0.268735 0.279453
8	Governing the gap... Ben only.\n- We notice that the statement... This is a contradiction. O budget: a knight...	0.426626 0.484353 0.510301 0.561809 0.582986	Hmm. So, the paradox arises... Got that down. So, maybe the remaining... Then, is that possible...	0.045391 0.291671 0.295538 0.343974 0.348499
10	Therefore:\n- guiding the statement of guided... Joseph’s statement is consistent... Let’s summarize:\n\n- Let K...	0.373919 0.503938 0.549551 0.550420 0.577642	Hmm. Or is Logan another? Wait, this is a... Then, since ** Or perhaps there was a...	0.175674 0.254154 0.304910 0.309152 0.318907
Count Down Task				
3	One approach is to use... We are there! First, we notice that... Adjust the approach by trying... First, consider the operation...	0.662153 0.670710 0.688039 0.697551 0.706210	I’m really stuck. So, negative numbers might... Let’s think about combining... Maybe using the digits in... Maybe subtract something?	0.219872 0.290523 0.311512 0.334947 0.342023
4	Consider using addition and multiplication... Start by identifying which operations... Consider the number 7... However, this doesn’t... We can subtract 2...	0.518555 0.614555 0.667058 0.686095 0.703876	Hmm. Oh! Oops! Nope. This seems like a step...	0.079202 0.150123 0.174373 0.275300 0.364554
6	Start by identifying possible combinations... Let’s see if we... Let’s instead try subtract... First, we try to... We can use the other...	0.624272 0.664639 0.669138 0.678575 0.708372	Hmm. Maybe ... But what? Perfect! Oh!	0.017172 0.041119 0.084418 0.165579 0.182604
8	Identify the numbers and possible... Identify potential combinations and operations... This... Consider the number 9... Identify the largest numbers and...	0.484072 0.622140 0.642424 0.642484 0.653467	Hmm Maybe subtract somewhere? Not helpful That’s good. Let’s think about that...	0.036037 0.119820 0.147793 0.228477 0.258753
10	Identify potential combinations of numbers... Identify the largest number and... We can use the numbers... We need to experiment with... Another approach is to look...	0.534293 0.600052 0.604406 0.610839 0.637062	Hmm. Perfect. Oh! Let’s try. Maybe that could work?	0.022847 0.041693 0.115664 0.146562 0.195875

Table 3: Top 5 probable yet uncertain sentences (the first 5 tokens) generated by Qwen2.5-Math-1.5B-Instruct and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B in different difficulty-level. For sentences that appear multiple times, we only consider the single instance with the lowest probability.

n	Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct		DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B	
	Sentences	Probability	Sentences	Probability
	K&K Task			
3	If given a unique answer...	0.021290	Hmm.	0.075861
	Charlotte is not a kn...	0.022217	Wait	0.132202
	Let's re-evaluate...	0.022454	Let me verify again:\n\n...	0.192162
	Revisiting the problem...	0.023387	Wait, no.	0.320067
	Therefore, Victoria cannot be...	0.024983	Hmm, not sure.	0.343187
4	This contradictionocalypse already ...	0.020467	Hmm.	0.025640
	Based on given logical logical...	0.021195	Maybe both.	0.226319
	We need to find the...	0.021396	Let me think.	0.260847
	Therefore, let's re...	0.021410	Wait a second!	0.271614
	Therefore, there is a...	0.021418	But we have the implication...	0.283957
6	This contradiction suggests reevaluation...	0.021000	Interesting.	0.145864
	Therefore, we reector...	0.021206	Hmm.	0.163861
	Since both are always true...	0.021938	Let me reconsider.	0.314669
	Therefore, Jack must be...	0.022510	No, no.	0.364315
	Thus, based on the...	0.023170	I just thought of another...	0.382149
8	Let's againinateuellen...	0.021018	Hmm.	0.222903
	Daniel statement...	0.021364	Interesting.	0.238739
	Therefore, Noah must be...	0.023305	So, is that consistent...	0.326876
	However, since we have...	0.025103	That means:\n\n-	0.339934
	However, based on logical...	0.029722	Owen is knight?	0.340216
10	Charlotte\n\nHowever, re...	0.021429	Hmm.	0.090210
	Elizabeth is a knight Lucas...	0.021480	We know that ...	0.163797
	This contradiction indicates a logical...	0.021510	Let's re-express...	0.220035
	Olivia: knight (contradict...	0.021734	However, we know from...	0.255357
	If Aria is indeed...	0.021865	Let me also consider James...	0.332764
	Count Down Task			
3	scribbola searchlegat...	0.020352	I'll consider using division...	0.475217
	then it subtract we...	0.020729	I need a way to...	0.487473
	Finally, we may...	0.020836	This is getting tricky...	0.505426
	we need to...	0.020858	This works perfectly.	0.526299
	Finally we need...	0.020544	To refine this,...	0.546421
4	Correct calculation:\n\n...	0.020353	Wait a minute.	0.422414
	Letisors(coefficients)value...	0.020503	Nope.	0.425691
	57+23...	0.020666	Let's start by exploring...	0.462525
	so we can work it...	0.020936	We'll explore the following...	0.488311
	Next, find another approach...	0.021074	Wait, this gives ...	0.530180
6	Finally we need...	0.020544	Hmm.	0.018334
	this approach can be...	0.020800	No.	0.142961
	Let's use:\n\n	0.020831	Oh!	0.191606
	If we duty seed box...	0.020854	Consider using ...	0.194675
	consider the number 2...	0.020924	Let me try that.	0.215487
8	We may finish with ...	0.020462	Nope.	0.038214
	Subtract:\n\n	0.020575	Hmm.	0.122892
	After furtheranging and checking...	0.020636	Hmm	0.155568
	8 + ...	0.020742	But how?	0.191274
	let's add revolutions.\n\n...	0.020858	No.	0.193985
10	Re consider basic ...	0.020173	Perfect.	0.029956
	255 adult...	0.020467	But that still seems unclear...	0.060331
	Let us try witnessed ...	0.020590	Hmm.	0.078308
	Let's use:\n\n	0.020845	Not sure.	0.114357
	The previous unilateral way I...	0.020947	Maybe combining some operations.	0.167437

Table 4: Top 5 probable yet uncertain sentences (the first 5 tokens) generated by Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B in different difficulty-level. For sentences that appear multiple times, we only consider the single instance with the lowest probability.

<i>n</i>	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct		DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B	
	Sentences	Probability	Sentences	Probability
K&K Task				
3	Because the statement is self...	0.560364	Hmm.	0.236663
	We have:\n-	0.581820	Let's be careful here...	0.296178
	Therefore, both cannot be...	0.604704	Therefore, contradiction.	0.328875
	This contradiction confirms our earlier...	0.673183	Is that acceptable?	0.374225
	Charlotte is a knight.\n\n...	0.674642	verify again.	0.391501
4	Therefore:\n-	0.415222	Hmm.	0.086689
	Samuel: Knight\n	0.604418	Let me think.	0.328805
	Given all statements and logical...	0.607570	Or can it be either...	0.355387
	But since we need consistency...	0.614379	Let me consider the possibilities...	0.393884
	However, since Jacob claims...	0.618115	Maybe like this:\n\n-	0.395614
6	This would mean Isabella...	0.496426	Hmm.	0.064495
	This contradiction means our assumption...	0.517584	Let's think carefully.	0.247777
	Based on all consistent statements...	0.539659	Let's check that.	0.296434
	But Owen is a knight...	0.555271	Let me clarify.	0.305299
	Charlotte as Knight: True...	0.580151	All statements hold.	0.319862
8	James: Not specified in...	0.378060	Hmm.	0.073389
	But for completeness:\n-	0.414346	Let's see.	0.220944
	This means Samuel is a...	0.545051	That's odd.	0.309094
	Aurora: Knight\n	0.564745	Which is already true.	0.338379
	James: Can be either...	0.579905	Let's see how they...	0.404691
10	This doesn't give us...	0.518703	Hmm.	0.154247
	Olivia's status is still...	0.596697	Is that consistent?	0.309588
	Hence, let's proceed...	0.616119	So that works.	0.320555
	Elizabeth: Unknown for now...	0.624314	Let me rephrase.	0.334192
	Joseph must be a kn...	0.639972	Let's clarify.	0.338246
Count Down Task				
3	We need to re-e...	0.544595	Hmm.	0.070761
	We need to get creative...	0.553488	Nope.	0.101929
	We need to think about...	0.566548	Not helpful.	0.149741
	We need to rethink our...	0.569159	Maybe addition?	0.286247
	After trying various combinations,...	0.577618	Nope, still way too...	0.359081
4	After several attempts,...	0.490595	Still	0.080027
	Let's verify again carefully...	0.509019	Hmm.	0.090551
	Rechecking calculations and ensuring...	0.556210	How?	0.131233
	It seems...	0.631089	Let me try.	0.198806
	Here's a step-by-...	0.644402	All right.	0.213726
6	Let's recheck our...	0.382034	Hmm.	0.100985
	We need a better combination...	0.406203	Perfect!	0.121031
	But this approach should work...	0.484926	Not quite.	0.247189
	This confirms the...	0.536346	But maybe subtract instead.	0.254818
	We need to re-e...	0.587170	Let me see.	0.256791
8	It might require rechecking...	0.358824	Exactly!	0.046170
	Use multiplication or addition involving...	0.417593	Yes!	0.052473
	After several attempts,...	0.546278	Hmm.	0.063112
	We need to find a...	0.571972	Perfect!	0.075026
	After verifying...	0.579883	Ah!	0.151318
10	The best approach is to...	0.496744	Hmm.	0.031313
	Given the constraints, we...	0.591498	Still over.	0.101248
	But instead of...	0.621007	Not enough.	0.122928
	This attempt didn't...	0.634036	Maybe not.	0.128383
	After several attempts, it...	0.640827	Let me think.	0.224669

Table 5: Top 5 probable yet uncertain sentences (the first 5 tokens) generated by Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B in different difficulty-level. For sentences that appear multiple times, we only consider the single instance with the lowest probability.

n	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct		DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B	
	Sentences	Probability	Sentences	Probability
	K&K Task			
3	From this, we...	0.420664	Hmm.	0.134315
	This means this statement is...	0.434759	So this seems impossible.	0.185909
	This would create another paradox...	0.484552	That seems redundant.	0.253995
	Now, let's...	0.510904	So, Riley is K...	0.271537
	To solve the puzzle properly...	0.528183	Maybe more precise:\n\n-	0.299061
4	However, the initial...	0.375455	Hmm.	0.028437
	This implies that our assumption...	0.401252	Interesting.	0.111463
	But, let's...	0.401558	Huh.	0.241335
	Let's continue with the...	0.522880	Not sure.	0.244895
	However, we can resolve...	0.537905	But wait, no—...	0.268583
6	Now let's check...	0.479586	Hmm.	0.059771
	So, this statement is...	0.488198	Let me think.	0.140541
	However, considering all...	0.495336	It's possible.	0.240117
	Now we know all the...	0.526281	That helps us.	0.248701
	Chloe: Knight	0.540745	Is that the only possibility...	0.297448
8	This would make Mia a...	0.444089	Hmm.	0.098603
	However, this contradiction arises...	0.466709	Interesting.	0.260285
	The last two statements are...	0.467839	But wait, no,...	0.312512
	Scarlett is not mentioned in...	0.498923	So let me summarize:\n\n...	0.324689
	This leaves us with ...	0.524408	That works.	0.331900
10	This would make both statements...	0.331598	Hmm.	0.038465
	Now we can conclude...	0.464352	That might be important.	0.196700
	Knights: Only 7...	0.465627	Or maybe not.	0.210730
	This creates a paradox.	0.475077	Let's see.	0.249268
	This statement is false.	0.485319	Wait, contradiction.	0.294464
	Count Down Task			
3	Now, we need to...	0.352150	Maybe.	0.039438
	However, we need...	0.413969	Hmm	0.069371
	32 / 0...	0.467406	Hmm.	0.168900
	So, let's try...	0.470556	Maybe division.	0.230316
	Let's use the...	0.490372	How?	0.257203
4	However, that would require...	0.343084	Hmm.	0.016199
	57, close but not...	0.376949	No.	0.032682
	Start with 88\n	0.425079	Oh!	0.047348
	Start by trying to combine...	0.495647	That works!	0.156867
	Using 6.	0.495879	Maybe subtract instead.	0.160207
6	693 + 5...	0.417244	No.	0.025702
	However, that is not...	0.436204	Yes!	0.026157
	26=67 and ...	0.493914	How?	0.054781
	But we need to get...	0.507572	Alternatively	0.056994
	25 is not possible,...	0.528331	Oh!	0.177169
8	42\n	0.350759	How?	0.027835
	121\n	0.400639	Maybe.	0.037071
	605\n	0.453578	Hmm.	0.050594
	Now we need to...	0.491798	Same result.	0.087146
	However,...	0.497138	25?	0.113435
10	676\n	0.117458	Maybe.	0.025831
	8889.	0.273806	No.	0.043118
	75, so that gives...	0.324264	Hmm.	0.051259
	However, we can also...	0.336813	Ah!	0.133850
	5 either.	0.382819	Close.	0.155760

Table 6: Top 5 probable yet uncertain sentences (the first 5 tokens) generated by Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B in different difficulty-level. For sentences that appear multiple times, we only consider the single instance with the lowest probability.




Figure 9: Distribution Metrics Across Difficulties