

Leveraging Constrained Monte Carlo Tree Search to Generate Reliable Long Chain-of-Thought for Mathematical Reasoning

Qingwen Lin¹, Boyan Xu¹, Zijian Li¹, Zhifeng Hao^{1,2}, Keli Zhang³, Ruichu Cai^{1,4*}

¹School of Computer Science, Guangdong University of Technology

²College of Science, Shantou University

³Huawei Noah’s Ark Lab, ⁴Peng Cheng Laboratory

qingwen_lin@foxmail.com, {hpakyim, leizigin}@gmail.com

haozhifeng@stu.edu.cn, zhangkeli1@huawei.com, cairuichu@gmail.com

Abstract

Recently, Long Chain-of-Thoughts (CoTs) have gained widespread attention for improving the reasoning capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs). This necessitates that existing LLMs, which lack the ability to generate Long CoTs, to acquire such capability through post-training methods. Without additional training, LLMs typically enhance their mathematical reasoning abilities through inference scaling methods such as MCTS. However, they are hindered by the large action space and inefficient search strategies, making it challenging to generate Long CoTs effectively. To tackle this issue, we propose constraining the action space and guiding the emergence of Long CoTs through a refined search strategy. In our proposed Constrained Monte Carlo Tree Search (C-MCTS) framework, we limit the actions selected from a constrained action space, which is divided into five disjoint subsets: *understanding*, *planning*, *reflection*, *coding*, and *summary*. Each subset is further constrained to a small number of pre-defined prompts, rather than allowing LLMs to generate actions arbitrarily. Additionally, we refine the search strategy by incorporating prior knowledge about the action sets, such as a human-like partial order of the action subsets and the pretrained process reward models. These strategies work together to significantly reduce the vast search space of Long CoTs. Extensive evaluations on mathematical reasoning benchmarks show that, under zero-shot settings, our method enables the 7B model to achieve reasoning capabilities that surpass those of the 72B model.

1 Introduction

Improving the reasoning ability, especially the mathematical reasoning ability, occupies a central position in current large language models (LLMs) research. The Chain of Thought (CoT) technique (Wei et al., 2022) has emerged as a mainstream

solution to enhance LLMs’ reasoning ability in a step-by-step manner. Recently, the generation of Long Chains of Thought (Long CoTs) has led to significant performance improvements. Compared to the original CoT, Long CoTs not only focus on problem decomposition but also introduce additional reflection and detailed calculations into the reasoning process. However, existing works typically rely on supervised fine-tuning or reinforcement learning-based post-training, making them highly dependent on extensive training resources. Thus, lots of existing foundational open-source language models, such as Qwen (Yang et al., 2024a,b), cannot generate Long CoTs effectively.

In contrast, foundational open-source models often achieve competitive results in structured reasoning through inference scaling. For instance, Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) and its numerous variants (Hao et al., 2023; Feng et al., 2023; Qi et al., 2024; Sun et al., 2024) constrain the model to reason in the form of CoT through process supervision. React (Yao et al., 2022) and Rethink (Schwarzschild et al., 2024) constrain the model to rethink and summarize the CoT in reasoning to arrive at new answers. NLRL (Feng et al., 2024) constrains the model to summarize and learn new experiences through continuous interaction with the environment. These existing research demonstrate that constraining MCTS through process supervision has led to notable improvements. However, due to the fundamental limitation of its large action space generated by the LLMs, MCTS struggles to generate Long CoTs effectively. First, within such a vast action space, LLMs often become trapped in an endless loop of ineffective decompositions, repeatedly generating redundant or suboptimal reasoning steps without making actual progress. Second, within such a vast action space, the process reward model fails to effectively constrain the model to generate human-like action sequences. While reward-based methods aim to guide reasoning, they

*Corresponding author, cairuichu@gmail.com

struggle to enforce structured and meaningful transitions between actions, leading to erratic or unnatural reasoning trajectories. The key to overcoming these limitations lies in effectively constraining the action space of MCTS.

Based on this insight, we therefore develop a constrained MCTS (C-MCTS in short) framework for mathematical reasoning, as shown in Fig. 1. Specifically, we first impose constraints on the selection of actions by restricting them to a predefined constrained action space. This action space is systematically divided into five disjoint subsets: *understanding*, *planning*, *reflection*, *coding*, and *summary*. Each subset consists of carefully curated and predefined prompts rather than allowing LLMs to generate actions in an unrestricted manner. Moreover, we enhance the search strategy by incorporating prior knowledge related to these action sets. Specifically, we integrate human-like partial ordering to guide the decision-making process, ensuring that actions are executed in a logical and interpretable sequence. Additionally, we utilize process reward models to further refine action selection, enabling more informed and effective decision-making. These combined strategies collectively lead to a substantial reduction in the otherwise vast and complex search space of Long CoTs. As a result, our C-MCTS framework not only improves efficiency but also enhances the overall coherence and quality of the generated reasoning processes. Extensive evaluations on mathematical reasoning benchmarks show that, under zero-shot settings, our approach surprisingly enables a 7B model to achieve reasoning performance that surpasses that of a 72B model.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

Constrained Action Space: We define five disjoint action subsets, each containing predefined prompts instead of allowing the model to generate actions freely. This significantly reduces the search space and enables the model to generate structured Long CoTs.

Search Strategy with Partial Ordering and Process Reward Model: By incorporating the sequential rules of human reasoning and leveraging a pre-trained PRM to evaluate the Q-values of actions, the search process is further optimized.

Performance Breakthrough under Zero-shot Settings: Experiments show that, without additional training, a 7B model equipped with the C-MCTS framework can generate Long CoTs that outperform a 72B model on multiple mathematical

reasoning benchmarks.

2 Related Work

In recent years, LLMs have become the focus of the academic community, demonstrating extremely strong performance. For example, the GPT series (Brown et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Nakano et al., 2021; Achiam et al., 2023), the LLaMA series (Touvron et al., 2023; Taori et al., 2023; Young et al., 2024; Dubey et al., 2024), the Gemma series (Team et al., 2024a,b), the RWKV series (Peng et al., 2024, 2023), and the DeepSeek series (Bi et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2025). Among the capabilities of LLMs, mathematical reasoning has attracted the most attention. In recent years, related research can be broadly categorized into two types: one based on tree search algorithms and the other focused on the training approach to enhance the model’s reasoning capabilities.

The tree search-based approaches: Notable works include MCTS (Hao et al., 2023) and TOT (Yao et al., 2023). These studies significantly enhanced reasoning performance by constraining the reasoning process of LLMs. However, since these methods rely on LLMs to generate actions, they fail to produce actions that can induce Long CoTs for LLMs lacking this capability. Some works have attempted to integrate PRM (Process Reward Model) to optimize the MCTS process. For example, Alpha-Zero-like methods train PRM models using reinforcement learning (Feng et al., 2023); HiAR-ICL (Wu et al., 2024) uses PRM models to filter answers; R-STAR (Qi et al., 2024) employs two LLMs as PRM models for answer selection; and AlphaMath (Chen et al., 2024a) uses LLMs as policy models while co-training a value model as the PRM. While these efforts have yielded promising results, they have not effectively harnessed PRM to constrain the generation process of LLMs, thereby failing to produce high-quality Long CoT.

The training-based approaches: The typical methods usually employ the reinforcement learning to align with human preferences (Li et al., 2023; Ouyang et al., 2022; Rafailov et al., 2024; Ethayarajh et al., 2024); employ mathematics-specific models with mathematical knowledge (Shao et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024b; Ying et al., 2024); and reward the generation of Long CoTs through reinforcement learning (Guo et al., 2025; Zhong et al., 2024; Team, 2024; Team et al., 2025). These methods have achieved impressive results, but the cost




Figure 1: The framework of our Constrained-MCTS, which is characterized by constrained action space and guided search strategy guidance. Specifically, actions are sampled from a predefined action list rather than being generated by LLMs. Meanwhile, the search process is guided by either predefined partial order rules or pre-trained PRMs.

of training LLMs is usually high. In contrast, our method effectively enhances performance by constraining the action space of LLMs using MCTS, without requiring additional training.

3 Problem Definition

We formulate the problem of mathematical reasoning with Long CoTs as a constrained Markov Decision Process (MDP) to address the challenge that models lacking the capability to generate Long CoTs cannot produce effective high-quality Long CoTs under the MCTS algorithm. The formal definition is provided as follows:

Let Q be the space of mathematical problems, and Π denote the category of large language models (LLMs). Given a problem instance $q \in Q$ and a reasoning strategy $\pi \in \Pi$, the reasoning process is modeled as an MDP tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R})$, where:

- \mathcal{S} is the state space, representing the reasoning context at each step t . The initial state s_0 is initialized by the problem instance q .
- \mathcal{A} is the action space, which is constrained to a predefined finite set of actions. This set is divided into five disjoint subsets: $\mathcal{A}^{\text{understand}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{\text{planning}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{\text{reflect}}$, $\mathcal{A}^{\text{code}}$, and $\mathcal{A}^{\text{summary}}$. Each subset contains predefined prompts to guide the reasoning process.

- \mathcal{T} is the transition function, defined as $s_{t+1} = \pi(s_t, a_{t+1})$, where s_{t+1} is the next state generated by the LLMs based on the current state s_t and the selected action a_{t+1} .
- \mathcal{R} is the reward function, providing feedback on the quality of the reasoning steps. Rewards are obtained using a process supervision model, which evaluates the correctness and coherence of the reasoning process.

Our goal is to generate one or more reasoning trajectories as follows, and derive the optimal answer from them:

$$p = [s_0, a_1, s_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, s_n]$$

The solution is obtained by aggregating the terminal states of multiple search trajectories \mathcal{P}_k generated through an iterative search process, such as MCTS. This approach aims to efficiently explore the constrained action space and produce high-quality reasoning chains.

4 Method

4.1 The C-MCTS Framework

Our method aims to address the challenge that existing MCTS methods cannot enable models like

Qwen to generate Long CoTs without additional training. As show in Figure 1, the C-MCTS framework consists of four main phases: Selection, Expansion, Simulation, and Back-propagation. Each phase plays a crucial role in guiding the reasoning process through a constrained search strategy.

Selection: In the Selection phase, we aim to identify the most promising part of the current search tree for further expansion. We employ the Upper Confidence bound for Trees (UCT) formula to balance exploration and exploitation. Specifically, each node s_t is selected based on:

$$s_t = \arg \max_a \left(\text{mean}(R_t) + c_{uct} \sqrt{\frac{\log N_t}{N_t}} \right),$$

where R_t represents the cumulative reward for this node, c_{uct} is a constant balancing exploration and exploitation, and N_t is the visit count of the current node.

Expansion: In the Expansion phase, we sample actions from the predefined action set \mathcal{A} using a Q-value model to evaluate the potential of each action. To determine the most suitable action for the current state, we employ a Q-value model to evaluate the Q-values of all potential actions, selecting the one with the highest Q-value as a_t . This selection process can be formally expressed as:

$$a_t = \arg \max_{a_t^n \in \mathcal{A}} Q(s_t, a_t^n)$$

After obtaining the action a_t , we use the LLMs π to generate multiple candidate states. To ensure diversity, we generate m candidate states and select the one with the highest V-value:

$$s_t = \arg \max_{s_t^j \in S_t^m} V(s_t^j),$$

where S_t^m is the set of candidate states generated by the LLM.

Simulation: In the Simulation phase, we repeatedly perform the Expansion phase until a terminal node is reached, thereby generating a complete reasoning trajectory. To ensure high-quality reasoning, we impose constraints on the action execution order using a search strategy that incorporates human-like partial ordering and process reward models. This strategy ensures that actions are executed in a logical and interpretable sequence.

Back-propagation: In the Back-propagation phase, we update the information of all nodes along the reasoning trajectory $[s_0, a_1, s_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, s_n]$,

excluding the root node. We update the visit count N_t for each node and compute the new reward using the Q-value and V-value models:

$$r_t = Q(s_{t-1}, a_t) + V(s_t).$$

The cumulative reward for each node is updated as:

$$R_t := \frac{\sum_{N_t} \left(\sum_{i=t}^T r_t \right)}{N_t}.$$

The MCTS algorithm generates k subtrees through k iterations, with each subtree corresponding to a reasoning trajectory. After k iterations, we obtain k candidate reasoning trajectories \mathcal{P}_k . We then design a voting-based aggregation algorithm to select the final answer from these trajectories. However, in some cases, there may be multiple answers with the highest frequency. In such cases, we can select the path with the highest reward as the final answer path. For any path p of length m in the path set \mathcal{P}_k , we use formula 1 to calculate the reward of its terminal node and select the node with the highest reward among all nodes as the final answer:

$$p^* = \arg \max_{p \in \mathcal{P}_k} r_{p_{\text{terminal}}}$$

4.2 Action Space Constraining

In the Expansion phase of the C-MCTS framework, we need to obtain an action a_t based on the current state s_{t-1} , and then use the LLMs to generate a new state s_t based on a_t and s_{t-1} . However, if we rely solely on the LLMs to generate actions arbitrarily, models that lack the inherent capability to generate Long CoTs may fail to produce actions that induce Long CoT. This is because unconstrained action generation leads to an extremely vast action space, making it difficult for the model to accurately search for actions that can effectively induce the generation of Long CoTs.

To address this issue, we constrain the action selection to a predefined, finite action space. Specifically, we divide the action space \mathcal{A} into five mutually exclusive subsets, each representing a specific cognitive operation in the reasoning process:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{ \mathcal{A}^{\text{understand}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{planing}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{reflect}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{code}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{summary}} \}$$

Each subset contains predefined prompts that guide the model's reasoning process:

- $\mathcal{A}^{\text{understand}}$: Problem Understanding and Information Extraction. This action set guides the model to deeply analyze the problem statement and identify key information points.

- $\mathcal{A}^{\text{planning}}$: Solution Planning and Execution. This subset helps the model devise problem-solving strategies, break down complex problems, plan reasoning paths, and execute solution ideas.
- $\mathcal{A}^{\text{reflect}}$: Process Reflection and Error Checking. This subset requires the model to validate its reasoning process and identify potential errors, helping to avoid misunderstandings and correct erroneous steps.
- $\mathcal{A}^{\text{code}}$: Coding Assistance and Result Verification. This subset leverages programming tools to assist with calculations and verify reasoning results, ensuring accuracy. For example, it uses the sympy library for symbolic computation or improves the accuracy of complex calculations.
- $\mathcal{A}^{\text{summary}}$: Final Answer Summary and Presentation. This subset guides the model to integrate the reasoning process and standardize the output of the final answer.

By constraining the action space in this manner, we ensure that the model’s reasoning process is guided by predefined, logical steps rather than arbitrary generation. This not only reduces the vast action space but also improves the coherence and quality of the generated reasoning chains.

4.3 Search Strategy Guidance

To further efficiently guide the search on the contained action space, as shown in Figure 1, we consider two types of supervision information, the human-like partial order rules and process reward models. These two kinds of guidance can be used individually according to the problems.

4.3.1 Human-like Partial Order Rules

These constraints are designed to align with human problem-solving patterns and improve the quality of the generated reasoning chains. Specifically, we establish the following fundamental rules:

- **Termination Rule:** When an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{summary}}$ is selected, it signifies the completion of the final answer synthesis. Upon reaching the maximum iteration limit m , we enforce $a_m \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{summary}}$ to ensure the answer is output. Actions in $\mathcal{A}^{\text{summary}}$ orchestrate a systematic review of preceding reasoning steps and format the final answer using [boxed] notation.

- **Initialization Rule:** To align with human problem-solving patterns, we initialize the reasoning sequence with $a_0 \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{understand}}$, ensuring foundational comprehension precedes analytical operations.

Beyond these fundamental rules, we introduce additional rules to further guide the reasoning process:

- **Action Continuity Rule:** Prohibit consecutive execution of code-assistance actions, as two code operations do not bring additional thinking:

$$\neg(a_t \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{code}} \wedge a_{t+1} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{code}})$$

- **Phase Progression Rule:** The initial phase must sequentially execute problem-understanding and solution-planning actions:

$$a_1 \in (\mathcal{A}^{\text{planning}} \cap \mathcal{A}^{\text{understand}})$$

- **Reflection Necessity Rule:** The complete reasoning chain must include at least one reflection-validation process:

$$\exists t \in [0, d_{\text{max}}), a_t \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{reflect}}$$

- **Action Diversity Rule:** Prohibit adjacent steps from using the same type of reasoning operation:

$$\forall t < d_{\text{max}}, \text{type}(a_t) \neq \text{type}(a_{t+1})$$

- **Depth-Aware Rule:** When the reasoning depth $t \geq \lfloor d_{\text{max}}/2 \rfloor$: - If code validation has not been executed, insert an $\mathcal{A}^{\text{code}}$ action. - Subsequent action space is constrained to $\mathcal{A}^{\text{reflect}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\text{code}}$.

These rules dynamically adjust the action space $\mathcal{A}_t \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ to control the reasoning process:

$$\mathcal{A}_t = \begin{cases} \mathcal{A}^{\text{understand}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\text{planning}}, & t = 0 \\ \mathcal{A}^{\text{reflect}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\text{code}}, & t \geq \lfloor d_{\text{max}}/2 \rfloor \\ \mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_{t-1}\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

When employing Human-like Partial Order Rules, we used the large language model itself as the Q-value evaluator, combined with manually defined partial-order rules to constrain actions. By implementing these constraints, we ensure that the reasoning process follows a logical and interpretable sequence, reducing the likelihood of errors and improving the overall coherence of the generated reasoning chains. Additionally, these constraints help prevent the model from getting stuck in suboptimal reasoning paths, thereby enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the C-MCTS framework.

Dataset	Qwen2.5-it-cot-7B	Qwen2.5-it-cot-72B	Qwen2.5-it-maj-7B	C-MCTS-RULE	C-MCTS-PRM
Gaokao2023	66.0	73.2	69.0	70.3	72.9
MATH-500	77.0	83.4	79.6	78.6	84
AauA	74.4	79.2	81.1	83.0	85.8
SVAMP	93.9	95.4	93.5	95.3	95.9
GSM8K	92.4	95.8	93.0	93.3	94.8
CMath	89.7	93.0	93.1	93.0	94.5
School	70.2	83.1	82.1	80.1	86.1
GaoKao-QA	60.9	74.3	68.6	72.6	78.0
weak12k	85.6	91.3	90.0	89.4	92.3
avg	78.9	85.4	83.3	83.9	87.1

Table 1: Experiment results on various datasets

4.3.2 Process Reward Models

Different from the human-like partial order rules, recent studies have shown that PRM (Process Reward Model) has significant advantages in the stage-wise evaluation of mathematical reasoning tasks. Therefore, we propose an alternative strategy: while retaining the basic rules, we discard other constraints and introduce PRM as the core component for Q-value evaluation.

Specifically, the Q-value calculation process is as follows: Given the state s_t and the candidate action a_{t+1} , we concatenate the state, action, and Q-value prompt template and input them into the PRM model. By extracting the logits for the "positive" and "negative" labels and normalizing them using softmax, we obtain the positive probability as the Q-value:

$$Q(s_t, a_{t+1}) = \frac{e^{\text{PRM}([p_Q, s_t, a_{t+1}])_{\text{pos}}}}{\sum_{t \in \{\text{pos}, \text{neg}\}} e^{\text{PRM}([p_Q, s_t, a_{t+1}])_t}}$$

Here, p_Q is the prompt template dedicated to Q-value evaluation. The calculation of V-value follows a similar paradigm but is not dependent on specific actions:

$$V(s_t) = \frac{e^{\text{PRM}([p_V, s_t])_{\text{pos}}}}{\sum_{t \in \{\text{pos}, \text{neg}\}} e^{\text{PRM}([p_V, s_t])_t}}$$

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setup

Benchmark Datasets: We evaluate the performance of the proposed method on several datasets for mathematical reasoning. Specifically, we consider the following datasets: GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), Weak12K (Liang et al., 2023), Math500 (Lightman et al., 2023), AquA (Ling et al., 2017), CMath (Wei et al., 2023), as well as the GaoKao-Math-QA, Gaokao2023 and CN-Middle-School datasets used in Qwen2.5-Math (Yang et al.,

2024b). These datasets cover a range of mathematical problems from elementary to middle school levels, providing a comprehensive test of our algorithm’s mathematical capabilities. To follow the zero-shot setting, all the datasets can be only accessed in the inference procedure. Please refer to Appendix B for the description of these datasets.

Baselines: For a controllable and fair comparison, we consider the two different model variants of the latest baseline Yang et al. (2024b) with different size of parameters, Qwen2.5-it-cot-7B and Qwen2.5-it-cot-72B. To maximize the performance of these baselines, we use the scripts from the official Qwen open-source code for problem reasoning. Additionally, considering that our method involves a voting process, we add a voting experiment based on Qwen2.5-it-7B, denoted as Qwen2.5-it-maj-7B, for a fair comparison. It is important to note that Qwen2.5-it-cot-7B uses greedy search in its official implementation, which is not suitable for voting methods. Moreover, for fairness, we employ the same hyper-parameters of Qwen2.5-it-maj-7B, such as prompt, top-p, and top-k.

5.2 Experimental Results

To ensure the fairness of the experiments, our algorithm also uses Qwen2.5-it-7B as the base reasoning model. We refer to the two variants mentioned in Section 4.3 as **C-MCTS-RULE** and **C-MCTS-PRM**, respectively. For C-MCTS-PRM, we use Qwen2.5-PRM-7B (Zhang et al., 2025) as the model for Q-values and V-values. While for C-MCTS-RULE, we use the LLMs themselves as the Q-value model and the V-value model. And we keep the hyperparameters of both completely the same. More details on hyperparameters will be elaborated in Appendix C.

According to the experiment results as shown in Table 1, we can draw the conclusions from the following three perspectives:

- **Performance on Par with Larger Models:** The C-MCTS-PRM method outperforms the baseline models on eight out of nine datasets, demonstrating that the long Chain-of-Thought (CoT) generated through our constrained reasoning can significantly mitigate model capacity limitations. This effect is particularly evident in the MATH-500 dataset (84.0% vs. 83.4%) and the GaoKao-QA dataset (78.0% vs. 74.3%). These results underscore the effectiveness of C-MCTS in constraining the action space and generating long CoT, allowing the 7B model to overcome size-related disadvantages by exploring the solution space more efficiently.
- **Enhanced Complex Reasoning Capability:** Our method achieves substantial performance improvement on challenging datasets like Gaokao2023. For instance, the proposed method delivers an absolute improvement of 6.6% on the AauA dataset (85.8% vs. 79.2%) compared to the 72B model. This significant gain is driven by the Long CoTs generated by our approach, enabling a more thorough analysis and deeper understanding of the problem before arriving at an answer. Moreover, the reflection operation plays a crucial role in mitigating error accumulation and preventing misunderstandings.
- **Efficiency of Constrained Search:** Compared to the voting baseline (Qwen2.5-it-maj-7B), our method achieves a significant average accuracy improvement of 3.9% (87.2% vs. 83.3%). This result highlights that merely increasing solution diversity through sampling is far less effective than our systematic exploration of the state space, guided by well-designed search strategies.
- **Consistent Performance Improvement:** Our method exhibits strong generalization across a wide range of problem types, from basic arithmetic (GSM8K: 94.8%) to advanced mathematics (GaoKao2023: 72.9%). Its consistent performance across datasets of varying difficulty—using the same action sets except for $\mathcal{A}_{\text{summary}}$ —demonstrates its robustness and adaptability. Moreover, these results show that simple action-space constraints on LLMs can naturally induce high-quality Long CoTs without requiring dataset-specific prompt customization, allowing the model to fully harness its potential.
- **Effectiveness of Rule-based Constraints:** The C-MCTS-RULE variant surpasses the baseline models Qwen2.5-it-maj-7B and Qwen2.5-it-cot-

7B, achieving an average accuracy of 83.9%. This result suggests that even manually defined rule-based ordering can significantly enhance model performance. However, the performance gap between C-MCTS-RULE and C-MCTS-PRM (83.9% vs. 87.1%) underscores the superior efficiency of the PRM model in selecting actions compared to static, rule-based processes. For instance, on the MATH-500 dataset, C-MCTS-RULE achieves 78.6%, whereas C-MCTS-PRM reaches 84.0%, demonstrating that static rules and inherent model validation fall short of the dynamic validation capabilities of PRM, particularly in multi-step algebraic reasoning. This finding aligns with our framework’s design philosophy: while human-designed rules establish foundational reasoning patterns, the PRM model provides adaptive mathematical validation tailored to the specific problem context.

In summary, these results confirm our core hypothesis: leveraging prior action spaces and process-aware reward constraints to guide the reasoning process of LLMs enables more effective Long CoTs generation. This approach facilitates a more structured exploration of solutions, surpassing the effectiveness of scale-driven capacity increases or conventional CoT methods.

5.3 Ablation Study

To thoroughly investigate the effectiveness of our method, we conducted three ablation experiments based on the principle of controlled variables: (1) removing the PPM from C-MCTS (C-MCTS-wo-PRM), (2) replacing C-MCTS with the The ablation studies in Table 2 provide three key insights into the components of our framework: (1) evaluating the impact of the original MCTS algorithm while retaining PRM (Native-MCTS+PRM) and testing the standalone performance of the original MCTS (Native-MCTS), and (2) ensuring consistent hyperparameters across all experiments to isolate the effects of methodological changes. These studies evaluate the contributions of each component to the overall effectiveness of our approach as follows.

- **Critical Role of PRM:** Comparing C-MCTS-PRM (87.1%) with C-MCTS-wo-PRM (81.7%), we observe a 5.4% drop in average accuracy when process supervision is removed. This gap is even more pronounced on the MATH-500 dataset, widening to 7.2% (84.0% vs. 76.8%), underscoring the critical role of PRM in validating complex reasoning. PRM’s step-by-step validation effectively mitigates

Dataset	Native-MCTS	Native-MCTS+PRM	C-MCTS-wo-PRM	C-MCTS-RULE	C-MCTS-PRM
Gaokao2023	67.5	69.8	67.0	70.3	72.9
MATH-500	75.0	77.2	76.8	78.6	84
AauA	84.7	83.7	79.9	83.0	85.8
SVAMP	93.0	93.5	95.5	95.3	95.9
GSM8K	92.5	92.5	92.4	93.3	94.8
CMath	93.0	93.3	92.1	93.0	94.5
School	83.1	83.1	75.2	80.1	86.1
GaoKao-QA	72.0	72.6	69.8	72.6	78.0
weak12k	89.5	89.3	87.0	89.4	92.3
AVG	83.3	83.8	81.7	83.9	87.1

Table 2: Ablation experiment results on various datasets

error accumulation, a challenge that manually defined rules alone cannot fully address. Additionally, C-MCTS-RULE (83.9%) surpasses C-MCTS-wo-PRM by 1.0% in average accuracy, demonstrating that even simple rule-based constraints enhance reasoning consistency, though they still fall short of PRM-driven supervision. This further emphasizes the importance of constraining the generation process in LLMs—while strong PRM rules provide optimal guidance, even basic rule-based constraints contribute to improved performance.

- **Advantage of Constrained Action Space:** Despite sharing the PRM component with C-MCTS-PRM, Native-MCTS+PRM (83.8%) lags behind C-MCTS-PRM by 3.3%. Additionally, removing PRM results in a 5.4% performance drop for C-MCTS, whereas Native-MCTS experiences only a 0.5% decline. This disparity highlights a fundamental limitation of Native-MCTS—its reliance on unrestricted action generation prevents it from efficiently inducing Long CoTs. Even with the PRM component, Native-MCTS struggles to improve due to the excessively large search space. In contrast, C-MCTS-RULE achieves an accuracy of 83.9%, outperforming Native-MCTS and reinforcing the effectiveness of predefined action constraints in enhancing reasoning quality. However, the 3.2% gap between C-MCTS-RULE and C-MCTS-PRM underscores the necessity of integrating PRM-driven validation with action constraints to maximize performance.
- **Synergistic Effects:** The complete C-MCTS-PRM framework surpasses the cumulative improvements of its individual components (Native-MCTS: 83.3%, Native-MCTS+PRM: 83.8%, C-MCTS-wo-PRM: 81.7%), achieving an overall accuracy of 87.1%. This 5.4% synergistic gain highlights the mutual reinforcement between constrained search

and process supervision—by narrowing the action space, PRM validation is concentrated on high-potential reasoning patterns, leading to more effective solution exploration. Furthermore, Native-MCTS gains only 0.5% in performance when combined with PRM, indicating that relying solely on LLM-generated actions is inefficient. Without constrained action spaces, the model cannot fully exploit PRM’s validation capabilities, reinforcing the importance of structured guidance in optimizing reasoning performance.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose Constrained Monte Carlo Tree Search (C-MCTS) as a method for generating reliable Long Chain-of-Thoughts (CoTs). By effectively constraining the action space and guiding the search strategy, C-MCTS reduces the complexity introduced by an expansive reasoning space, enabling more efficient and structured exploration. Experimental results on mathematical reasoning benchmarks demonstrate its effectiveness in enhancing the reasoning capabilities of smaller models, particularly in resource-constrained environments, where computational efficiency is crucial. These findings highlight the significant potential of C-MCTS as a robust framework for improving structured reasoning in LLMs.

Limitations

Despite the significant improvements achieved by our method, the design of our action set remains imperfect. We have not fully explored the completeness of the action space, nor have we attempted to incorporate additional domain-specific knowledge into our action set. In the future, we will build on this foundation to further refine our work and enhance the adaptability and scalability of our framework.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Xiao Bi, Deli Chen, Guanting Chen, Shanhuang Chen, Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Honghui Ding, Kai Dong, Qiushi Du, Zhe Fu, et al. 2024. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02954*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Guoxin Chen, Minpeng Liao, Chengxi Li, and Kai Fan. 2024a. Alphamath almost zero: process supervision without process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03553*.
- Guoxin Chen, Minpeng Liao, Chengxi Li, and Kai Fan. 2024b. Step-level value preference optimization for mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10858*.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- 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*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. 2024. Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01306*.
- Xidong Feng, Ziyu Wan, Haotian Fu, Bo Liu, Mengyue Yang, Girish A Koushik, Zhiyuan Hu, Ying Wen, and Jun Wang. 2024. Natural language reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.14251*.
- Xidong Feng, Ziyu Wan, Muning Wen, Stephen Marcus McAleer, Ying Wen, Weinan Zhang, and Jun Wang. 2023. Alphazero-like tree-search can guide large language model decoding and training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17179*.
- 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*.
- Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshua Jiahua Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Zhiting Hu. 2023. Reasoning with language model is planning with world model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14992*.
- Qingyao Li, Wei Xia, Kounianhua Du, Xinyi Dai, Ruiming Tang, Yasheng Wang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. 2024. Rethinkmcts: Refining erroneous thoughts in monte carlo tree search for code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.09584*.
- Zihao Li, Zhuoran Yang, and Mengdi Wang. 2023. Reinforcement learning with human feedback: Learning dynamic choices via pessimism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18438*.
- Zhenwen Liang, Jipeng Zhang, Lei Wang, Yan Wang, Jie Shao, and Xiangliang Zhang. 2023. Generalizing math word problem solvers via solution diversification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37 of 11, pages 13183–13191.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2023. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*.
- Wang Ling, Dani Yogatama, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. 2017. Program induction by rationale generation: Learning to solve and explain algebraic word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.04146*.
- Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bin Wang, Bingxuan Wang, Bo Liu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, et al. 2024. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04434*.
- Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, et al. 2021. Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Bo Peng, Eric Alcaide, Quentin Anthony, Alon Albalak, Samuel Arcadinho, Stella Biderman, Huanqi Cao, Xin Cheng, Michael Chung, Matteo Grella, et al. 2023. Rwkv: Reinventing rnns for the transformer era. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13048*.

- Bo Peng, Daniel Goldstein, Quentin Anthony, Alon Albalak, Eric Alcaide, Stella Biderman, Eugene Cheah, Xingjian Du, Teddy Ferdinan, Haowen Hou, et al. 2024. Eagle and finch: Rwkv with matrix-valued states and dynamic recurrence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05892*.
- Zhenting Qi, Mingyuan Ma, Jiahang Xu, Li Lyna Zhang, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. 2024. Mutual reasoning makes smaller llms stronger problem-solvers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06195*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Avi Schwarzschild, Zhili Feng, Pratyush Maini, Zachary C Lipton, and J Zico Kolter. 2024. Rethinking llm memorization through the lens of adversarial compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15146*.
- 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*.
- Linzhuang Sun, Hao Liang, Jingxuan Wei, Bihui Yu, Conghui He, Zenan Zhou, and Wentao Zhang. 2024. Beats: Optimizing llm mathematical capabilities with backverify and adaptive disambiguate based efficient tree search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.17972*.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. Alpaca: A strong, replicable instruction-following model. *Stanford Center for Research on Foundation Models*. <https://crfm.stanford.edu/2023/03/13/alpaca.html>, 3(6):7.
- Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. 2024a. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*.
- Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. 2024b. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118*.
- Kimi Team, Angang Du, Bofei Gao, BOWEI XING, Changjiu Jiang, Cheng Chen, Cheng Li, Chenjun Xiao, Chenzhuang Du, Chonghua Liao, et al. 2025. Kimi k1. 5: Scaling reinforcement learning with llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12599*.
- Qwen Team. 2024. Qwq: Reflect deeply on the boundaries of the unknown. *Hugging Face*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Tianwen Wei, Jian Luan, Wei Liu, Shuang Dong, and Bin Wang. 2023. Cmath: Can your language model pass chinese elementary school math test? *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.16636.
- Jinyang Wu, Mingkuan Feng, Shuai Zhang, Feihu Che, Zengqi Wen, and Jianhua Tao. 2024. Beyond examples: High-level automated reasoning paradigm in in-context learning via mcts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18478*.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024a. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.
- An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, et al. 2024b. Qwen2. 5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12122*.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:11809–11822.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2022. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*.
- Huaiyuan Ying, Shuo Zhang, Linyang Li, Zhejian Zhou, Yunfan Shao, Zhaoye Fei, Yichuan Ma, Jiawei Hong, Kuikun Liu, Ziyi Wang, et al. 2024. Internlm-math: Open math large language models toward verifiable reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06332*.
- Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Guoyin Wang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, et al. 2024. Yi: Open foundation models by 01. ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652*.
- Zhenru Zhang, Chujie Zheng, Yangzhen Wu, Beichen Zhang, Runji Lin, Bowen Yu, Dayiheng Liu, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. 2025. The lessons of developing process reward models in mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.07301*.

Tianyang Zhong, Zhengliang Liu, Yi Pan, Yutong Zhang, Yifan Zhou, Shizhe Liang, Zihao Wu, Yanjun Lyu, Peng Shu, Xiaowei Yu, et al. 2024. Evaluation of openai o1: Opportunities and challenges of agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18486*.

A Implementation Details of Code

We refer to existing studies (Li et al., 2024; Yao et al., 2022) and build an automated unit testing module G_{test} based on the Python interpreter. For a generated candidate state s_t^0 , we use G_{test} to check whether the code can run successfully. If it can, we accept the code; if not, G_{test} will automatically generate an error report. Subsequently, based on the existing s_t^0 and report, we rethink and generate a new code until G_{test} no longer reports errors or the maximum number of iterations is reached.

If the problem remains unresolved after reaching the maximum number of iterations, an error log will be recorded in the state s_t^0 ; if the problem is resolved, the execution result will be recorded in s_t^0 .

B Dataset

GSM8K: GSM8K is a dataset containing 8.5K high-quality, linguistically diverse elementary school math problems. Its main features include: Each problem requires multi-step reasoning involving basic arithmetic operations. The problems are challenging enough to test the limits of models but not so difficult as to be unmanageable. In our work, we only use their test set.

Weak12K: Weak12K is a new Chinese math dataset containing 12,117 math problems. Compared to the commonly used Math23k dataset, problems in Weak12K are more complex and difficult. We extracted one thousand problems as the test set.

Math-500: The Math-500 dataset contains 500 math problems and is a subset of the benchmark MATH dataset. It covers a wide range of mathematical fields and difficulty levels, including algebra, geometry, probability, and more. Each problem is carefully selected to ensure its completeness in mathematical logic and solution steps. We use the entire dataset as the test set.

Aqua: This dataset, constructed by the DeepMind team, aims to support research in math problem solving, especially for tasks that guide program induction through solution generation. Problems in the dataset cover a variety of mathematical topics and difficulty levels, with each problem including a problem description, options, solution process, and correct answer label. It is a multiple-choice dataset with a test set size of approximately 200.

CMath: A primary school level dataset mainly for Chinese students, with 600 data points in the test set.

GaoKao-Math-QA: Composed of multiple-choice questions from real Chinese college entrance exam math problems over the years. The dataset covers knowledge points such as sequences, sets, complex numbers, and is a high-difficulty dataset. The test set contains 351 questions. Abbreviated as "GaoKao-QA".

CN-Middle-School: A simplified version of the GaoKao-Math-QA dataset, mainly consisting of junior high school knowledge points in China, including equations, geometry, inequalities, and other knowledge points. Unlike the GaoKao-Math-QA dataset, this one is not a multiple-choice dataset. Abbreviated as "School". **Gaokao2023:** This is the English version of the 2023 Chinese College Entrance Examination (GaoKao) questions. It includes multiple-choice questions, multiple-answer questions, fill-in-the-blank questions, and extended-response questions. The content covers sequences, ellipses, probability theory, and more. The difficulty level is extremely high, and it is challenging for an average Chinese high school student to achieve a passing score. It has been widely used in numerous studies to test performance (Chen et al., 2024b,a; Yang et al., 2024b). We refer to it as GaoKao2023 for short.

C Hyperparameter Setting

In our experiments, we strive to maintain consistent hyperparameter settings across different datasets. For example, when transitioning to a new state, we require the LLMs to generate no more than 512 tokens and produce 3 candidate states each time, for all datasets. More detailed hyperparameter settings are documented in Table 3.

It is important to note that in the MCTS iterations, our method generates up to k subtrees at a time. We have observed that more subtrees do not necessarily lead to better reasoning outcomes. Therefore, we incrementally increase the number of subtrees until reaching the maximum value specified by the "Max Subtree Number" hyperparameter listed in Table 3. Finally, we select the optimal result from the "Maximum Number of Subtrees" results as the final outcome.

D Prompt

Our work only requires simple prompts to function effectively. Below, I will list the prompts used in our method, which are universal across all datasets with at most minor differences of just a few words

Dataset	Max Subtree Number	Temperature	Top-p	Top-k	Depth_limit
GSM8K	7	1	0.5	32	8
MATH-500	9	1	0.5	32	7
GaoKao-QA	7	1	0.8	32	8
Weak12k	7	1.05	0.7	50	8
CMath	9	1.05	0.7	50	8
SVAMP	5	1	0.5	32	8
AauA	9	1	0.7	32	8
School	9	1	0.8	32	8
GaoKao2023	7	1	0.8	32	7

Table 3: Comparison of Hyperparameters in the Main Experiment

between datasets.

Prompt D.1: Instruction

Below is a mathematical problem. Please think step by step and solve it. Enclose each thought process with the <think> and </think> symbols. The thought process should be as rich and detailed as possible, delving into every content and detail deeply, rather than just skimming over. After you feel that the thought process is sufficient to solve the problem, organize your thought process into a complete answer, and write the final answer in boxed.

Prompt D.2: understand action

We need to think step by step to understand the meaning of the problem
Let's consider if there are any ambiguities in the problem statement
This problem is quite difficult; we should first analyze what knowledge points it involves, what mathematical formulas and related properties it utilizes

Prompt D.3: plan action

We need to plan what our goal is in solving this, and what conditions and corresponding sub-problems we may need to satisfy first
We can try to give a preliminary solution first
The problem can be divided into several parts, with several questions that need to be addressed

Prompt D.4: code action

We can write a piece of code to validate our idea
We can write a piece of code to assist with the calculation
We can write a piece of code to check our calculation results

Prompt D.5: reflect action

We should step by step check if the above process is reasonable and correct There may be errors and inaccuracies in the above questions; we need to step by step check for any mistakes
We need to combine the above thought process to see if it aligns with the problem's intention
There are some details in the problem that were not considered clearly; we need to check them

Prompt D.6: summary action

Based on the above thought process, we have solved this problem. Now, let's organize our thoughts into a complete answer and write the final answer in boxed. If there are multiple questions, I will answer each one in turn, separated by commas.
Now, let's compile our thought process into a complete answer and place the final answer in boxed. If there are multiple questions, I will answer each one in turn, separated by commas.

However, it is important to note that for multiple-choice questions, the corresponding instruction and summary action will be slightly different. We need to encourage the LLMs to directly select from the options rather than just providing the calculation result. For specific prompt templates, refer to Prompt D.7 and Prompt D.8.

Prompt D.7: Multiple-choice question Instruction

You will be given a mathematics problem. Please think through and solve it step by step. Enclose each thought process with <think> and </think> tags. Make your thought process as rich and detailed as possible, deeply considering every content and detail, rather than briefly skimming over them. Once you believe the thought process is sufficient to solve the problem, organize your thoughts into a complete answer, and choose the option from "A", "B", "C", "D", "E" that is closest to your answer. Write the final answer in boxed.

Prompt D.8: Multiple-choice question summary
action

Based on the above thought process, we have solved this problem. First, we will recall the problem, then organize our thought process and write down the final solution, and finally choose the closest answer from "A", "B", "C", "D", "E". The final answer will be written in boxed.

Now, let's first recall the problem. Then, we will organize our thought process into a complete answer, and finally choose the closest answer from "A", "B", "C", "D", "E". The final answer will be written in boxed.