

Process or Result? Manipulated Ending Tokens Can Mislead Reasoning LLMs to Ignore the Correct Reasoning Steps

Yu Cui^{1*} Bryan Hooi² Yujun Cai³ Yiwei Wang^{4†}

¹Beijing Institute of Technology, ²National University of Singapore

³University of Queensland, ⁴University of California, Merced

{cuiyu.ycui, wangyw.evan}@gmail.com

Abstract

Recent reasoning large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable improvements in mathematical reasoning capabilities through long Chain-of-Thought. The reasoning tokens of these models enable self-correction within reasoning chains, enhancing robustness. This motivates our exploration: how vulnerable are reasoning LLMs to subtle errors in their input reasoning chains? We introduce "Compromising Thought" (CPT), a vulnerability where models presented with reasoning tokens containing manipulated calculation results tend to ignore correct reasoning steps and adopt incorrect results instead. Through systematic evaluation across multiple reasoning LLMs, we design three increasingly explicit prompting methods to measure CPT resistance, revealing that models struggle significantly to identify and correct these manipulations. Notably, contrary to existing research suggesting structural alterations affect model performance more than content modifications, we find that local ending token manipulations have greater impact on reasoning outcomes than structural changes. Moreover, we discover a security vulnerability in DeepSeek-R1 where tampered reasoning tokens can trigger complete reasoning cessation. Our work enhances understanding of reasoning robustness and highlights security considerations for reasoning-intensive applications.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have made remarkable progress in mathematical reasoning (Zhang et al., 2024b; 2025), yet ensuring their robustness against errors remains challenging (Li et al., 2024). Recent reasoning LLMs (Li et al., 2025b) such as DeepSeek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025) have significantly improved mathematical problem-solving through their reasoning tokens encompassing long Chain-of-Thought (CoT). These models continuously scrutinize their own computational processes, boosting their self-correction capability (Kumar et al., 2024; Song et al., 2025; Yang et al., 2024; YAO et al., 2024), which enhances accuracy and reliability in the reasoning. This inspires us to explore the effects of incorporating minor errors into reasoning traces and evaluating how well the models can self-correct. Therefore, a critical question emerges: **how vulnerable are these advanced reasoning LLMs to subtle errors in their input reasoning chains?**

We investigate this problem by examining how reasoning LLMs respond when presented with reasoning tokens containing tampered calculation results. Our findings reveal a concerning vulnerability we term "Compromising Thought" (CPT): when provided with reasoning tokens incorporating manipulated calculation results at the ends of reasoning logic steps, models tend to undergo thinking confusion, ignore the correct reasoning steps and adopt the incorrect results instead. Even when models initially demonstrate strong inclination toward the correct answer during their reasoning process, the final result may

*Work done during internship at UC Merced NLP Lab.

†Corresponding author.




Figure 1: CPT overview. In the original reasoning tokens, the correct ending tokens 159,973,388,714,262 will be altered to the incorrect answer 159,973,389,714,262.

suddenly shift to match the incorrect values from the tampered reasoning tokens, resulting in a inconsistent reasoning in the output result.

Consider the example in Figure 1, where a model can correctly solve a mathematical multiplication problem under normal conditions. When the same model is presented with the same problem but with subtly tampered reasoning tokens (changing just one digit in the final product) as its previous thinking, it produces a new reasoning chain with illogical calculation steps. In addition, the final result content includes the correct steps and incorrect product. This inconsistency demonstrates how endpoint tampering of input reasoning chain can override the model’s own reasoning capabilities. This vulnerability has important implications for the reliability of reasoning LLMs. The self-correction of LLMs is crucial for enhancing their reasoning robustness. However, our work shows that current reasoning LLMs, despite their advances, remain susceptible to being misled by tampered tokens, compromising their self-correction abilities.

To systematically study this phenomenon, we design three increasingly explicit prompting methods to encourage models to scrutinize the tampered reasoning tokens. Our experiments across multiple reasoning LLMs (DeepSeek-R1, OpenAI-o1(Jaech et al., 2024), o3-mini¹, and others) reveal that these models have difficulties in identifying wrong answers in the reasoning tokens, and struggle significantly to resist CPT.

Our investigation into CPT reveals an interesting contrast with recent work (Li et al., 2025a) on reasoning chains. While existing research suggests global structural alterations to long CoT more significantly impact model performance than local content modifications, we find that in reasoning vulnerabilities, endpoint token manipulations can have greater effects than structural changes. Some structural modifications even enhance CPT resistance. Additionally, we discovered that when presented with tampered reasoning tokens for mathematical word problems, DeepSeek-R1 may experience "thinking stopped"—completely ceasing its reasoning process without producing a final answer. This is a security vulnerability in model reasoning that deserves attention.

Above all, the contributions of this paper are as follows: (1) We focus on mathematical problem-solving and introduce a new research question: how well can reasoning LLMs perform even in the presence of minor errors introduced in the input reasoning tokens? (2) We define the new concept of CPT and demonstrate, based on three approaches, that existing reasoning LLMs struggle to resist CPT; (3) We find that local ending token modifications have a greater impact on model reasoning than structural changes, which is contrary to the existing research; (4) Based on our tampered reasoning tokens, we find a security vulnerability that DeepSeek-R1 may stop thinking and fail to produce the final result.

¹<https://openai.com/index/openai-o3-mini>

2 Related Work

Reasoning LLMs. Reasoning LLMs show significant advantages in solving complex problems based on their long CoT. Li et al. (2025b) discusses the evolution of different reasoning LLMs and provides the comprehensive performance comparison of typical reasoning LLMs. (Chen et al., 2025b) provides a summary of Long CoT, highlighting its main features, including deep reasoning, feasible reflection, and extensive exploration.

Resistance of LLMs to Errors in Reasoning It is crucial to study the impact of introducing minor mistakes in the reasoning process and analyze the effectiveness of the self-correction of models. Mukherjee et al. (2025) focuses on improving the error identification ability of LLMs in the reasoning chain. Li et al. (2025a) indicates that the structure of the long CoT is vital for LLMs to learning, while small tampering to local content (for instance, the accuracy of the final answer and the numerical values) do not substantially affect model performance. However, our work reaches an opposing conclusion to some extent. In addition, many studies focus on the mathematical reasoning ability evaluation (Yuan et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024) of LLMs. He et al. (2025) systematically studies the ability of LLMs to detect errors in long CoT reasoning, and finds that there will be calculation error, reasoning error and understanding errors in the inference of mathematical problems. But there is still relatively little research on evaluation and improvement of the model’s capability to reflect and self-correct mistakes in the reasoning process (Chen et al., 2025a). Moreover, the reasoning tokens may not only contain errors, but may also be inconsistent with the final results given by the reasoning LLMs (Zhou et al., 2025).

3 Methodology

When reasoning LLMs solve mathematical problems, they generate detailed reasoning steps leading to a final answer. We propose "Compromising Thought" (CPT) to describe a vulnerability where models adopt incorrect results from tampered reasoning tokens despite their ability to calculate correctly. This behavior raises important questions about how these models integrate prior information with current reasoning processes.

To systematically investigate CPT, we first analyze the structure of reasoning tokens in mathematical problem-solving (Section 3.1), then formalize the concept of CPT and develop metrics to quantify its impact (Section 3.2). We explain our approach to tampering with reasoning tokens (Section 3.3), evaluate methods to enhance model resistance (Section 3.4), and investigate how structural modifications affect CPT (Section 3.5).

3.1 Initial Observations on Reasoning Token Vulnerabilities

When evaluating reasoning LLMs on mathematical problems, we discovered that models presented with reasoning chains containing subtle calculation errors often adopt these incorrect results in their outputs, despite their ability to calculate correctly. For example, when DeepSeek-R1 correctly solved $38,697,082 \times 4,133,991$, changing just one digit in the result tokens (from 159,973,388,714,262 to 159,973,389,714,262) caused it to adopt this incorrect value in subsequent reasoning.

This behavior appeared across multiple models, particularly when modifications targeted "loop ending result" tokens - the numerical conclusions at critical points in reasoning. This observation raised a key question: How do reasoning LLMs prioritize between their own calculation abilities and presented calculation results? This apparent vulnerability forms the basis of our "Compromising Thought" (CPT) concept formalized in the following section.

3.2 CPT of Reasoning LLMs

We formalize CPT as follows: Given a mathematical problem q_0 , we first establish that a reasoning LLM can correctly solve it, generating accurate reasoning tokens rt_0 and final answer s_0 . We then create tampered tokens rt_T by modifying specific calculation results in the ending tokens of rt_0 while preserving the reasoning steps. When these tampered tokens

are presented alongside the original problem to the models in **LM**, we observe whether the model’s new reasoning tokens rt_c and answer s_c align with the correct answer w or are influenced by the tampered information (Algorithm 1). It should be noted that we require the initial reasoning tokens rt_m and final result s_m to be correct, meaning that the evaluated model itself has the ability to correctly solve q_0 . Otherwise, it is unreasonable to investigate whether it is affected by CPT.

To quantify CPT susceptibility, we define the compromising rate:

$$r_{CPT} = \frac{D_T}{2D_T - D_{CPT}} \in [0.5, 1], \quad (1)$$

where D_T is the number of tampered digits and D_{CPT} is the number of digits in the model’s output matching our tampered digits rather than the correct result. For instance, with a single-digit modification ($D_T = 1$), a value of $r_{CPT} = 1$ indicates complete compromise, while $r_{CPT} = 0.5$ shows complete resistance. Specifically, when CPT causes severe reasoning confusion in models, i.e. $D_T < D_{CPT}$ (see the instance 5 and 6 in Appendix A), $r_{CPT} = 2$. The aggregate compromising rate R_{CPT} across n evaluation results is calculated as:

$$R_{CPT} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n r_{CPT,i} \quad (2)$$

3.3 Tampering with Reasoning Tokens

To systematically study CPT, we need a principled approach to create tampered reasoning tokens. As illustrated in Figure 2, reasoning tokens typically contain calculation loops, self-reflection, and self-verification components. Our tampering strategy specifically targets the "loop ending result" tokens - the numerical conclusions at critical points in the reasoning process.

We implement digit substitution as our primary method, carefully modifying specific digits in calculation results while maintaining the original format and length. For example, changing "711,025,910,075,981" to "711,025,710,075,981" by replacing '9' with '7'. The instances are shown in Appendix C. This method creates subtle numerical discrepancies that challenge the model’s ability to reconcile its own calculations with presented information.

After evaluating alternative approaches, we found that digit substitution is optimal for studying CPT, as methods that alter result length (insertion or deletion) tend to trigger format validation mechanisms rather than testing numerical reasoning fidelity. By preserving the structure and only modifying specific result digits, we can directly assess how reasoning LLMs prioritize between their own calculations and externally provided conclusions.

Algorithm 1: CPT Research

Input: Reasoning LLM set **LM**, question q_0 , method **Tamper** for tampering with ending tokens, correct answer w to q_0 .

Output: Result s .

```

 $s := \emptyset$ 
 $(rt_0, s_0) \leftarrow M(q_0) \quad \triangleright M \in \mathbf{LM}.$ 
 $rt_T \leftarrow \mathbf{Tamper}(rt_0)$ 
 $q_T \leftarrow q_0 \parallel rt_T$ 
for  $j = 0$  to  $\text{length}(\mathbf{LM}) - 1$  do
   $(rt_m, s_m) \leftarrow \mathbf{LM}_j(q_0)$ 
  if  $w \subseteq s_m$  then
     $(rt_c, s_c) \leftarrow \mathbf{LM}_j(q_T)$ 
    if  $s_c == \perp$  then
       $r \leftarrow \perp \quad \triangleright \text{Thinking stopped.}$ 
      continue
    else
       $r \leftarrow \text{Compare}(rt_m, rt_c, s_m, s_c)$ 
    end
  else
     $r \leftarrow \perp$ 
    continue
  end
   $s \leftarrow s \cup r$ 
end
return  $s$ 

```

3.4 Probing LLM Resistance to CPT

To evaluate how effectively reasoning LLMs can resist CPT, we developed three increasingly direct interventions (Figure 3):

- **Method 1** (Uncertainty Prompting): Uses filter text suggesting possible errors in the reasoning tokens.




Figure 2: Overview of reasoning tokens for solving mathematical problems and specific objectives of tampering.

- **Method 2 (Direct Contradiction):** Explicitly states the reasoning tokens contain errors and instructs the model to ignore them.
- **Method 3 (Output Prefix Control):** On the basis of Method 2, implements forced reconsideration using the method described by (Wang et al., 2024), which leverages output prefix to override model tendencies.

For Method 3, we provide implementation pseudocode based on the DeepSeek API² (Figure 3). Since reasoning tokens are often not directly accessible in API-based interactions, we focus our analysis on final outputs for this condition. These interventions create a systematic framework for measuring CPT resistance across models and mathematical problem types. Complete examples of model responses across these conditions are provided in Appendix B.

Method 1: Uncertainty Prompting

Input Suffix Below is your previous thought. But your previous thinking may be wrong. You need to carefully identify...

Method 2: Direct Contradiction

Input Suffix Below is your previous thought. But your previous thinking is wrong. You should ignore it and rethink...

Method 3: Output Prefix Control

My previous thinking is incorrect, especially the final result. Therefore, I should ignore my previous reasoning and rethink. **Output Prefix**

```

response = client.chat.completions.create(
    model="deepseek-reasoner",
    messages=[
        [{"role": "user", "content": "<Question><Input Suffix>"}, Method 2
        {"role": "assistant", "content": "<Output Prefix>", "prefix": True}]
    print("result: ", response.choices[0].message.content)
                
```

Code

Figure 3: The approaches of exploring the resistance of reasoning LLMs to CPT.

3.5 Structural Modifications on Tampered Reasoning Tokens

To investigate whether the "structure matters more than local results" hypothesis proposed by (Li et al., 2025a) applies to the CPT phenomenon, we adopted their effective reasoning step modification methods (deleted and inserted reasoning steps) to structurally modify the tampered reasoning tokens in our study. We consider self-reflection and self-verification components (Figure 2) as integral reasoning units. For deleted reasoning steps, we implement two approaches: Delete-R (removing only self-reflection) and Delete-V (removing only self-verification). For inserted reasoning steps, we introduce extraneous reasoning tokens related to angle calculation between the self-reflection and self-verification components. If structural modifications have a more significant impact than content modifications on reasoning outcomes, we would expect the model’s ability to resist CPT to be substantially weakened when the structure is altered, leading to increased compromising thinking probability. Conversely, if local content modifications prove more influential, structural changes might have minimal effect or even potentially enhance CPT resistance. Through these structural modifications, we aim to test whether the conclusions from prior work on reasoning chain structure extend to the CPT phenomenon, or whether result token modifications represent a distinct vulnerability that operates through different mechanisms.

²<https://api-docs.deepseek.com>

| Model | Baseline | Method 1 | Method 2 | Method 3 | Average |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| DEEPSEEK-R1 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.50 | 0.72 |
| O3-MIN | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 0.67 |
| KIMI K1.5 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| OPENAI-O1 | 0.67 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| DOUBAO | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |

Table 1: Evaluation result of CPT towards reasoning LLMs in mathematical word problems.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Dataset. Our research requires an in-depth analysis of the reasoning tokens generated by reasoning LLMs. Since most model APIs do not allow direct access to these tokens, automated evaluation is difficult and extensive human assessment is required. As a result, our experimental dataset is relatively concise and precise. For standalone arithmetic tasks (Shrestha et al., 2025), we focus on addition and multiplication problems and construct a test dataset containing 15-digit plus 13-digit addition and 8-digit by 7-digit multiplication via random number generation. For mathematical word problems, we randomly selected 6 representative questions (see Appendix E) from GSM-Ranges (Shrestha et al., 2025) with level 6 perturbation to build a subset for evaluation.

Models. We evaluate multiple reasoning LLMs, including DeepSeek-R1, OpenAI o3-min, Kimi k1.5 (long-CoT) (Team et al., 2025), Doubao (Deep Thinking)³, and OpenAI-o1. To acquire reasoning tokens, the models were accessed through their respective APIs using default temperature settings and web-based conversations.

Benchmark. We conduct experimental evaluation following Algorithm 1, and use the questioning method illustrated in Figure 1 as our baseline. This baseline simply appends the question to the manipulated reasoning tokens by using a basic filter (i.e., "Below is your previous thought."). We compare the baseline with three methods (Method 1-3) designed to resist CPT. For mathematical calculation tasks, we adopt manipulated reasoning tokens with different levels of tampering, defined by $D_T \in [1, 6]$. We focus on the $D_T = 1$ case for mathematical word problems, due to the complex numerical and logical structures of the tokens. To better demonstrate the impact of the CPT issue, we use DeepSeek-R1 for M in Algorithm 1, as its generated long CoT exhibits a more rigorous and comprehensive reasoning process.

Evaluation Protocol. For each model and problem combination, we first verify that the model can correctly solve the problem independently. Then, following Algorithm 1, we present the model with the same problem appended with tampered reasoning tokens and measure the compromising rate as defined in Equation 1. For structural modification experiments, we implement three variants (Delete-R, Delete-V, and Insertion) as described in Section 3.5 and evaluate their impact on CPT resistance.

4.2 Main Results

In Figure 4, we present the R_{CPT} evaluation results for the reasoning LLMs performing both addition and multiplication at various D_T values. As far as we know, Doubao model cannot implement the output prefix method under deep-thinking, so its evaluation data for Method 3 are omitted and thus displayed as a zero value in Figure 5. Overall, Method 3 substantially outperforms Method 1 and Method 2 in improving models' resistance to CPT. Under the baseline condition, all models are noticeably affected by CPT, with DeepSeek-R1 being the most susceptible. For DeepSeek-R1, cases under Method 3 arise in which D_T is lower than D_{CPT} , causing R_{CPT} to exceed the baseline. This indicates that under the output prefix approach, DeepSeek-R1's mathematical computation capabilities are not robust enough. Furthermore, it can be clearly observed that resistance to CPT generally strengthens as D_T increases.

³<https://www.doubao.com/chat>




Figure 4: Evaluation result of CPT towards reasoning LLMs in standalone arithmetic tasks.

Figure 5 shows CPT performance for both addition and multiplication, aggregating r_{CPT} across the different D_T values. For addition, o3-mini demonstrates excellent resilience, clearly exceeding its multiplication performance. By contrast, DeepSeek-R1 follows the opposite trend, underscoring the variability in CPT’s influence across distinct mathematical operations. Furthermore, while Method 1 and Method 2 generally reduce R_{CPT} , they negatively impact OpenAI-o1.

Lastly, Table 1 summarizes the results for mathematical word problems, which largely align with the observations from standalone arithmetic tasks. Under the baseline, DeepSeek-R1, Doubao, and kimi k1.5 display minimal resistance to CPT. However, with progressively direct interventions, DeepSeek-R1 exhibits a marked improvement in resistance.




Figure 5: Comparative evaluation of reasoning LLMs on addition and multiplication in CPT.

Structure or Content. In Figure 8, we illustrate the reasoning performance of reasoning LLMs for additive calculation under CPT setting and structural modifications on reasoning tokens. Compared with the baseline method, all three approaches of modifying structure improve the model’s resistance to CPT. Among these approaches, Delete-R achieves optimal performance. Therefore, structural modifications are unlikely to significantly enhance the impact of CPT. This finding also suggests that for the CPT problem, local ending token manipulations have greater impact on reasoning outcomes than structural alterations, which partially conflicts with previous work (Li et al., 2025a) to some extent.




Figure 6: The compromising thinking of o3-mini model. It is caused by the tampered reasoning tokens of DeepSeek-R1 ($D_T = 2$).

5 Analysis and Discussion

In the previous experimental results, we explored the impact of CPT on reasoning LLM’s performance. This section will further analyze these results, focusing on the additional findings and new contributions derived from them. We first investigate the impact of varying degrees of manipulation on CPT (Section 5.1), and then analyze the nature of CPT’s effect on model reasoning (Section 5.2). Finally, we reveal a security vulnerability that manipulated tokens can lead DeepSeek-R1 to stop reasoning and fail to deliver a final answer (Section 5.3).

5.1 Impact of Different Degrees of Tampering on CPT

In our experiments, along with the increasing of the number of tampered digits in ending reasoning tokens, the reasoning LLMs become more likely to identify and self-correct errors in the calculation results. This may be related to the existing research conclusion that LLMs usually fail to confidently predict the last digit of calculation tasks (Gambardella et al., 2024). In fact, the degree of numerical discrepancy caused by tampering may be the key factor. As shown below, when the modified result deviates significantly from the correct result, the models exhibit higher confidence in identifying the error in the reasoning tokens and providing the correct result.

Significant tampering enhances the model’s resistance to CPT

When I add them all together, I get \$1,151,679,562, but the earlier provided result was \$1,151,676,562. That’s a difference of \$3,000, so I’m confident there was a small error in that chain-of-thought. The correct total cost is \$1,151,679,562.

5.2 Fundamental Impact of CPT on the Reasoning Process

By carefully analyzing the "compromising thinking" process in reasoning LLMs, we find that compared with the initial reasoning tokens rt_m towards solving q_0 , the tokens under CPT are markedly fewer, and the reasoning time is noticeably shorter (even reduced by more than 60%). The reason for this is that the models have great confidence that the calculation result provided is correct, and thus perform simple verification before ending the reasoning task. For o3-mini, the reasoning and answer tokens under CPT will show obvious slackness, impatience and perfunctory behavior, as shown in Figure 6. The counts of tokens are calculated by Tokenizer ("GPT-4o & GPT-4o mini")⁴. The poor performance is in sharp contrast to the initial tokens, which indicate the effort to think and pursue careful examination.

Moreover, when dealing with mathematical word problems, o3-mini significantly outperforms DeepSeek-R1 in resisting CPT. The essence is that the reasoning time under CPT of DeepSeek-R1 is less than initial reasoning time, while that of o3-mini is just the opposite (see Figure 7). Under the influence of CPT, the reasonable and ideal reasoning time T_{CPT}

⁴<https://platform.openai.com/tokenizer>




Figure 7: Time comparison of the initial reasoning and the reasoning under CPT for DeepSeek-R1 and o3-mini on Q1, Q3, and Q4 (Others exhibit thinking stopped as described in Section 5.3.




Figure 8: Evaluation result of reasoning LLMs for structural modifications on reasoning to-tokens

should be:

$$T_{init} + T_{identify} + T_{compare}, \quad (3)$$

where T_{init} denotes the initial time taken to solve q_0 independently, $T_{identify}$ represents the time spent checking the provided reasoning tokens, and $T_{compare}$ is the time spent comparing incorrect results in the tokens with the final calculated results. Therefore, T_{CPT} should be more than T_{init} . In fact, the three methods proposed in Section 3.4 all aim to make the reasoning of LLMs more consistent with this principle.

5.3 Thinking Stopped

When examining the impact of tampered reasoning tokens on the mathematical word problem solving of DeepSeek-R1, we accidentally observe an unsafe phenomenon: for certain questions, DeepSeek-R1 may stop thinking and fail to provide a final answer, as shown in Appendix D. In this kind of reasoning tokens with thinking interruption, we can still clearly see that DeepSeek-R1 gives a relatively complete thinking process of problem solving, indicating the influence of CPT. When calling DeepSeek-R1 via its API, this thinking stopped problem manifests as the value of `choices[0].message.content` in code being empty. In our experiments, the probability of this phenomenon occurring for the chosen problems is extremely high. Further analysis reveals that the core reason for the problem is the presence of previously generated reasoning tokens for the same question in the prompt. In fact, the method to trigger this security vulnerability can be simplified as follows:

$$(rt, s) \leftarrow \mathbf{LM}(q_0|\theta), (rt_1, s_1) \leftarrow \mathbf{LM}(rt|\theta), \quad (4)$$

where s_1 has a very high probability of being empty. In other words, resubmitting to DeepSeek-R1 the reasoning tokens it previously generated for q_0 can cause its reasoning to stop. This issue could lead to unexpected problems in downstream applications based on LLMs, such as various Natural Language Processing systems exploiting LLM-based agents (Zhang et al., 2024a). This discovery is of great significance for enhancing the security of DeepSeek-R1 in the future.

The overall structure of reasoning tokens generated by DeepSeek-R1 for mathematical word problems and standalone arithmetic tasks is similar, but this thinking stopped is difficult to occur in our experiments targeting the latter. Our experimental results show that the core trigger factor has nothing to do with the count of tokens, and is more likely to be closely related to the semantic logic within the reasoning tokens for mathematical word problem. Further investigations are needed to clarify the specific underlying logic responsible for this vulnerability.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we explore the vulnerability of reasoning LLMs to subtle errors in their input reasoning chains. Our findings indicate that long CoT with manipulated ending tokens can misguide reasoning LLMs to ignore the correct reasoning steps and give wrong final result. Focused on mathematical problem-solving, we introduce the concept of CPT and demonstrate that existing reasoning LLMs struggle to resist CPT. In addition, our study reveals that local ending token modifications have a greater influence on model reasoning than structural changes. Finally, we discover a security vulnerability that tampered reasoning tokens can cause DeepSeek-R1 to stop thinking and fail to deliver a final answer.

Ethics Statement

Some of the research methods we designed may mislead LLMs into outputting incorrect results, requiring readers to have the ability to distinguish. Additionally, unsafe prompting methods mentioned in the paper that could cause abnormal behavior of LLMs, such as thinking stopped, should only be used for scientific research and authorized security evaluation.

References

- Guizhen Chen, Weiwen Xu, Hao Zhang, Hou Pong Chan, Chaoqun Liu, Lidong Bing, Deli Zhao, Anh Tuan Luu, and Yu Rong. Finereason: Evaluating and improving llms' deliberate reasoning through reflective puzzle solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.20238*, 2025a.
- Qiguang Chen, Libo Qin, Jinhao Liu, Dengyun Peng, Jiannan Guan, Peng Wang, Mengkang Hu, Yuhang Zhou, Te Gao, and Wanxiang Che. Towards reasoning era: A survey of long chain-of-thought for reasoning large language models, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.09567>.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, T. Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wanbiao Zhao, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yuduan Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao,

Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.

Andrew Gambardella, Yusuke Iwasawa, and Yutaka Matsuo. Language models do hard arithmetic tasks easily and hardly do easy arithmetic tasks. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp. 85–91, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-short.8. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-short.8/>.

Yancheng He, Shilong Li, Jiaheng Liu, Weixun Wang, Xingyuan Bu, Ge Zhang, Zhongyuan Peng, Zhaoxiang Zhang, Wenbo Su, and Bo Zheng. Can large language models detect errors in long chain-of-thought reasoning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.19361*, 2025.

Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, Alex Iftimie, Alex Karpenko, Alex Tachard Passos, Alexander Neitz, Alexander Prokofiev, Alexander Wei, Allison Tam, Ally Bennett, Ananya Kumar, Andre Saraiva, Andrea Vallone, Andrew Duberstein, Andrew Kondrich, Andrey Mishchenko, Andy Applebaum, Angela Jiang, Ashvin Nair, Barret Zoph, Behrooz Ghorbani, Ben Rossen, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Boaz Barak, Bob McGrew, Borys Minaiev, Botao Hao, Bowen Baker, Brandon Houghton, Brandon McKinzie, Brydon Eastman, Camillo Lugaresi, Cary Bassin, Cary Hudson, Chak Ming Li, Charles de Bourcy, Chelsea Voss, Chen Shen, Chong Zhang, Chris Koch, Chris Orsinger, Christopher Hesse, Claudia Fischer, Clive Chan, Dan Roberts, Daniel Kappler, Daniel Levy, Daniel Selsam, David Dohan, David Farhi, David Mely, David Robinson, Dimitris Tsipras, Doug Li, Dragos Oprica, Eben Freeman, Eddie Zhang, Edmund Wong, Elizabeth Proehl, Enoch Cheung, Eric Mitchell, Eric Wallace, Erik Ritter, Evan Mays, Fan Wang, Felipe Petroski Such, Filippo Raso, Florencia Leoni, Foivos Tsimpourlas, Francis Song, Fred von Lohmann, Freddie Sulit, Geoff Salmon, Giambattista Parascandolo, Gildas Chabot, Grace Zhao, Greg Brockman, Guillaume Leclerc, Hadi Salman, Haiming Bao, Hao Sheng, Hart Andrin, Hessa Bagherinezhad, Hongyu Ren, Hunter Lightman, Hyung Won Chung, Ian Kivlichan, Ian O’Connell, Ian Osband, Ignasi Clavera Gilaberte, Ilge Akkaya, Ilya Kostrikov, Ilya Sutskever, Irina Kofman, Jakub Pachocki, James Lennon, Jason Wei, Jean Harb, Jerry Twore, Jiacheng Feng, Jiahui Yu, Jiayi Weng, Jie Tang, Jieqi Yu, Joaquin Quiñero Candela, Joe Palermo, Joel Parish, Johannes Heidecke, John Hallman, John Rizzo, Jonathan Gordon, Jonathan Uesato, Jonathan Ward, Joost Huizinga, Julie Wang, Kai Chen, Kai Xiao, Karan Singhal, Karina Nguyen, Karl Cobbe, Katy Shi, Kayla Wood, Kendra Rimbach, Keren Gu-Lemberg, Kevin Liu, Kevin Lu, Kevin Stone, Kevin Yu, Lama Ahmad, Lauren Yang, Leo Liu, Leon Maksin, Leyton Ho, Liam Fedus, Lilian Weng, Linden Li, Lindsay McCallum, Lindsey Held, Lorenz Kuhn, Lukas Kondraciuk, Lukasz Kaiser, Luke Metz, Madelaine Boyd, Maja Trebacz, Manas Joglekar, Mark Chen, Marko Titor, Mason Meyer, Matt Jones, Matt Kaufer, Max Schwarzer, Meghan Shah, Mehmet Yatbaz, Melody Y. Guan, Mengyuan Xu, Mengyuan Yan, Mia Glaese, Mianna Chen, Michael Lampe, Michael Malek, Michele Wang, Michelle Fradin, Mike McClay, Mikhail Pavlov, Miles Wang, Mingxuan Wang, Mira Murati, Mo Bavarian, Mostafa Rohaninejad, Nat McAleese, Neil Chowdhury, Neil Chowdhury, Nick Ryder, Nikolas Tezak, Noam Brown, Ofir Nachum, Oleg Boiko, Oleg Murk, Olivia Watkins, Patrick Chao, Paul Ashbourne, Pavel Izmailov, Peter Zhokhov, Rachel Dias, Rahul Arora, Randall Lin, Rapha Gontijo Lopes, Raz Gaon, Reah Miyara, Reimar Leike, Renny Hwang, Rhythm Garg, Robin Brown, Roshan James, Rui Shu, Ryan Cheu, Ryan Greene, Saachi Jain, Sam Altman, Sam Toizer, Sam Toyer, Samuel Miserendino, Sandhini Agarwal, Santiago Hernandez, Sasha Baker, Scott McKinney, Scottie Yan, Shengjia Zhao, Shengli Hu, Shibani Santurkar, Shraman Ray Chaudhuri, Shuyuan Zhang, Siyuan Fu, Spencer Papay, Steph Lin, Suchir Balaji, Suvansh Sanjeev, Szymon Sidor, Tal Broda, Aidan Clark, Tao Wang, Taylor Gordon, Ted Sanders, Tejal Patwardhan, Thibault Sottiaux, Thomas Degry, Thomas Dimson, Tianhao Zheng, Timur Garipov, Tom Stasi, Trapit Bansal, Trevor Creech, Troy Peterson, Tyna Eloundou, Valerie Qi, Vineet Kosaraju, Vinnie Monaco, Vitchyr Pong, Vlad Fomenko, Weiyi Zheng, Wenda Zhou, Wes McCabe, Wojciech Zaremba, Yann Dubois, Yinghai Lu, Yining Chen,

- Young Cha, Yu Bai, Yuchen He, Yuchen Zhang, Yunyun Wang, Zheng Shao, and Zhuohan Li. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*, 2024.
- Aviral Kumar, Vincent Zhuang, Rishabh Agarwal, Yi Su, John D Co-Reyes, Avi Singh, Kate Baumli, Shariq Iqbal, Colton Bishop, Rebecca Roelofs, et al. Training language models to self-correct via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12917*, 2024.
- Dacheng Li, Shiyi Cao, Tyler Griggs, Shu Liu, Xiangxi Mo, Shishir G Patil, Matei Zaharia, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Llms can easily learn to reason from demonstrations structure, not content, is what matters! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.07374*, 2025a.
- Qintong Li, Leyang Cui, Xueliang Zhao, Lingpeng Kong, and Wei Bi. GSM-plus: A comprehensive benchmark for evaluating the robustness of LLMs as mathematical problem solvers. 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. 2961–2984, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.163. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.163/>.
- Zhong-Zhi Li, Duzhen Zhang, Ming-Liang Zhang, Jiaxin Zhang, Zengyan Liu, Yuxuan Yao, Haotian Xu, Junhao Zheng, Pei-Jie Wang, Xiuyi Chen, et al. From system 1 to system 2: A survey of reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17419*, 2025b.
- Hongwei Liu, Zilong Zheng, Yuxuan Qiao, Haodong Duan, Zhiwei Fei, Fengzhe Zhou, Wenwei Zhang, Songyang Zhang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. MathBench: Evaluating the theory and application proficiency of LLMs with a hierarchical mathematics benchmark. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pp. 6884–6915, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.411. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.411/>.
- Sagnik Mukherjee, Abhinav Chinta, Takyong Kim, Tarun Anoop Sharma, and Dilek Hakkani Tur. Premise-augmented reasoning chains improve error identification in math reasoning with llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02362*, 2025.
- Safal Shrestha, Minwu Kim, and Keith Ross. Mathematical reasoning in large language models: Assessing logical and arithmetic errors across wide numerical ranges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.08680*, 2025.
- Xiaoshuai Song, Yanan Wu, Weixun Wang, Jiaheng Liu, Wenbo Su, and Bo Zheng. Progco: Program helps self-correction of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.01264*, 2025.
- Kimi Team, Angang Du, Bofei Gao, Bofei Xing, Changjiu Jiang, Cheng Chen, Cheng Li, Chenjun Xiao, Chenzhuang Du, Chonghua Liao, Chuning Tang, Congcong Wang, Dehao Zhang, Enming Yuan, Enzhe Lu, Fengxiang Tang, Flood Sung, Guangda Wei, Guokun Lai, Haiqing Guo, Han Zhu, Hao Ding, Hao Hu, Hao Yang, Hao Zhang, Haotian Yao, Haotian Zhao, Haoyu Lu, Haoze Li, Haozhen Yu, Hongcheng Gao, Huabin Zheng, Huan Yuan, Jia Chen, Jianhang Guo, Jianlin Su, Jianzhou Wang, Jie Zhao, Jin Zhang, Jingyuan Liu, Junjie Yan, Junyan Wu, Lidong Shi, Ling Ye, Longhui Yu, Mengnan Dong, Neo Zhang, Ningchen Ma, Qiwei Pan, Qucheng Gong, Shaowei Liu, Shengling Ma, Shupeng Wei, Sihan Cao, Siying Huang, Tao Jiang, Weihao Gao, Weimin Xiong, Weiran He, Weixiao Huang, Wenhao Wu, Wenyang He, Xianghui Wei, Xianqing Jia, Xingzhe Wu, Xinran Xu, Xinxing Zu, Xinyu Zhou, Xuehai Pan, Y. Charles, Yang Li, Yangyang Hu, Yangyang Liu, Yanru Chen, Yejie Wang, Yibo Liu, Yidao Qin, Yifeng Liu, Ying Yang, Yiping Bao, Yulun Du, Yuxin Wu, Yuzhi Wang, Zaida Zhou, Zhaoji Wang, Zhaowei Li, Zhen Zhu, Zheng Zhang, Zhexu Wang, Zhilin Yang, Zhiqi Huang, Zihao Huang, Ziyao Xu, and Zonghan Yang. Kimi k1. 5: Scaling reinforcement learning with llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12599*, 2025.
- Yiwei Wang, Muhao Chen, Nanyun Peng, and Kai-Wei Chang. Vulnerability of large language models to output prefix jailbreaks: Impact of positions on safety. 11 2024. doi: 10.36227/techrxiv.173161123.33560859/v1.

- Zhe Yang, Yichang Zhang, Yudong Wang, Ziyao Xu, Junyang Lin, and Zhifang Sui. Confidence vs critique: A decomposition of self-correction capability for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19513*, 2024.
- Yuxuan YAO, Han Wu, Zhijiang Guo, Zhou Biyan, Jiahui Gao, Sichun Luo, Hanxu Hou, Xiaojin Fu, and Linqi Song. Learning from correctness without prompting makes LLM efficient reasoner. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=dcbNzhVVQj>.
- Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chuanqi Tan, Wei Wang, and Songfang Huang. How well do large language models perform in arithmetic tasks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02015*, 2023.
- Beichen Zhang, Yuhong Liu, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, Pan Zhang, Haodong Duan, Yuhang Cao, Dahua Lin, and Jiaqi Wang. Booststep: Boosting mathematical capability of large language models via improved single-step reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.03226*, 2025.
- Jintian Zhang, Xin Xu, Ningyu Zhang, Ruibo Liu, Bryan Hooi, and Shumin Deng. Exploring collaboration mechanisms for LLM agents: A social psychology view. 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. 14544–14607, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024a. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.782. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.782/>.
- Wei Zhang, Chaoqun Wan, Yonggang Zhang, Yiu-ming Cheung, Xinmei Tian, Xu Shen, and Jieping Ye. Interpreting and improving large language models in arithmetic calculation. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'24*. JMLR.org, 2024b.
- Kaiwen Zhou, Chengzhi Liu, Xuandong Zhao, Shreedhar Jangam, Jayanth Srinivasa, Gaowen Liu, Dawn Song, and Xin Eric Wang. The hidden risks of large reasoning models: A safety assessment of r1. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12659*, 2025.

A Instances of Compromising Thought

Instance 1: Multiplication by o3-mini (Baseline: $D_T = 2$)

The product of 38,697,082 and 4,133,991 is 159,973,389,714,562.

To summarize briefly without revealing internal steps: I computed the product using a standard multiplication approach by breaking down each digit's contribution according to its place value and then summing the results, confirming that the final answer is correct.

Instance 2: Multiplication by DeepSeek-R1 (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

...Add each subsequent result sequentially:

$$+3,869,708,200,000 = 158,658,036,200,000$$

$$+1,160,912,460,000 = 159,818,948,660,000$$

$$+116,091,246,000 = 159,935,039,906,000$$

$$+34,827,373,800 = 159,969,867,279,800$$

$$+3,482,737,380 = \mathbf{159,973,350,017,180}$$

$$+\mathbf{38,697,082} = \mathbf{159,973,389,714,262}$$

Final Answer: $38,697,082 \times 4,133,991 = 159,973,389,714,262$

Instance 3: Addition by Doubao (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

The sum of 705,537,514,349,043 and 5,488,395,726,938 is 711,025,710,075,981.

Step-by-Step Breakdown:

Align the numbers by place value (pad the shorter number with leading zeros):

plaintext 7 0 5 5 3 7 5 1 4 3 4 9 0 4 3 + 0 0 5 4 8 8 3 9 5 7 2 6 9 3 8

Add digit by digit from right to left, carrying over when necessary:

Units: $3 + 8 = 11 \rightarrow 1$ (carry 1)

Tens: $4 + 3 + 1 = 8 \rightarrow 8$

Hundreds: $0 + 9 = 9 \rightarrow 9$

Thousands: $9 + 6 = 15 \rightarrow 5$ (carry 1)

Ten thousands: $4 + 2 + 1 = 7 \rightarrow 7$

Hundred thousands: $3 + 7 = 10 \rightarrow 0$ (carry 1)

Millions: $4 + 5 + 1 = 10 \rightarrow 0$ (carry 1)

Ten millions: $1 + 9 + 1 = 11 \rightarrow 1$ (carry 1)

Hundred millions: $5 + 3 + 1 = 9 \rightarrow 9$

Billions: $7 + 8 = 15 \rightarrow 5$ (carry 1)

Ten billions: $3 + 8 + 1 = 12 \rightarrow 2$ (carry 1)

Hundred billions: $5 + 4 + 1 = 10 \rightarrow 0$ (carry 1)

Trillions: $5 + 5 + 1 = 11 \rightarrow 1$ (carry 1)

Ten trillions: $0 + 0 + 1 = 1 \rightarrow 1$

Hundred trillions: $7 + 0 = 7 \rightarrow 7$

Combine the results:

7 1 1 0 2 5 7 1 0 0 7 5 9 8 1 \rightarrow 711,025,710,075,981.

Let me know if you need further clarification!

Instance 4: Word problem by DeepSeek-R1 (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

To determine how much Janet makes daily at the farmers' market, follow these steps:

1. Total Eggs Laid:

Janet's ducks lay 8,488,302 eggs per day.

2. Eggs Used for Consumption:

- Breakfast: 1,146,800 eggs

- Muffins: 1,309,630 eggs

- Total Used: $1,146,800 + 1,309,630 = 2,456,430$ eggs

3. Remaining Eggs for Sale:

Subtract the total eggs used from the total eggs laid:

$$8,488,302 - 2,456,430 = 6,031,872 \text{ eggs}$$

4. Daily Earnings:

Each remaining egg is sold for \$7. Multiply the remaining eggs by the price per egg:

$$6,031,872 \times 7 = 42,225,104$$

Final Answer:

Janet makes dollars every day at the farmers' market.

Instance 5: Multiplication by DeepSeek-R1 (Method 3: $D_T = 4$)

First, I need to multiply the two numbers: 38,697,082 and 4,133,991. To ensure accuracy, I'll use the standard multiplication method, breaking down the numbers and summing their products.

Step 1: Decompose the multiplier (4,133,991) - 4,000,000 - 100,000 - 30,000 - 3,000 - 900 - 90 - 1

Step 2: Multiply 38,697,082 by each decomposed part 1. $38,697,082 \times 4,000,000$ $38,697,082 \times 4 = 154,788,328$ Shift 6 places: 154,788,328,000,000

2. $38,697,082 \times 100,000$ Shift 5 places: 3,869,708,200,000

3. $38,697,082 \times 30,000$ $38,697,082 \times 3 = 116,091,246$ Shift 4 places: 1,160,912,460,000

4. $38,697,082 \times 3,000$ Shift 3 places: 116,091,246,000

5. $38,697,082 \times 900$ $38,697,082 \times 9 = 348,273,738$ Shift 2 places: 34,827,373,800

6. $38,697,082 \times 90$ Shift 1 place: 3,482,737,380

7. $38,697,082 \times 1$ 38,697,082

Step 3: Sum all the products

$$\begin{array}{r}
 154,788,328,000,000 \\
 + 3,869,708,200,000 \\
 + 1,160,912,460,000 \\
 + 116,091,246,000 \\
 + 34,827,373,800 \\
 + 3,482,737,380 \\
 + 38,697,082 \\
 = 159,973,350,017,180
 \end{array}$$

Final Answer: 159,973,350,017,180

Instance 6: Multiplication by DeepSeek-R1 (Method 3: $D_T = 6$)

To calculate $38,697,082 \times 4,133,991$, let's use scientific notation to simplify the process:

1. Approximate the numbers: - $38,697,082 \approx 3.8697 \times 10^7$ - $4,133,991 \approx 4.134 \times 10^6$
2. Multiply the coefficients:

$$3.8697 \times 4.134 \approx 16.0 \quad (\text{exact value: } 3.8697 \times 4.134 \approx 16.0)$$

3. Add the exponents:

$$10^7 \times 10^6 = 10^{13}$$

4. Combine results:

$$16.0 \times 10^{13} = 1.6 \times 10^{14} \quad (\text{or } 160,000,000,000,000)$$

However, this is an approximation. For the exact value, use direct multiplication:

$$38,697,082 \times 4,133,991 = 160,000,000,000,000 \quad (\text{adjusted for precision})$$

Final Answer:

(Note: The exact value requires precise arithmetic, but this is the closest simplified result using scientific notation.)

Instance 7: Word problem by Kimi k1.5 (Method 1: $D_T = 1$)

I need to find out how many eggs Janet has left after using some for breakfast and baking, and then calculate how much money she makes by selling the remaining eggs.

First, I subtract the eggs used for breakfast and muffins from the total eggs laid: - Total eggs laid: 8,488,302 - Eggs eaten for breakfast: 1,146,800 - Eggs used for muffins: 1,309,630

So, the remaining eggs are:

$$8,488,302 - 1,146,800 - 1,309,630$$

Let me do the subtraction step by step: 1. Subtract the breakfast eggs:

$$8,488,302 - 1,146,800 = 7,341,502$$

2. Subtract the muffin eggs:

$$7,341,502 - 1,309,630 = 6,031,872$$

So, Janet has 6,031,872 eggs left to sell.

Next, I calculate how much money she makes by selling these eggs at \$7 each:

$$6,031,872 \times 7$$

Breaking it down: - $6,000,000 \times 7 = 42,000,000$ - $31,872 \times 7 = 223,104$

Adding these together:

$$42,000,000 + 223,104 = 42,225,104$$

So, Janet makes **42225104** dollars every day at the farmers' market.

Instance 8: Word problem by o3-mini (Method 1: $D_T = 1$)

The calculation you've outlined looks correct, but I agree that the numbers presented in the problem seem to be extraordinarily large and likely unrealistic. Nonetheless, based on the information given, we can proceed with the steps as follows:

Step-by-step breakdown:

1. Total classes in a week:

- Weekdays (Monday to Friday): $5,687,781$ classes per day $\times 5$ days = $28,438,905$ classes.

- Saturday: $9,536,275$ classes.

Total weekly classes:

$28,438,905$ (weekdays) + $9,536,275$ (Saturday) = $37,975,180$ classes.

2. Total number of students:

Each class has 20 students, so:

$37,975,180$ classes $\times 20$ students = $759,503,600$ students.

3. Total revenue:

Judy charges \$25 per student, so:

$759,503,600$ students \times $\$25/\text{student} = \$18,987,591,000$.

Final Answer:

Judy makes $\$18,987,591,000$ in one week.

This result seems incredibly high, which suggests that either the numbers provided are meant to be fictional or there's a mistake in how the numbers were presented. If there was a typo (for instance, the number of classes per day might have been intended to be much smaller), the total revenue would be much more realistic.

B Instances of Revised Results

Instance 1: Addition by o3-mini (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

The sum is $711,025,910,075,981$.

Here's a quick breakdown:

Units: $043 + 938 = 981$

Thousands: $349 + 726 = 1,075 \rightarrow$ write 075 and carry 1 to the millions

Millions: $514 + 395 = 909$; plus the carry gives 910

Billions: $537 + 488 = 1,025 \rightarrow$ write 025 and carry 1 to the trillions

Trillions: $705 + 5 = 710$; plus the carry gives 711

Putting it all together:

711 (trillions), 025 (billions), 910 (millions), 075 (thousands), 981 (units)
w711,025,910,075,981.

Instance 2: Addition by o3-mini (Method 1: $D_T = 3$)

The correct sum is 711,025,910,075,981.

Let's briefly explain:

We have two numbers: - 705,537,514,349,043 - 5,488,395,726,938

When added...

I verified this using a precise calculation. **The previous chain-of-thought had an error in the addition process.**

Thus, the correct answer is 711025910075981.

Instance 3: Addition by o1 (Method 1: $D_T = 4$)

There's a small slip in the final assembly of digits in your workings...

Below is a more transparent way to see why that final "910" in the millions place (rather than "720") is correct. ... Hence the final six digits must be "075,981." This clinches that the sum is 711,025,910,075,981.

Instance 4: Addition by o1 (Method 3: $D_T = 1$)

Below is a fresh, concise addition (ignoring the previous reasoning): ...

• First number: 705 trillion, 537 billion, 514 million, 349 thousand, 43 • Second number: 5 trillion, 488 billion, 395 million, 726 thousand, 938

a) Trillions: $705 + 5 = 710$

b) Billions: $537 + 488 = 1,025 \rightarrow$ that is 1 trillion + 25 billion.

Add the extra 1 trillion to the previous 710 \rightarrow 711 trillion left, 25 billion remain.

c) Millions: $514 + 395 = 909$.

So we still have 25 billion, 909 million.

d) Thousands: $349 + 726 = 1,075 \rightarrow$ that is 1 million + 75 thousand.

Adding 1 million to 909 million \rightarrow 910 million.

So now we have 25 billion, 910 million, 75 thousand.

e) Units: $43 + 938 = 981$.

Putting it all together yields 711 trillion, 25 billion, 910 million, 75 thousand, 981, which in standard form is:

711,025,910,075,981.

So the correct sum is 711,025,910,075,981.

Instance 5: Addition by DeepSeek-R1 (Method 3: $D_T = 6$)

...

Final Result: Combining all digits from left to right: 711,025,910,075,981

Answer: 711,025,910,075,981

(Note: Previous grouping errors have been corrected here.)

Instance 6: Multiplication by o1 (Baseline: $D_T = 2$)

A careful recalculation shows that the correct product is 159,973,388,714,262 (not 159,973,389,714,562)...

Hence, $38,697,082 \times 4,133,991 = 159,973,388,714,262$.

Instance 7: Word problem by o3-mini (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

Let's break down the problem step by step:

1. Total eggs per day: 8,488,302 eggs
2. Eggs used for breakfast: 1,146,800 eggs
3. Eggs used for muffins: 1,309,630 eggs
4. Calculate remaining eggs:

$$\text{Remaining eggs} = 8,488,302 - 1,146,800 - 1,309,630 = 6,031,872$$

5. Calculate daily earnings: Each remaining egg is sold for \$7, so:

$$\text{Earnings} = 6,031,872 \times 7 = 42,223,104$$

Thus, Janet makes \$42,223,104 every day at the farmers' market.

C Tampered Reasoning Tokens

Instance 1: Addition by DeepSeek-R1 (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

705537514349043+5488395726938=? **Below is your previous thought.**

Alright, so I need to add these two big numbers: 705,537,514,349,043 and 5,488,395,726,938. Hmm, let me see. Okay, first, adding large numbers can be a bit intimidating because there are so many digits, but if I take it step by step, it should be manageable...

So the resulting number is:

7 1 1 0 2 5 7 1 0 0 7 5 9 8 1

Wait, that seems a bit off. Let me check if that makes sense. Let's break it down with commas:

Starting from the right, every three digits:

... 5981 → but let's group the digits:

711,025,710,075,981?

Wait, let's see:

Digits: 7 1 1 0 2 5 7 1 0 0 7 5 9 8 1

Grouping from the right:

15 digits: 7 1 1 0 2 5 7 1 0 0 7 5 9 8 1

Starting from the right, three by three:

981 (positions 13-15)

598 (positions 10-12): Wait, no. Let's index them:

...

So putting commas: 711,025,710,075,981

But wait, the commas in large numbers go every three digits starting from the right, so it should be: 711,025,710,075,981

But let's verify the addition another way. Let's convert the numbers to something more manageable...

But when you have 1,025 billion, that's 1 trillion and 25 billion. Similarly, 1,075 thousand is 1 million and 75 thousand.

So adjusting:

710 trillion + 1 trillion = 711 trillion

25 billion + 909 million + 1 million = 25 billion + 910 million

75 thousand + 981 units = 75 thousand 981

So the result would be 711,025,710,075,981

Which matches the earlier result. Therefore, the sum is 711,025,710,075,981.

Let me check with another method. Let's subtract a small number to see.

Alternatively, use approximate values to check. 705 trillion + 5 trillion is 710 trillion. But the actual numbers are slightly more: 705,537... + 5,488... So roughly 705.5 + 5.5 = 711 trillion. The exact answer is 711,025,710,075,981, which is about 711.025 trillion, which makes sense.

Therefore, I'm confident the answer is correct.

D Stop Thinking

Instance 1: Thinking Stopped By Q2 (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

<Reasoning Tokens:>

To determine the total cost of the pastries Toula bought, we need to calculate the cost for each type of pastry separately and then sum them up.

Donuts: - Quantity: 7,079,464 dozen

- Cost per dozen: \$94

- Calculation: $7,079,464 \times 94$

- Breaking down 94 into 90 + 4:

- $7,079,464 \times 90 = 637,151,760$

- $7,079,464 \times 4 = 28,317,856$

- Total cost for donuts: $637,151,760 + 28,317,856 = 665,469,616$

Mini Cupcakes:

- Quantity: 4,483,609 dozen

- Cost per dozen: \$86

- Calculation: $4,483,609 \times 86$

- Breaking down 86 into 80 + 6:

- $4,483,609 \times 80 = 358,688,720$

- $4,483,609 \times 6 = 26,901,654$

- Total cost for cupcakes: $358,688,720 + 26,901,654 = 385,590,374$

Mini Cheesecakes:

- Quantity: 4,374,764 dozen

- Cost per dozen: \$23

- Calculation: $4,374,764 \times 23$

- Breaking down 23 into 20 + 3:

- $4,374,764 \times 20 = 87,495,280$

- $4,374,764 \times 3 = 13,124,292$

- Total cost for cheesecakes: $87,495,280 + 13,124,292 = 100,619,572$

Total Cost:

- Summing up all costs:

- Total cost: $665,469,616 + 385,590,374 + 100,619,572 = 1,151,676,562$

- Calculation:

- $665,469,616 + 385,590,374 = 1,051,059,990$

- $1,051,059,990 + 100,619,572 = 1,151,676,562$

Thus, the total cost was 1151676562.

Thinking stopped

Instance 2: Thinking Stopped By Q5 (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

<Reasoning Tokens:>

Okay, let's go through the problem step by step to find the total number of stories Alani, Braylen, and Margot wrote altogether over two weeks.

First, we need the number of stories each child wrote in the first week:

- Alani: 3,970,368 stories
- Braylen: 7,543,015 stories
- Margot: 8,494,230 stories

In the second week, each child doubled the number of stories they wrote in the first week. Therefore, the total number of stories each child wrote over the two weeks is three times their first week's count (first week + second week = original + doubled = 3 times original).

To find the total number of stories altogether, we first calculate the sum of the stories from the first week for all three children:

$$3,970,368 + 7,543,015 + 8,494,230 = 3,970,368 + 7,543,015 + 8,494,230$$

Adding these step by step:

1. Add Alani's and Braylen's stories:

$$3,970,368 + 7,543,015 = 11,513,383$$

2. Add the result to Margot's stories:

$$11,513,383 + 8,494,230 = 20,007,613$$

Next, we multiply this sum by 3 to account for both weeks (since each child's total is three times their first week's count):

$$20,007,613 \times 3 = 60,022,839$$

Verifying by calculating each child's total individually and then summing them:

- Alani's total: $3,970,368 \times 3 = 11,911,104$
- Braylen's total: $7,543,015 \times 3 = 22,629,045$
- Margot's total: $8,494,230 \times 3 = 25,482,690$

Adding these totals:

$$11,911,104 + 22,629,045 + 25,482,690 = 60,022,839$$

Thus, the total number of stories they wrote altogether is 60022539.

Thinking stopped

Instance 3: Thinking Stopped By Q6 (Baseline: $D_T = 1$)

<Reasoning Tokens:>

Okay, let's solve this step by step. Axel has 9,900,270 silver pesos and 1,735,148 gold pesos. Anna has 9 times as many silver pesos as Axel and 9,356,776 more gold pesos than Axel. We need to find the total number of pesos they have together.

First, calculate Anna's silver pesos:

$$9 \times 9,900,270 = 89,102,430$$

Next, calculate Anna's gold pesos:

$$1,735,148 + 9,356,776 = 11,091,924$$

Now, find the total silver pesos by adding Axel's and Anna's amounts:

$$9,900,270 + 89,102,430 = 99,002,700$$

Then, find the total gold pesos by adding Axel's and Anna's amounts:

$$1,735,148 + 11,091,924 = 12,827,072$$

Finally, add the total silver and gold pesos together:

$$99,002,700 + 12,827,072 = 111,828,772$$

The total number of pesos Axel and Anna have together is .

Thinking stopped

E Mathematical Word Problems

Questions selected from GSM-Ranges

Q1: Janet's ducks lay 8488302 eggs per day. She eats 1146800 for breakfast every morning and bakes muffins for her friends every day with 1309630. She sells the remainder at the farmers' market daily for \$7 per fresh duck egg. How much in dollars does she make every day at the farmers' market?

Q2: Toula went to the bakery and bought various types of pastries. She bought 7079464 dozen donuts which cost \$94 per dozen, 4483609 dozen mini cupcakes which cost \$86 per dozen, and 4374764 dozen mini cheesecakes for \$23 per dozen. How much was the total cost?

Q3: Jill gets paid \$9594033 per hour to teach and \$9477896 to be a cheerleading coach. If she works 30 weeks a year, 25 hours a week as a teacher and 25 hours a week as a coach, what's her annual salary?

Q4: Judy teaches 5687781 dance classes every day on the weekdays and 9536275 classes on Saturday. If each class has 20 students and she charges \$25.00 per student, how much money does she make in 1 week?

Q5: Alani's family decided that the children should write stories of any kind. They were then required to read all of the stories they'd written to the family at the end of the weekend. Alani wrote 3970368 stories in the first week, her brother Braylen wrote 7543015 stories, and her sister Margot wrote 8494230 stories. If they each doubled the number of stories they'd written in the first week in the second week, calculate the total number of stories they wrote altogether.

Q6: Axel has 9900270 silver pesos and 1735148 gold pesos. He visits his friend Anna who has 9 times as many silver pesos as he has and 9356776 more gold pesos. What's the total number of pesos they have together?