Dynamic Sampling that Adapts: Iterative DPO for Self-Aware Mathematical Reasoning

Jun Rao 1* , Xuebo Liu 1† , Hexuan Deng 1 , Zepeng Lin 1 , Zixiong Yu 2 , Jiansheng Wei 2 , Xiaojun Meng 2† , and Min Zhang 1

¹Institute of Computing and Intelligence, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China
²Huawei Noah's Ark Lab

Abstract

In the realm of data selection for reasoning tasks, existing approaches predominantly rely on externally predefined static metrics such as difficulty and diversity, which are often designed for supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and lack adaptability to continuous training processes. A critical limitation of these methods is their inability to dynamically align with the evolving capabilities of models during online training, a gap that becomes increasingly pronounced with the rise of dynamic training paradigms and online reinforcement learning (RL) frameworks (e.g., R1 models). To address this, we introduce SAI-DPO, an algorithm that dynamically selects training data by continuously assessing a model's stage-specific reasoning abilities across different training phases. By integrating realtime model performance feedback, SAI-DPO adaptively adapts data selection to the evolving strengths and weaknesses of the model, thus enhancing both data utilization efficiency and final task performance. Extensive experiments on three state-of-the-art models and eight mathematical reasoning benchmarks, including challenging competition-level datasets (e.g., AIME24 and AMC23), demonstrate that SAI-DPO achieves an average performance boost of up to 21.3 percentage points, with particularly notable improvements of 10 and 15 points on AIME24 and AMC23, respectively. These results highlight the superiority of dynamic, model-adaptive data selection over static, externally defined strategies in advancing reasoning.

1 Introduction

Since the release of OpenAI O1 (Jaech et al., 2024) and DeepSeek R1 (Guo et al., 2025), there has been a gradual shift in focus toward reasoning models in the field of large language models (LLMs), specifically on how to enhance their reasoning capabilities.




Figure 1: The difficulty levels and knowledge scopes of problems solvable by different models vary significantly. Basic knowledge points are manageable for small models, while complex or advanced content poses challenges. Even for a large model, such advanced problems (Differentiation) remain difficult, highlighting the importance of aligning difficulty with capabilities.

However, training and deploying these reasoning models incur extremely high resource costs (*e.g.*, R1 has 671 billion parameters), which limits research given the limited resources. Developing powerful reasoning models with smaller parameter counts and in more constrained environments remains a subject of further investigation.

Current works mainly focus on SFT (Taori et al., 2023; Chung et al., 2024; Rao et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2023) after data filtering (Muennighoff et al., 2025; Ye et al., 2025) or online reinforcement learning algorithms (Shao et al., 2024; Schulman et al., 2017). Most of these methods are static, failing to adaptively select suitable data for continuous training based on the model's current capabilities, thereby limiting the sustainable improvement of its reasoning abilities. As shown in Figure 1, different models have varying capabilities, thus leading to differences in their discrimination of the questions. Although some existing works (Team et al., 2025) have addressed the impact of difficulty on models, the related metrics remain unclear.

To address the issue of the lack of dynamic adaptive training for reasoning data, we propose the

 $^{^*\}mbox{Work}$ was done when Jun was interning at Huawei Noah's Ark Lab.

[†] Corresponding Authors.

SAI-DPO (Self-Aware Iterative Direct Preference Optimization) algorithm for mathematical reasoning. This algorithm dynamically selects training data that matches the model's current competence (self-aware difficulty) and weaknesses (knowledge points similarity), enhancing its reasoning abilities through iterations. Using these two metrics, the algorithm dynamically selects data and filters low-quality inputs to enhance training efficiency.

We conducted extensive experiments to explore the defined metric, data acquisition strategy, and the gradual improvement through iterative training. Our experiments were carried out on 8 existing public mathematical test sets and 3 public models (Qwen2.5-7B-Math-Base, Qwen2.5-7B-Distill, Llama3.1-8B-Instruct). The results demonstrate that our defined components lead to significant improvements. Our main contributions are as follows:

- We introduce SAI-DPO, a novel dynamic sampling method which exploits the *self-aware difficulty* measurer of LLMs and the *similarity of the knowledge points* of datasource (§3).
- SAI-DPO significantly boosts LLM performance across diverse models and varying difficulty math tests, while outperforming existing approaches in data efficiency (§4).
- Our exploration suggests that finding the right training data for the current LLMs is the most effective to consistently improve the effectiveness of RL, offering a new perspective on the characteristics of optimal RL data (§5).

2 Related Work

2.1 Post-training Preference Optimization

In the post-training stage, many RL algorithms improve model performance by aligning the model's output objectives with human preferences-specifically, by increasing the probability of generating high-quality responses and decreasing the probability of producing low-quality ones. A common algorithm is Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017), which has been applied in multiple current LLM systems (Ouyang et al., 2022; Dubey et al., 2024; Lambert et al., 2024). Recently, more powerful reasoning models such as KIMI K1.5 (Team et al., 2025), Deepseek V3 (Liu et al., 2024), and R1 (Guo et al., 2025) have made modifications to PPO, giving rise to

algorithms like GRPO (Shao et al., 2024) and RE-INFORCE++ (Hu et al., 2025). Although these algorithms have shown good performance, their practical deployment is often complicated due to the time-consuming nature of the online exploration involved. In contrast, some offline methods (Rafailov et al., 2023; Ethayarajh et al., 2024; Zhang et al.; Guo et al., 2024) are simpler to deploy. Rafailov et al. (2023) propose Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) to efficiently train large models for knowledge alignment using preference rankings instead of reward models. DPO optimizes classification loss from preference data, making implementing it simpler than RL from human feedback. Online DPO (Guo et al., 2024; Pang et al., 2024) employs an LLM as an annotator. Each iteration generates two responses from the current model, prompting the LLM annotator to select the preferred one and thereby acquiring online feedback.

2.2 Post-training Data Strategies

Data plays a crucial role in unlocking the capabilities of models. In the early days, the LIMA (Zhou et al., 2023) found that a small amount of data could activate the relevant capabilities of the model and improve the test results of multiple tasks. Recently, some data selections in the field of mathematics have also demonstrated the importance of data quality and diversity. For instance, selections like S1 (Muennighoff et al., 2025) and LIMO (Ye et al., 2025), which used a small amount of data, managed to stimulate the mathematical reasoning capabilities of the models. KIMI K1.5 (Team et al., 2025) adopted curriculum learning and constructed a curriculum-based data training strategy. Pangu Ultra (Yin et al., 2025) assigned quality and difficulty labels to the data and also used a curriculumbased sampling strategy throughout its three pretraining stages. In this work, we explored an approach to dynamic data training during the training process, aiming to enhance the final RL performance by selecting training data that is aligned with the model's own competency.

3 Self-Aware Iterative Direct Preference Optimization

3.1 Overview

Figure 2 shows the overview of SAI-DPO. We predefine two metrics: *knowledge points similarity* and *self-aware difficulty*. Using these metrics, the model dynamically samples suitable training data




Figure 2: An overview of the SAI-DPO. We introduce two measures: Knowledge Points Similarity (for finding questions with similar knowledge points) and Self-aware Difficulty (for sampling data of appropriate difficulty levels), and two parts: 1) Dynamic Data Acquisition: Sample data of appropriate difficulty and similarity via difficulty distribution, 2) Iterative Preference Optimization: Filter easy samples by difficulty, train with DPO, and initialize the next iteration for final training data construction.

by similarity and difficulty (referring the difficulty distribution) during training, then performs iterative DPO training on the relevant data.

3.2 Measurer

Knowledge Points Similarity Just like humans, problem-solving requires relevancy. The questions that are typically answered incorrectly often belong to a specific category and involve specific knowledge points. We define a similarity metric to preclassify questions with similar knowledge points. If the model answers a question incorrectly, we can proactively increase the sampling number of this question type in the training set during sampling. Inspired by S1 (Muennighoff et al., 2025), each problem may involve different stages and domains, which can be defined as the knowledge points of each problem. For example, a problem about sequences may involve knowledge points such as "the formula for the sum of the first n terms of a sequence" and "the method of staggered subtraction". We present some examples in Appendix A.2. We use existing powerful mathematical reasoning LLM¹ to annotate the existing data pool, thereby obtaining the knowledge points that each problem may involve. Given an initial dataset \mathcal{D} , we apply the tagging model to the input x of each data point, as shown in Figure 2. Specifically, the tagging model assigns one or more tags T(x) to each input x, representing its knowledge points such as "Geometry" or "area of trapezoid and triangles".

We vectorize with sentence-transformers² for the annotated knowledge points to generate embedding vectors for the input x of each data point, resulting in $\mathbf{e}(x^i)_{i=1}^N$. We use the K-Means algorithm (Ahmed et al., 2020) to cluster these knowledge points, thereby obtaining multiple category divisions. Data within the same category is determined to belong to similar domains, while data between categories represents content involving different domains.

Self-aware Difficulty For model learning, problems need to align with the model's current competence (Liu et al., 2020). If a model consistently answers a question correctly or incorrectly regardless of attempts, such questions contribute little to its current learning (Yue et al., 2025). What is needed are problems that the model can probabilistically correct but not entirely accurately, as these truly aid the model's learning process. This necessitates defining difficulty levels that match the model's own competency.

We systematically define three dimensions of difficulty metrics: P@K, overall steps, and average length. When P@K values are identical, overall steps are compared; when overall steps are the same, average length is used for comparison. This approach enables the ranking of different data points based on self-awareness-related difficulty. Naturally, for questions whose correctness can be determined, we can well judge whether a question is difficult for a model by checking if the LLMs

¹https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B

²https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2/tree/main/

answer it correctly. P@K (Brown et al., 2024) is a commonly used metric in the code field (Chen et al., 2021). If the model answers a question correctly at least once in k attempts, the result is considered valid; otherwise, it is set to 0. We take the k as the difficulty of the problem. The average P@K score across the dataset represents the percentage of problems the model itself can solve within k attempts, offering a rigorous assessment of the breadth of reasoning capabilities covered by LLMs. Following the approach of Lai et al. (2024), we prompt the model to output detailed problem-solving steps in a specific format ("Step 1: "), thereby obtaining the total number of self-generated steps by the model to determine the relative difficulty between two answers. We present some examples in Appendix A.1. Here, we define problems for which the model generates more problem-solving steps as being considered more difficult. When the number of problem-solving steps is the same, the length of the model's output can be considered as an indicator (Yuan et al., 2023) to measure the complexity of the problem. Here, we define problems with longer model outputs as more difficult.

3.3 Dynamic Data Acquisition

Difficulty Distribution Similar to human learning, we first define a subset to assess the model's current mastery of problems across various domains (analogous to creating practice exams for testing). We sample data from each cluster category using each category's sample-to-total ratio to form a subset (Sub). We use the model to explore these selected problems, thereby obtaining K responses for each problem. Based on the previous difficulty rating, we obtain the sorted results of difficulty levels for these problems. After removing invalid data (problems where the model answered all K attempts incorrectly or all correctly), we select the top 50% of the most difficult data for subsequent sampling, called the error dataset. Let the error dataset be E. It represents the model's most errorprone data here; a higher frequency of classes indicates weaker mastery by the model, so the weighting of these classes will be further increased in subsequent training set sampling. Ideally, the error set will become smaller with iterations.

Dynamic Sampling After obtaining the model's performance on the subset, we can use the error dataset to select data from the entire question pool to obtain problems with similar knowledge points

to those the model struggles to solve. We prioritize selecting more difficult data for training, such that the sampling probability of categories containing the top 50% most difficult data (after sorting by difficulty) is increased. To find data similar to difficult data, we need to perform clustering on the original data. Let there be n clustering categories C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n . The number of elements in each category C_i is $|C_i|$, and the total number of elements in all categories is $N = \sum_{i=1}^n |C_i|$.

The initial sampling probability $P_{initial}(i)$ of the i-th category is calculated as:

$$P_{initial}(i) = \frac{|C_i|}{N} \tag{1}$$

Calculating initial sampling probability establishes a baseline distribution for cross-cluster sampling, ensuring initial samples reflect the original clustering structure before error data adjustment.

The number of elements in the *i*-th category that belong to the error dataset is $|C_i \cap E|$.

Then, calculate the adjusted weight W(i):

$$W(i) = P_{initial}(i) \times (|C_i \cap E| + 1)$$
 (2)

Adding 1 here is to avoid the situation where the weight is 0 when the number of errors is 0. Then, calculate the sum of the adjusted weights of all categories $T = \sum_{i=1}^{n} W(i)$. Finally, obtain the adjusted probability $P_{adjusted}(i)$ of categories:

$$P_{adjusted}(i) = \frac{W(i)}{T} \tag{3}$$

Adjusting probabilities using error data systematically biases sampling toward high-error clusters/elements, prioritizing critical-issue classes in the final sample. For each element $x_{ij} \in C_i$ $(j=1,2,\cdots,|C_i|)$, the weight of x_{ij} is:

$$w_{ij} = \frac{P_{adjusted}(i)}{|C_i|} \tag{4}$$

Ultimately, our goal is to obtain the probability value of each element. We get the fraction used for sorting by the following formula. For each element x_{ij} with weight w_{ij} , we generate a uniformly distributed random number $u_{ij} \in (0,1)$. Then, the score s_{ij} of x_{ij} is calculated:

$$s_{ij} = -\frac{\ln(u_{ij})}{w_{ij}} \tag{5}$$

The reason for using this formula is that the probability density function of the exponential distribution $Y=-\frac{\ln(U)}{\lambda}$ is $f(y)=\lambda e^{-\lambda y}, y>0$. A

larger weight w_{ij} will make the expected value of s_{ij} smaller, which means that elements with larger weights are more likely to have smaller scores. We sort all the elements x_{ij} according to their normalized scores s_{ij} in ascending order. Let the sorted elements be $x_{k_1}, x_{k_2}, \cdots, x_{k_m}$, where $m = \sum_{i=1}^n |C_i|$, and $s_{k_1} \leq s_{k_2} \leq \cdots \leq s_{k_m}$.

Given the desired sample size S, the final sampled samples are $x_{k_1}, x_{k_2}, \cdots, x_{k_S}$. Using this sampling approach, we obtain problems to be explored in each iteration. This enables the model to focus more on error-prone problems related to specific knowledge points.

3.4 Iterative Preference Optimization

Difficulty Filtering Since DPO training requires positive and negative samples, we use rule-based rewards to annotate the model's outputs to obtain correct and incorrect responses. For each problem, we randomly select one correct answer generated by the model as the positive sample and one incorrect answer as the negative sample, thereby constructing a triplet (question x, positive answer y_w , negative answer y_l) to form the training data. After obtaining the triplet, we can also filter the annotated training samples using the previously defined Self-aware Difficulty Measurer to derive the final training data. Typically, we first filter out data that is either all incorrect (too difficult) or all correct (too easy), then select the relatively more challenging problems (the top 70% of the filtered data sorted by difficulty) as the final training set.

Training Objective The RL process involves a reward function r(x,y) for given sequence pairs (x,y). Replies y that are more preferred are anticipated to yield higher rewards r(x,y), with the objective being to maximize the following:

$$L(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{Train}, y \sim p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot|x)}[r(x, y)] - \lambda \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{Train}} \text{KL}\left(p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot \mid x) \| p_{\text{ref}}(\cdot \mid x)\right)$$
(6

Here, $x \sim D_{Train}$ is sampled from a given distribution D_{Train} , and the KL regularization term prevents excessive deviation of the new model p_{θ} from the reference model p_{ref} , with the regularization parameter $\lambda > 0$. Training reward functions is challenging in practice, but DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023) simplifies this process using a predefined preference dataset. The objective optimization function for this process is as follows:

$$L_{\text{DPO}}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{ref}}\right) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y_w, y_l) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{Train}}} \left[\ell \left(\lambda \log \frac{p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\left(y_w \mid x\right)}{p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{ref}}}\left(y_w \mid x\right)} - \lambda \log \frac{p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\left(y_l \mid x\right)}{p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{ref}}}\left(y_l \mid x\right)} \right) \right]$$
(7)

Here, we have obtained training data triplets (question x, positive answer y_w , negative sample y_l) through the previous steps. As the model's capabilities improve, ideally, the proportion of difficult training data will gradually decrease. Eventually, the trainable data will gradually decrease, so that the model's performance reaches a stable value. At this point, the iterative process comes to an end.

3.5 Efficiency Discussion

Our training efficiency is higher (better results with less data) than IDPO's, utilizing only a small amount of additional computation: 1) obtaining the distribution of the subset and 2) measuring the similarity of the overall data. For the subset, we only select 1% data in each iteration for exploratory annotation. We dynamically adjust the selection of the training set based on difficulty distribution. This part's resource consumption is negligible compared to the total 20,000 training data samples, accounting for less than 1% of additional time. Regarding the measurement of the entire sample dataset, the model labeling we adopt only requires a single annotation process and can be reused. The additional time does not exceed 5% of the overall training process. Due to the adoption of DPO, the time consumption of our training method is also substantially lower than that of online RL approaches.

4 Experiments

4.1 Setup

Baseline and Models Following previous work (Guo et al., 2024; Rafailov et al., 2023; Bai et al., 2023) of RL, we use Numina-Math (Li et al., 2024), including 400,000 prompts, as the dataset pool for preference learning dataset construction. We compare IDPO (Guo et al., 2024; Pang et al., 2024) (iterative training 8 times with random sampling of 20,000 samples per iteration) and PPO (400,000) as baselines. We use the Qwen2.5 series (7B-Math-Base,7B-Distill³) and Llama3.1-8B-Instruct as the base models for RL for the main results. For other analytical experiments, we primarily report the results related to Qwen2.5-7B-Math-Base.

³https://huggingface.co/RLHFlow/Qwen2.5-7B-SFT

Model	Method	Elem	entary		Mi	ddle		Competition		Avg.
		GSM	MATH	Minerva	Gaokao	Olympiad	College	Aime24	Amc23	·-· 6•
	Instruct	69.1	29.0	16.5	31.9	7.3	21.3	0.0	7.5	22.8
Llama3.1-8B	+IDPO	76.1	38.6	17.3	36.4	9.2	23.7	0.0	7.5	26.1
	+SAI-DPO	77.0	36.4	19.1	36.9	10.5	25.5	6.7	15.0	28.4
	Instruct	90.8	73.8	32.0	65.5	37.9	47.4	10.0	60.0	52.2
Qwen2.5-7B-Distill	+IDPO	91.4	79.0	30.1	66.5	43.4	47.7	20.0	62.5	55.1
	+SAI-DPO	90.7	81.0	30.9	67.5	44.7	48.3	20.0	70.0	56.6
	Base	57.0	52.0	13.6	39.2	15.6	21.3	13.3	45.0	32.1
Qwen2.5-Math-7B	+IDPO	88.3	71.8	28.7	62.6	39.6	45.7	16.7	65.0	52.3
	+SAI-DPO	87.9	72.4	27.9	61.0	39.4	45.3	23.3	70.0	53.4

Table 1: Main results on multiple test sets for multiple models. The results show that our SAI-DPO can deliver superior results compared to the existing method over multiple model series, notably on competition-level benchmarks.

Method	Туре	Total Data Size	Avg.
LIMO	Distillation SFT	0.8K	46.9
S 1	Distillation SFT	1K	46.4
PPO	Online RL	400K	55.0
IDPO	Offline RL	67K	52.3
Ours	Offline RL	48K	53.4

Table 2: Compare the sample utilization efficiency. Qwen2.5-Math-7B serves as the base model.

Evaluations We follow Yang et al. (2024) using two common English math benchmarks GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), Math (Hendrycks et al., 2021), and using different sets of math tests at different stages to test stronger math skills, such as Minerva Math (Lewkowycz et al., 2022), Gaokao 2023 En (Liao et al., 2024), Olympiad Bench (He et al., 2024), College Math (Tang et al., 2024), AIME 24⁴, and AMC 23⁵. We report greedy, Maj@8, and RM@8 performance on all benchmarks in the zero-shot setting, except for the multichoice benchmarks (multiple-choice problems in GaoKao) with a 5-shot setting.

Training Details The model was trained using a learning rate of 5×10^{-7} , following a cosine decay strategy for the learning rate schedule. A per-device batch size of 1 was used during training, and to achieve an effective total batch size of 128, we employed gradient accumulation over 16 steps, which optimized memory usage during training. The training process utilized a multidevice distributed setup with 8 devices and was initialized with a random seed of 42 for repro-

ducibility. For optimization, we used the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2015) with $\beta_1=0.9$, $\beta_2=0.999$, and $\epsilon=1\times 10^{-8}$. Training proceeded for a total of 2 epochs, determined by the total number of training samples and the batch size. Regarding the hyperparameters of DPO, we set $\beta=0.1$. For the rollout step in RL, we set the temperature to 1 and perform exploration 8 times, generating 8 responses for each question to obtain positive and negative samples for DPO.

4.2 Main Results

Performance across Different Models Overall. the results in Table 1 demonstrate that our method significantly enhances the mathematical capabilities of base models. Specifically, our approach achieves further improvements across different models on top of IDPO, even when the original gains from IDPO alone are already substantial. Notably, we observe that our method yields results very close to those of IDPO on simpler benchmarks such as GSM and MATH. This is due to our data acquisition scheme deeming data similar to these types as already sufficiently simple, resulting in a lower sampling probability for such data. In contrast, our sampling strategy prioritizes more challenging data, which is most evident in the improvements on competition-level datasets Aime24 and Amc23, which achieved gains of nearly 7 and 15 percentage points, respectively. This indicates that the model can autonomously select training data with self-aware difficulty metrics, mimicking human iterative practice to target weak problems of similar knowledge points for improvement.

Training Sample Utilization Efficiency As shown in Table 2, we compared the relationship between the training data and the final results on

⁴https://huggingface.co/datasets/AI-MO/aimo-validation-aime

⁵https://huggingface.co/datasets/AI-MO/aimo-validation-amc

Task	w/o Similarity	w/o Difficulty	Ours
GSM	87.9	88.5	87.9
MATH	73.0	71.8	72.4
Minerva	27.9	28.7	27.9
Gaokao	61.8	62.3	61.0
Olympiad	37.9	39.0	39.4
College	45.6	45.8	45.3
Aime24	16.7	23.3	23.3
Amc23	60.0	60.0	70.0
Avg.	51.4	52.4	53.4

Table 3: Ablation study on the defined measurer with dynamic data acquisition.

average 8 benchmarks of the selection methods (LIMO and S1), online RL algorithm PPO⁶ and the offline RL algorithms (IDPO and Ours). Data selection methods employ data distillation (generating responses from stronger models), achieving favorable scores with a relatively small sample size (around 1,000), but still 6 percentage points lower than our scores. Although PPO has relatively good performance, its training efficiency is too low. It requires 400,000 pieces of data to slightly outperform the offline IDPO. In contrast, our method achieves better results with fewer samples. This demonstrates the higher sample utilization efficiency.

4.3 Ablation Study

Dynamic Data Acquisition The success of the SAI-DPO depends on dynamic sampling. Dynamic sampling requires similar sets as well as difficulty metrics. We conducted an ablation study of these two components and present the corresponding results in the Table 3. Without similarity, it is impossible to efficiently identify questions with similar knowledge points, thus leading to performance degradation. Without difficulty metrics, there is no way to perform a targeted selection of samples where the model performs poorly, making it impossible to further address more challenging problems.

Difficulty Filtering Table 4 demonstrates the training results of the data that have been processed using different filtering strategies and then used for training. Hard refers to the top 50% of the most difficult data after directly ranking the acquired data. Our refers to the top 70% of the most difficult data after removing the results that are all correct or all wrong and then ranking the remaining data. All

Task	Filter	Filtering Strategies			
Tusk	Easy	Easy Hard		Our All	
Train Samples	34K	34K	48K	67K	
GSM	78.4	86.7	87.9	87.3	
MATH	68.4	72.2	72.4	73.0	
Minerva	21.0	29.4	27.9	29.8	
Gaokao	54.5	60.8	61.0	60.3	
Olympiad	25.5	37.0	39.4	37.6	
College	30.4	44.9	45.3	44.7	
Aime24	13.3	20.0	23.3	36.7	
Amc23	55.0	60.0	70.0	60.0	
Avg.	43.9	51.4	53.4	53.7	

Table 4: Compare the results of difficulty filtering. "Train Samples" refers to the total number of samples.

refers to all the data after removing the results that are all correct or all wrong. It shows that training with overly difficult data or an excessive amount of easy data can lead to a decline. A proper mix of data difficulty (including both hard and simple examples) enhances final performance. The comparison between our and all demonstrates that using 70% of the data achieves performance comparable to that of the original data. The simplest portion of the data contributes little to performance.

5 Analysis

5.1 Analysis on Dynamic Data Acquisition

Difficulty Indicators for Sampling Table 5 shows the comparison results of different difficulty indicators. We compare two distinct difficulty indicators including static external metric by scoring model⁷ and the recent metric P@K (Shi et al., 2025). We use identical sampling/filtering methods but change the difficulty metrics. Comparing static difficulty and baseline P@K difficulty, neither can improve the final performance. In fact, using inappropriate externally set difficulty (External) may even lead to performance degradation. However, adopting more fine-grained difficulty metrics (steps and length) can yield improvements. This indicates that dynamically acquired training data requires more appropriate difficulty metrics.

Numbers of Clusters Table 6 shows the impact of clusters on final training, comparing clustering into 50, 150, and 250 classes. Imbalanced distributions in 50-class and 250-class clusters (scarce samples in some classes) caused dynamic sampling

⁶https://huggingface.co/RLHFlow/Qwen2.5-7B-PPO-Zero

⁷https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B

Task	Original	External	P@K	Ours
GSM	88.3	84.4	87.9	87.9
MATH	71.8	76.4	70.4	72.4
Minerva	28.7	18.8	29.4	27.9
Gaokao	62.6	60.5	60.0	61.0
Olympiad	39.6	36.6	38.4	39.4
College	45.7	42.9	45.5	45.3
Aime24	16.7	26.7	26.7	23.3
Amc23	65.0	60.0	62.5	70.0
Avg.	52.3	50.8	52.6	53.4

Table 5: Compare the results of different difficulty measurement criteria. External refers to acquiring data from easy to difficult using external difficulty metrics (scoring model). P@K denotes using only this metric. Ours denotes combining all difficulty metrics we define.

Task	Number of Categories				
Task	50 150		250		
GSM	87.1	87.9	88.2		
MATH	70.4	72.4	70.0		
Minerva	27.6	27.9	30.9		
Gaokao	62.6	61.0	60.5		
Olympiad	39.1	39.4	37.9		
College	43.9	45.3	46.0		
Aime24	26.7	23.3	26.7		
Amc23	57.5	70.0	57.5		
Avg.	51.9	53.4	52.2		

Table 6: Compare the impacts of the number of clusters.

to revert to random with the iterations, yielding no improvements. In contrast, 150-class clustering maintained balanced class distributions and data diversity. Performance suffered at extreme cluster numbers: small clusters led to dominant classes, while large clusters reduced inter-category distinction, both driven by distribution imbalance.

5.2 Analysis on Training Iterations

Accelerate Convergence As shown in Figure 3, we show the results of the score at the data scale. Since the amount of training data obtained in each iteration is different, their horizontal coordinates are not the same. As the amount of training data gradually increases, the overall scores for both methods rise. However, the results of our method increased more rapidly and reached a peak earlier. This indicates that even with less training data but with difficulty levels matching the model's capabilities, we achieved better results in fewer iterations, highlighting the importance of appropriately difficult samples in training. These results demonstrate




Figure 3: Compare the results of the data scale. Our method achieved better results with fewer data.




Figure 4: Comparison of the ability to solve sample variability. Both our method and IDPO reduce unsolvable hard samples and enhance simple samples.

that our method has a higher training efficiency.

Benefits of Hard Samples In Figure 4, we compared the counts of easy samples (all 8 explorations were correct) and hard samples (incorrectly answered after 8 explorations) across iterations (20,000 data points per iteration) in various training rounds. The overall trend for both methods is that there are fewer hard samples and more easy samples. Despite our sampling method selecting more hard training samples, our model solved more hard problems (fewer hard samples remaining) and fewer easy problems (more easy samples solved) than IDPO. This demonstrates our method's superior ability to learn effectively from sampled data.

6 Conclusion

This work addresses the static, externally defined nature of existing data selection strategies of math reasoning, which fail to adapt to evolving model capabilities. We introduce SAI-DPO, an adaptive algorithm that dynamically selects training data by leveraging real-time model performance feedback, aligning data selection with the model's knowledge-specific reasoning strengths during training. Experiments on three models and eight mathematical

reasoning benchmarks, including challenging competition datasets AIME24 and AMC23, show that method achieves an average performance boost of 21.3%, with 10% and 15% improvements on AIME24 and AMC23, respectively. These results validate that dynamic, model-adaptive data selection significantly outperforms static methods in enhancing reasoning capabilities and data efficiency.

Limitations

There are several limitations to our work. First, due to training resource constraints, our algorithm primarily focuses on offline RL methods such as iterative DPO and does not conduct sampling-related experiments on mainstream online approaches like PPO. Another limitation is that because of the capacity ceiling of offline algorithms, our final performance does not surpass mainstream online RL algorithms like PPO. Finally, we have only conducted experiments on test sets of varying difficulty levels within the field of mathematical reasoning, and other domains such as code and general domains remain unexplored.

Ethics Statement

Our work follows the ACL Ethics Policy. Our findings are based on publicly available datasets for reproducibility purposes. All procedures performed in this study are in accordance with the ethical standards. In addition, it is hard to control the generation of LLMs. We should be aware of the potential problems caused by hallucinations.

References

- Mohiuddin Ahmed, Raihan Seraj, and Syed Mohammed Shamsul Islam. 2020. The k-means algorithm: A comprehensive survey and performance evaluation. *Electronics*, 9(8):1295.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2309.16609.
- Bradley Brown, Jordan Juravsky, Ryan Ehrlich, Ronald Clark, Quoc V. Le, Christopher Ré, and Azalia Mirhoseini. 2024. Large language monkeys: Scaling inference compute with repeated sampling. *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21787.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen

- Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *Preprint*, arXiv:2107.03374.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2024. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 25:70:1–70:53.
- 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. Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- 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*.
- Shangmin Guo, Biao Zhang, Tianlin Liu, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Felipe Llinares, Alexandre Rame, Thomas Mesnard, Yao Zhao, Bilal Piot, et al. 2024. Direct language model alignment from online ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04792*.
- Chaoqun He, Renjie Luo, Yuzhuo Bai, Shengding Hu, Zhen Thai, Junhao Shen, Jinyi Hu, Xu Han, Yujie Huang, Yuxiang Zhang, Jie Liu, Lei Qi, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. OlympiadBench: A challenging benchmark for promoting AGI with olympiad-level bilingual multimodal scientific problems. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3828–3850, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the MATH dataset. In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1, NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks* 2021, *December* 2021, *virtual*.
- Jian Hu, Jason Klein Liu, and Wei Shen. 2025. Reinforce++: An efficient rlhf algorithm with robustness to both prompt and reward models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.03262.
- Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. 2024. Openai o1 system card. *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.16720.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings.
- Xin Lai, Zhuotao Tian, Yukang Chen, Senqiao Yang, Xiangru Peng, and Jiaya Jia. 2024. Step-dpo: Step-wise preference optimization for long-chain reasoning of llms. *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.18629.
- Nathan Lambert, Jacob Morrison, Valentina Pyatkin, Shengyi Huang, Hamish Ivison, Faeze Brahman, Lester James V Miranda, Alisa Liu, Nouha Dziri, Shane Lyu, et al. 2024. Tulu 3: Pushing frontiers in open language model post-training. *arXiv* preprint *arXiv*:2411.15124.
- Aitor Lewkowycz, Anders Andreassen, David Dohan, Ethan Dyer, Henryk Michalewski, Vinay Ramasesh, Ambrose Slone, Cem Anil, Imanol Schlag, Theo Gutman-Solo, Yuhuai Wu, Behnam Neyshabur, Guy Gur-Ari, and Vedant Misra. 2022. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2206.14858.
- Jia Li, Edward Beeching, Lewis Tunstall, Ben Lipkin, Roman Soletskyi, Shengyi Huang, Kashif Rasul, Longhui Yu, Albert Q Jiang, Ziju Shen, et al. 2024. Numinamath: The largest public dataset in ai4maths with 860k pairs of competition math problems and solutions. *Hugging Face repository*, 13:9.
- Minpeng Liao, Chengxi Li, Wei Luo, Wu Jing, and Kai Fan. 2024. MARIO: MAth reasoning with code interpreter output a reproducible pipeline. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 905–924, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. 2024. Deepseek-v3 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437.

- Xuebo Liu, Houtim Lai, Derek F. Wong, and Lidia S. Chao. 2020. Norm-based curriculum learning for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 427–436, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Zitong Yang, Weijia Shi, Xiang Lisa Li, Li Fei-Fei, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, Percy Liang, Emmanuel Candès, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2025. s1: Simple test-time scaling. *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.19393.
- 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. *NeurIPS*, 35:27730–27744.
- Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, Kyunghyun Cho, He He, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason Weston. 2024. Iterative reasoning preference optimization. *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.19733.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D. Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 16, 2023.
- Jun Rao, Xuebo Liu, Lian Lian, Shengjun Cheng, Yunjie Liao, and Min Zhang. 2024. CommonIT: Commonality-aware instruction tuning for large language models via data partitions. In *EMNLP*, pages 10064–10083, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- 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*.
- Taiwei Shi, Yiyang Wu, Linxin Song, Tianyi Zhou, and Jieyu Zhao. 2025. Efficient reinforcement finetuning via adaptive curriculum learning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2504.05520.
- Zhengyang Tang, Xingxing Zhang, Benyou Wang, and Furu Wei. 2024. Mathscale: Scaling instruction tuning for mathematical reasoning. In *ICML*, pages 47885–47900.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.

- 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.
- An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Keming Lu, Mingfeng Xue, Runji Lin, Tianyu Liu, Xingzhang Ren, and Zhenru Zhang. 2024. Qwen2.5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement. *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.12122.
- Yixin Ye, Zhen Huang, Yang Xiao, Ethan Chern, Shijie Xia, and Pengfei Liu. 2025. Limo: Less is more for reasoning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.03387.
- Yichun Yin, Wenyong Huang, Kaikai Song, Yehui Tang, Xueyu Wu, Wei Guo, Peng Guo, Yaoyuan Wang, Xiaojun Meng, Yasheng Wang, Dong Li, Can Chen, Dandan Tu, Yin Li, Fisher Yu, Ruiming Tang, Yunhe Wang, Baojun Wang, Bin Wang, Bo Wang, Boxiao Liu, Changzheng Zhang, Duyu Tang, Fei Mi, Hui Jin, Jiansheng Wei, Jiarui Qin, Jinpeng Li, Jun Zhao, Liqun Deng, Lin Li, Minghui Xu, Naifu Zhang, Nianzu Zheng, Qiang Li, Rongju Ruan, Shengjun Cheng, Tianyu Guo, Wei He, Wei Li, Weiwen Liu, Wulong Liu, Xinyi Dai, Yonghan Dong, Yu Pan, Yue Li, Yufei Wang, Yujun Li, Yunsheng Ni, Zhe Liu, Zhenhe Zhang, and Zhicheng Liu. 2025. Pangu ultra: Pushing the limits of dense large language models on ascend npus. *Preprint*, arXiv:2504.07866.
- Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chengpeng Li, Guanting Dong, Keming Lu, Chuanqi Tan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Scaling relationship on learning mathematical reasoning with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01825.
- Yang Yue, Zhiqi Chen, Rui Lu, Andrew Zhao, Zhaokai Wang, Yang Yue, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. 2025. Does reinforcement learning really incentivize reasoning capacity in llms beyond the base model? *Preprint*, arXiv:2504.13837.
- Hanning Zhang, Jiarui Yao, Chenlu Ye, Wei Xiong, and Tong Zhang. Online-dpo-r1: Unlocking effective reasoning without the ppo overhead, 2025. *Notion Blog*.
- Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinivasan Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. 2023. LIMA: less is more for alignment. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 16, 2023.

A Appendix

A.1 Examples of Problem-Solving Steps

We present the output results of several models, which can automatically continue to generate replies in this format by adding the field "Step: 1". We present response examples from the Qwen-7B-Distill model. As shown in the examples, the model can output logical problem-solving steps and include reflections (e.g., "wait"), where correct reflection processes solve problems using fewer logical steps. Additionally, the output results can be used to calculate total step counts, response length, and correctness, thereby determining the difficulty of the current data for the model.

A.2 Examples of Tags

We present several examples for different types of math problems. We use a uniform prompt template to prompt the model to output the corresponding tag. The specific prompt template is as follows: "<|begin of sentence|><|User|>What knowledge points need to be involved in solving the following questions. Answer should be output in the following format, no need to output the answer, reply in English, ###Knowledge Points:{}\nPlease output the results directly, reducing the thought process.{input}<|Assistant|>###Knowledge Points:" The {input} is a placeholder indicating the input question. As shown in the figure (Tag Case), the second and third examples both involve trigonometry, indicating repetitive knowledge points. By leveraging this tagging, we can better identify data with similar knowledge points, thereby enabling self-learning by locating example problems for knowledge points where the model currently has weaknesses.

Responses of Explorations

Ouestion:

A girl has three different types of coins in her wallet: 3 nickels, 3 dimes, and 2 quarters. She also adds 2 half-dollars. She randomly picks two coins, calculates the total value, and puts them back. She repeats this process multiple times. What is the maximum number of different sums she can record?

gt:10

False Response 1 (No answer output):

Step 1: Identify all possible coin combinations. First, list all the coins available: -3 nickels (each worth 0.05)- 3 dimes (each worth 0.10)- 2 quarters (each worth 0.25)- 2 half-dollars (each worth 0.50)...

Step 2: Determine all possible sums for picking two coins. ...

Wait, perhaps not directly.

Wait, she picks two coins, calculates their sum, puts them back, and repeats.

So, each pick results in a sum, which is recorded.

She does this multiple times, perhaps until she gets all possible sums.

Wait, but the problem seems to suggest that the sums are recorded based on how many times they occur, so perhaps it's about the frequency.

But, in any case, we need to find out how

False Response 2 (Wrong answer):

Step 1: Identify the possible values of each type of coin ...

Step 2: Determine all possible combinations of two coins being picked. - Nickels: There are 3 nickels, but since the girl is picking two coins at random, she could pick two nickels, a nickel and a dime, a nickel and a quarter, a nickel and a half-dollar, a dime and a quarter, a dime and a half-dollar, and a quarter and a half-dollar.

Step 3: Calculate the unique sums for each combination ...

Step 4: Ensure that all sums are unique. Looking at the sums: 0.10, 0.15, 0.30, 0.55, 0.35, 0.60, 0.75. These sums are all distinct.

Step 5: Determine the number of different sums. From the above, we have: -0.10 from two nickels -0.15 from nickel and dime -0.30 from nickel and quarter -0.55 from nickel and half-dollar -0.35 from dime and quarter -0.60 from dime and half-dollar -0.75 from quarter and half-dollar So, there are 7 different sums.

Therefore, the maximum number of different sums she can record is 7 ...

Final Answer: 7

True Response 1:

Step 1: Determine the total number of coins and their values ...

So, total coins: 3 + 3 + 2 + 2 = 10 coins.

Step 2: Calculate all possible sums of two coins.

We need to consider all combinations of picking two coins and summing their values, then find out how many unique sums are possible.

Step 3: List all possible pairs and their sums ...

So, it seems like these are all the possible sums.

Therefore, the number of different sums is 10.

Wait, but is there any overlap or additional sums I might be missing?

Let me think differently.

. . .

Hence, the maximum number of different sums is 10.

Therefore, the final answer is: 10

I hope it's correct.

Final Answer 10 I think that's the answer.

Tag Case 1

Question: Evaluate the expression $5^{\log_5(9+4)}$.

Tags: Logarithmic and Exponential Expressions and Equations

Tag Case 2

Question: Determine the domain of the function $f(x) = \tan(\arcsin(x^2))$.

Tags: Trigonometric functions, inverse trigonometric functions, domain and range

Tag Case 3

Question:

Given the function $f(x) = A\sin(\omega x + \phi)$, where $(A > 0, \omega > 0, |\phi| < \frac{\pi}{2})$, its graph intersects the y-axis at $(0, \frac{3}{2})$, and its first highest and lowest points on the right side of the y-axis are $(x_-0, 3)$ and $(x_-0 + 2\pi, -3)$ respectively.

- 1. Find the analytical expression of the function y = f(x).
- 2. How can the graph of this function be obtained through translation and scaling transformations from the graph of $y = \sin x (x \in \mathbb{R})$?
- 3. Find the intervals where this function is monotonically increasing and its center of symmetry. **Tags:** Trigonometric functions, function transformation, monotonicity, symmetry, maximum and minimum points.

Tag Case 4

Question: Find the largest prime divisor of the number 102111011_6 .

Tags: Number Bases, Prime Factorization.