
Distilling the Implicit Multi-Branch Structure in LLMs’ Reasoning via Reinforcement Learning

Shicheng Xu^{1,2}, Liang Pang^{1*}, Yunchang Zhu³, Jia Gu^{1,2}, Zihao Wei^{1,2},
Jingcheng Deng^{1,2}, Feiyang Pan³, Huawei Shen¹, Xueqi Cheng¹

¹State Key Laboratory of AI Safety, Institute of Computing Technology, CAS

²University of Chinese Academy of Sciences ³Huawei Inc.

{xushicheng21s, pangliang, shenhuawei, cxq}@ict.ac.cn
zhuyunchang@huawei.com, pfy824@gmail.com

Abstract

Distilling reasoning paths from teacher to student models via supervised fine-tuning (SFT) provides a shortcut for improving the reasoning ability of the smaller Large Language Models (LLMs). However, the reasoning paths generated by teacher models often reflect only surface-level traces of their underlying authentic reasoning. Insights from cognitive neuroscience suggest that authentic reasoning involves a complex interweaving between meta-reasoning—which selects the appropriate sub-problem from multiple candidates—and solving, which addresses the sub-problem. It means that authentic reasoning has implicit multi-branch structure. Supervised fine-tuning collapses this rich structure into a flat sequence of token prediction in teacher’s reasoning path, which cannot distill this structure to student. To address this limitation, we propose RLKD, a reinforcement learning (RL)-based distillation framework guided by a novel Generative Structure Reward Model (GSRM). Our GSRM converts the reasoning path into multiple meta-reasoning-solving steps and gives the reward to measure the alignment between the reasoning structures of student and teacher. Our RLKD combines this reward with RL, enables the student LLM to internalize the teacher’s implicit multi-branch structure in authentic reasoning, rather than merely mimicking fixed teacher’s output paths. Experiments show that RLKD, even when trained on only 0.1% of the data under an RL-only regime, surpasses the performance of standard SFT-RL pipelines and further unleashes the potential reasoning ability of the student LLM than SFT-based distillation.

1 Introduction

Recently, Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive abilities on complex reasoning tasks Pan et al. [2025], Jiaqi et al. [2025], Xu et al. [2025a] via generating long reasoning paths Havrilla et al. [2024], Wei et al. [2022] such as Deepseek-R1 Guo et al. [2025]. However, high training costs Guo et al. [2025], Xu et al. [2025b] and the strong base model Chu et al. [2025], Yue et al. [2025] are required in order for LLMs to emerge with this excellent capability, which prevents this reasoning capability from being explored by resource-constrained teams in developing their LLMs. To solve this challenge, supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on the reasoning paths generated from LLMs with powerful reasoning capabilities provides a shortcut and efficient method to make the smaller LLMs generate the long reasoning paths and achieve significant improvement Guo et al. [2025], Zhang et al. [2025], Face, Wen et al. [2025]. Despite this advance, some studies find SFT-distilled reasoning LLMs are trapped in rigid imitation rather than authentic reasoning. Purely mimicking the teacher’s reasoning paths can leave the student LLM “unthinking”: it replicates the

*Corresponding Author




Figure 1: (a) The generated reasoning path has implicit multi-branch structure. (b) Distillation only based on SFT collapses the rich structure into a flat sequence of token prediction to memorize only the teacher’s generated path. (c) Our proposed RL-based distillation can teach the student LLM to learn this structure by using a Generative Structure Reward Model to measure the alignment between the reasoning structure of the student and teacher, serving as the reward in RL.

surface form of the reasoning steps yet still makes errors on key underlying steps Chen et al. [2025], Dai et al. [2024].

To analyze and solve this phenomenon, we introduce the concepts from human cognitive neuroscience to rethink the definition of authentic reasoning of LLMs, which consists of two parts: one is **meta-reasoning** and the other is **solving** Stefik [1981], Cox and Raja [2007], Russell and Wefald [1991]. Specifically, answering a complex problem involves multiple steps and each step consists of a **meta-reasoning** phase that determines the specific sub-problem from multiple potential sub-problems – followed by a **solving** phase that executes or answers the specific determined sub-problem. From this perspective, although the generated reasoning content is a definitive path, each step on this path is actually determined by meta-reasoning from multiple candidate states. Therefore, the complex interweaving between meta-reasoning and solving constitutes the authentic reasoning, in which both generated reasoning path and multiple other potential paths form the **implicit multi-branch structure** (Figure 1 (a)). A critical challenge in SFT-based distillation is that it does not teach the student LLM this structure. SFT trains a student LLM to imitate the teacher’s output sequence token-by-token with cross-entropy loss. Therefore, SFT collapses this rich implicit multi-branch structure in teacher into a flat sequence of token prediction to memorize only the teacher’s generated path (Figure 1 (b)) while fails to learn how to sample the path from other potential paths. Besides, by treating each token equally in training, the student LLM cannot learn how to meta-reason, how to solve and how to connect them in multi-steps respectively.

To solve this problem, it is important to provide the learning signal in distillation that clearly organizes multi-step meta-reasoning and solving in the reasoning paths, which is the core of implicit multi-branch structure. This is a highly semantic supervision that cannot be accomplished by token-level SFT and requires reinforcement learning (RL) Ouyang et al. [2022], Havrilla et al. [2024], so we propose RLKD, the first reinforcement learning-based knowledge distillation method for LLM’s reasoning. In RLKD, we design Generative Structure Reward Model (GSRM), a two-stage reward pattern that combines the semantic understanding of generative reward model Mahan et al. [2024] with the interpretability and controllability of the rule-based reward model Guo et al. [2025]. GSRM

can convert the reasoning path into the sequence consisting of multiple meta-reasoning-solving steps, and then score the matching degree between the sequences of the student and the teacher with structured reward mechanism. When combining GSRM with RL, our RLKD can guide the student LLM at a step-level on how to better perform sampling to select the most suitable sub-problem from multiple potential ones, and then solving it. In this way, RLKD can distill the implicit multi-branch structure in the reasoning of teacher LLMs to the student LLMs to make the student learn to perform authentic reasoning (Figure 1 (c)).

Experimental results on math (AIME and MATH-500) and graduate-Level Q&A (GPQA) show that our RLKD: (1) can use only 0.1% training data with RL-only paradigm to outperform SFT-RL pipeline in Qwen2.5-Math, (2) can further unleash the potential reasoning ability of the student LLM than SFT-based distillation, and (3) can outperform existing RL baselines.

The contributions of this paper can be concluded as:

- We point out that the reasoning paths generated by LLMs are merely superficial manifestations of authentic reasoning, whereas authentic reasoning possesses an implicit multi-branch structure, which can not be distilled to the student LLM by SFT.
- We propose RLKD, which, to the best of our knowledge, is the first RL-based distillation method for LLM’s reasoning, and can effectively distill the implicit multi-branch structure.
- The experimental results demonstrate the superiority of our proposed RL-based method over SFT-based distillation, highlighting the immense potential of RL-based distillation techniques in LLM’s reasoning and paving the way for new directions in subsequent research.

2 Related Work

2.1 Structure in Reasoning of LLMs

Recent studies find that the reasoning of LLMs has the structure. Chain-of-Thought Wei et al. [2022], Least-to-Most Zhou et al. [2022] and Self-Ask Press et al. [2022] initially formalize the reasoning path as a chain consisting of multiple nodes, which is a linear structure. Tree-of-Thought Yao et al. [2023], Graph-of-Thought Besta et al. [2024] and SearChain Xu et al. [2024a] explicitly build a non-linear structure for reasoning. SuperCorrect Yang et al. [2025] uses high-level plans plus detailed steps as hierarchical thought templates to correct student models. The commonality of existing studies is that they explicitly let LLMs generate the specified structure in reasoning through prompt engineering or fine-tuning. Different from them, we introduce human cognitive neuroscience to rethink the reasoning, which consists of meta-reasoning and solving. The former is responsible for determining the sub-problem from multiple potential candidates, while the latter aims to solve the sub-problem. This means that a generated reasoning path contains multiple potential other paths, and these potential paths together with the generated path form the structure of reasoning. We focus on how to distill this implicit multi-branch structure into the student LLM.

2.2 Supervised Fine-Tuning for Reasoning Path Distillation

Supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on chain-of-thought demonstrations has emerged as a straightforward way to distill reasoning capabilities from large models into smaller ones. For example, Deepseek releases a series of distilled LLMs based on Deepseek-R1 and significantly improve the reasoning capabilities Guo et al. [2025]. A similar study shows that with only 17k curated reasoning traces, a 32B student model can nearly match a closed-source o1-preview on math and coding benchmarks Li et al. [2025] and many open-source projects are released Wen et al. [2025], Face, Bespoke-Labs. However, recent findings highlight that SFT often teaches format over substance: models learn to imitate the reasoning paths without authentic understanding of their content Chen et al. [2025], Dai et al. [2024]. In fact, a student can produce correct answers by mimicking a long Chain-of-Thought (CoT) pattern even if many intermediate steps are incorrect Li et al. [2025]. The key reason behind this limitation is that reasoning has implicit multi-branch structure but only SFT-based distillation collapses this rich structure into a flat sequence of token prediction. So we propose RLKD, a RL-based distillation method that can teach the student LLM to learn this structure.

2.3 Reinforcement Learning for Reasoning Optimization in LLMs

Reinforcement learning (RL) has been explored as a means to optimize reasoning strategies in language models, building on foundations like Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) Schulman et al. [2017]. More recent advances include Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) Shao et al. [2024], introduced by the DeepSeek team to push mathematical reasoning performance and Decoupled Clip

and Dynamic Sampling Policy Optimization (DAPO) Yu et al. [2025] to train LLM with RL at Scale. These methods primarily focus on human feedback, outcome accuracy or heuristic rewards to optimize LLMs in specific downstream tasks. Different from them, our RLKD aims to use RL in knowledge distillation to transfer the implicit multi-branch structure from teacher to student to make the student LLM learn authentic reasoning.

3 Our Method

This section introduces details of our RLKD, a RL-based knowledge distillation method that can transfer the implicit multi-branch structure for complex reasoning from teacher to student. Firstly, we propose to train a Generative Structure Reward Model (GSRM) to score the alignment degree between the reasoning paths of student and teacher LLMs in terms of their implicit multi-branch structure. Then, we combine the GSRM with GRPO for RL-based knowledge distillation training.

3.1 Generative Structure Reward Model

Rewarding the implicit multi-branch structure is premised on accessing the meta-reasoning and solving at each reasoning step. However, the raw reasoning path generated by LLMs such as Deepseek-R1 is unstructured, making it difficult to directly distinguish between various reasoning steps and to decouple the meta-reasoning and solving content of each step. To solve this, we propose Generative Structure Reward Model (GSRM), a two-stage reward pattern that combines the semantic understanding of generative reward model Mahan et al. [2024] with the interpretability and controllability of the rule-based reward model Guo et al. [2025]. In the implementation of GSRM, firstly, we train a LLM to generate a sequence of meta-reasoning and solving pairs for the input reasoning path. Then, we design a structured reward mechanism to score the alignment degree between the teacher and the student in terms of their meta-reasoning and solving content at the corresponding steps.

3.1.1 Generation of Meta-Reasoning and Solving Sequence

Dataset Construction. We devise detailed instructions and examples to perform in-context learning (ICL) with the GPT-4o API, enabling it to automatically construct a large-scale supervised fine-tuning dataset. Each data sample of this dataset is a input-out pair: reasoning path \mathbf{R} is the input and the sequence \mathbf{S} consisting of multiple meta-reasoning and solving steps is the output. Specifically, we first structurally define each meta-reasoning and solving steps as $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{Q} \& \mathcal{A})$, in which \mathcal{M} is the content of meta-reasoning that focuses on determining the sub-problem that the current reasoning step should solve. \mathcal{Q} - \mathcal{A} pair is the content of solving, in which \mathcal{Q} is a clear description of the current sub-problem and \mathcal{A} is the solving result to the sub-problem. So the sequence \mathbf{S} containing n meta-reasoning and solving steps can be described as:

$$\mathbf{S} = [(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{Q}_1 \& \mathcal{A}_1), (\mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{Q}_2 \& \mathcal{A}_2), (\mathcal{M}_3, \mathcal{Q}_3 \& \mathcal{A}_3), \dots, (\mathcal{M}_n, \mathcal{Q}_n \& \mathcal{A}_n)]. \quad (1)$$

The essential for the generation of \mathbf{S} is (1) containing each key reasoning step in the reasoning path and (2) fully decoupling the contents of \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{Q} , and \mathcal{A} so that they contain and only contain the specified information. Based on these two points, we design specific instruction and examples covering four reasoning tasks (math, science, code and puzzles) to enable GPT-4o to perform effective ICL. The instruction is in Figure 2 (a) and one example is shown in Figure 2 (b), and the full prompt content for ICL can be found in Appendix. Besides, we introduce a verification-based feedback strategy to improve data quality. For each \mathbf{S} generated by GPT-4o given input \mathbf{R} , we use Deepseek-V3 to determine whether \mathbf{S} meets the requirements of the instruction. If it does not, we give the feedback from Deepseek-V3 to GPT-4o to re-generate \mathbf{S} . If a data sample fails to pass the verification after three re-generations, we discard this sample. We automatically execute this data production process on OpenThoughts-114k Team [2025], an open synthetic reasoning dataset with 114k high-quality examples covering math, science, code, and puzzles, and each example has Deepseek-R1 generated reasoning path, which is the \mathbf{R} . Finally, we get 93,625 \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{S} pairs for the future supervised fine-tuning.

Structured Fine-grained Training. This stage aims to train a generative reward model in our GSRM that can generate the sequence of meta-reasoning and solving pairs for the input reasoning path. Since the target output \mathbf{S} (Equ. 1) is a highly structured text, we propose a training method

Decompose the problem into multiple steps according to the thinking process for reasoning. Format the thinking content in the form of [Meta-reasoning]-[Sub-problem]-[Answer] for each step. When the [Answer] of a certain step gets the answer to the original question, stop reasoning, and the last answer should include a complete answer to the original question.
[Meta-reasoning] represents the thinking process. It is necessary to analyze the previous and next steps as detailed as possible, explain in detail why this step is done to lead to the following query, and do not mention the answer of this step. [tiny Sub-Problem] represents the problem that needs to be solved in the current step, and analyze it as detailed as possible. Each query contains only one question.
[Answer] represents the answer to the Problem. Give the answer to the [Sub-Problem] directly and briefly without any reasoning steps and redundant statements.
You should split it into more [Meta-reasoning]-[Sub-Problem]-[Answer] with finer granularity, but do not repeat the conditions given in the question.
Here are some examples for 1) task:

(a) Instruction

[Question]: Given real numbers a, b, c and a positive number λ such that the polynomial $f(x) = x^3 + ax^2 + bx + c$ has three real roots x_1, x_2, x_3 , and the conditions $x_2 - x_1 = \lambda$ and $x_3 > \frac{\lambda}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$ are satisfied, find the maximum value of $\frac{2a^2 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$.
[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so I... (too long to show here)
[Response]:
[Meta-reasoning 1]: To find the maximum value of $\frac{2a^2 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$, use Vieta's formulas to express coefficients a, b, c in terms of the roots x_1, x_2, x_3 . Parametrize the roots to satisfy $x_2 - x_1 = \lambda$ and $x_3 > \frac{\lambda}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$. Define $x_1 = t - \frac{\lambda}{2}$, $x_2 = t + \frac{\lambda}{2}$, and $x_3 = t + s$ where $s > 0$. This parametrization simplifies the problem by eliminating λ through symmetry.
[Sub-problem 1]: Express a, b, c in terms of t, s , and λ using the parametrized roots. [Answer 1]: $a = -3t - s, b = 3t^2 + 2ts - \frac{\lambda^2}{4}, c = -t^3 - t^2s + \frac{\lambda^2}{4}(t + s)$
[Meta-reasoning 2]: Substitute a, b, c into the expression $\frac{2a^2 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$. Simplify the expression by combining like terms. The result will depend only on s and λ , allowing further simplification by introducing $k = \frac{s}{\lambda}$. This reduces the problem to maximizing a cubic function in k .
[Sub-problem 2]: Simplify $\frac{2a^2 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$ after substitution. What is the simplified form in terms of k ? [Answer 2]: $-2k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k$.
[Meta-reasoning 3]: To maximize $Q(k) = -2k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k$, find its critical points by taking the derivative and solving for k . Verify that the critical point corresponds to a maximum using the second derivative test.
[Sub-problem 3]: Find the critical point of $Q(k) = -2k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k$. [Answer 3]: $k = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$.
[Meta-reasoning 4]: Substitute $k = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ back into $Q(k)$ to compute the maximum value. Confirm the calculation to ensure no arithmetic errors.
[Sub-problem 4]: Calculate $Q(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$. [Answer 4]: $\frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}$.
[Meta-reasoning 5]: Verify that the critical point $k = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ satisfies all constraints (e.g., $s > 0$) and that the polynomial discriminant condition for three real roots is implicitly satisfied by the problem's given conditions. Confirm no additional constraints affect the result.
[Sub-problem 5]: Does $k = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ satisfy $s > 0$? [Answer 5]: Yes.
[Meta-reasoning 6]: Finalize the maximum value of the original expression based on the derived result.
[Sub-problem 6]: What is the maximum value of $\frac{2a^2 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$? [Answer 6]: $\frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}$.
So the final answer is: $\frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}$.

(b) One example in math

Figure 2: One sequence generation example for math task in in-context learning prompts for GPT-4o.

called Structured Fine-grained Training to optimize each task (meta-reasoning generation and solving generation) in a fine-grained manner and dynamically adjust the optimization weight according to the difficulty of the task. Specifically, we split the tokens in \mathbf{S} into two sets: one are tokens in meta-reasoning \mathcal{M} and the other are tokens in solving $\mathcal{Q\&A}$. We perform 3 training epochs. Define \mathcal{F} is the LLM used in this part (Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct), the first epoch is training for meta-reasoning generation, only loss from the tokens in \mathcal{M} is computed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \sum_{\mathbf{S}_{[i]} \in \mathcal{M}} -\log \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{S}_{[i]} | \mathbf{S}_{[1:i-1]}; \theta).$$

The second epoch is training for solving generation, only loss from $\mathcal{Q\&A}$ is computed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \sum_{\mathbf{S}_{[i]} \in \mathcal{Q\&A}} -\log \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{S}_{[i]} | \mathbf{S}_{[1:i-1]}; \theta).$$

The third stage is mixed training with dynamical weight. The total loss is the weighted average of the losses on the two token sets:

$$\mathcal{L}_3 = a \sum_{\mathbf{S}_{[i]} \in \mathcal{M}} -\log \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{S}_{[i]} | \mathbf{S}_{[1:i-1]}; \theta) + b \sum_{\mathbf{S}_{[i]} \in \mathcal{Q\&A}} -\log \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{S}_{[i]} | \mathbf{S}_{[1:i-1]}; \theta).$$

a and b are initialized to the average of \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 over training steps respectively. During training, we calculate the loss of the tokens in \mathcal{M} and $\mathcal{Q\&A}$ respectively, and update a and b according to the ratio of the losses in two sets every α training steps. We set α as 100. Ablation study about this part can be found in Appendix.

3.1.2 Structured Reward Mechanism

After above generation, we denote \mathbf{S}^t and \mathbf{S}^s as the sequences generated from reasoning paths of the teacher LLM and the student LLM respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}^t &= [(\mathcal{M}_1^t, \mathcal{Q}_1^t \& \mathcal{A}_1^t), (\mathcal{M}_2^t, \mathcal{Q}_2^t \& \mathcal{A}_2^t), (\mathcal{M}_3^t, \mathcal{Q}_3^t \& \mathcal{A}_3^t), \dots, (\mathcal{M}_n^t, \mathcal{Q}_n^t \& \mathcal{A}_n^t)], \\ \mathbf{S}^s &= [(\mathcal{M}_1^s, \mathcal{Q}_1^s \& \mathcal{A}_1^s), (\mathcal{M}_2^s, \mathcal{Q}_2^s \& \mathcal{A}_2^s), (\mathcal{M}_3^s, \mathcal{Q}_3^s \& \mathcal{A}_3^s), \dots, (\mathcal{M}_m^s, \mathcal{Q}_m^s \& \mathcal{A}_m^s)]. \end{aligned}$$

We propose the Structured Reward Mechanism to map the generated sequence consisting of multiple meta-reasoning and solving to a reward value according to the alignment between \mathbf{S}^t and \mathbf{S}^s . Although this computation is carried out based on a linear sequence, when combined with RL, it becomes capable of quantifying the degree of alignment between the teacher and the student in terms of the implicit multi-branch structure, serving as environmental feedback in RL. This is because it can assess the step-level alignment between the sequences and, through the mechanism of reward for RL, finely guide the student LLM to make correct sampling from multiple potential sub-problems at each meta-reasoning step. Compared with SFT-based distillation, it makes the student LLM learn the

implicit multi-branch structure in the authentic reasoning of the teacher LLM rather than just focus on memorizing the reasoning path on the surface generated by the teacher LLM. Compared with existing RL methods, it can guide the student LLM on how to do better sampling at each step and avoid reward hacking Amodei et al. [2016], Di Langosco et al. [2022] by step-to-step comparison and early-exist mechanism.

Specifically, our structured reward mechanism sequentially compares the corresponding steps of \mathbf{S}^t and \mathbf{S}^s (Algorithm 1). We use Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct to determine whether two texts are matched. For the steps where \mathcal{M}_i^t matches \mathcal{M}_i^s , we assign a temporary reward value of 1. We further deduct the temporary reward by judging the matching relationship of \mathcal{Q}_i and \mathcal{A}_i . The temporary reward value is added to the total reward value after this. When meeting the mismatched \mathcal{M}_i , this reward accumulation process is ended. This reward mechanism follows the sequential dependency of the reasoning path and can give an approximately unique reward value for each step.

Algorithm 1: Structured Reward Mechanism

```

Initialize  $r \leftarrow 0$ ; // Total reward accumulator
for each index  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \min(n, m)\}$  do
    Initialize temporary reward  $v \leftarrow 0$ ; // Step-wise reward score
    if Match( $\mathcal{M}_i^t, \mathcal{M}_i^s$ ) then
         $v \leftarrow 1$ ; // Base score for matched meta-reasoning
        if Not Match( $\mathcal{Q}_i^t, \mathcal{Q}_i^s$ ) then
             $v \leftarrow v \times 0.5$ ; // 50% penalty for question mismatch
        end
        if Not Match( $\mathcal{A}_i^t, \mathcal{A}_i^s$ ) then
             $v \leftarrow v \times 0.5$ ; // Additional 50% penalty for answer mismatch
        end
    end
    end
    else
        Break; // Encountering mismatched meta-reasoning, exit
    end
     $r \leftarrow r + v$ ; // Accumulate step contribution
end
return  $r$ ; // Final reward between sequences

```

3.2 RL-based Knowledge Distillation Training

We combine our Generative Structure Reward Models (GSRM) with Group-based Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) Shao et al. [2024] for RL-based knowledge distillation training. GRPO introduces a group-constrained policy update method to address the exploration-stability trade-off. By dynamically partitioning experiences into K groups $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_K\}$, GRPO enables differentiated policy optimization: each group applies an adaptive clipping threshold $\epsilon_k \propto 1/\sigma_k$ (where σ_k is the group’s advantage standard deviation) to its policy ratio $r_k(\theta)$, constraining updates with:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{GRPO}}(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}_k} \left[\min \left(r_k \hat{A}_k, \text{clip} \left(r_k, 1 - \epsilon_k, 1 + \epsilon_k \right) \hat{A}_k \right) \right] - \beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_s [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{\text{old}} \parallel \pi_{\theta})], \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{A}_k = A_k/\sigma_k$ is the group-normalized advantage. The dual-constraint design combines low-variance intra-group updates (via adaptive clipping) with global policy coherence (via KL divergence). In training, we combine the reward obtained from GSRM and the outcome reward of the specific task, such as the accuracy in math, in a weighted manner as the total reward for GRPO. Ablation study about the weights can be found in Appendix.

4 Experiments

This section conducts a series of experiments to analyze our method.

4.1 Experimental Setup.

Datasets and Evaluation Metrics. We use OpenR1-Math² as the training dataset for RL, in which Deepseek-R1 generated responses in this dataset are used as the teacher LLM’s reasoning paths.

²<https://huggingface.co/datasets/open-r1/OpenR1-Math-220k>

We keep the training datasets consistent with baselines including PPO and GRPO. In evaluation, we use the popular and challenging datasets on LLM’s reasoning including AIME24 MAA and MATH-500 Hendrycks et al. [2021] for math reasoning and GPQA-Diamond Rein et al. [2024] for graduate-Level Q&A. As for the metrics, we follow existing studies on LLM’s reasoning Guo et al. [2025], Shao et al. [2024], Zhang et al. [2025], Deng et al. [2024], Xu et al. [2024b] to use pass@k Chen et al. [2021]. Our validation is divided into two parts: pass@1 and pass@k ($k > 1$). As for pass@1, we generate m (m is 64 for AIME, 8 for GPQA and 4 for MATH500) responses for each question and compute pass@1 as $pass@1 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m p_i$, in which p_i is the correctness of the i -th response. This can alleviate randomness on small datasets. As for pass@k ($k > 1$), it involves the LLM generating k responses for each question, with the data sample being marked as accurate if at least one of the k responses is accurate. Paying attention to the metric where $k > 1$ is crucial, as in this setting, the LLM has the opportunity to explore multiple diverse paths to answer the question, it reflects the LLM’s ability to sample from multiple implicit paths during reasoning, thereby assessing whether the distilled LLM has learned authentic reasoning or merely memorized the teacher’s paths.

Baselines and Comparison Settings. We categorize the baselines into three groups according to the experimental settings. The first setting aims to show the effect of our method on improving LLM’s reasoning ability. We compare our RL-only training method with the LLM trained in SFT-RL pipeline. We use Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct Yang et al. [2024], a powerful reasoning LLM trained on large-scale chain-of-thought datasets with SFT and then GRPO. Both our method and Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct use the same based model: Qwen2.5-Math-7B, which has been pre-trained on math corpus. The second setting aims to explore whether our RL-based distillation can further improve the performance of the SFT-distilled LLM and achieve effective optimization of the SFT-RL pipeline in knowledge distillation. We compare our method with RL baselines including PPO and GRPO based on DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B Guo et al. [2025], a powerful LLM that is SFT-distilled from Deepseek-R1. The third setting aims to compare which method is better for the student LLM to learn authentic reasoning rather than memorizing the teacher’s path. We use embedding³ similarity Deng et al. [2025] to select the 3.2K data samples with the largest difference from the test set in OpenR1-Math-220k training set, and train Qwen2.5-Math-7B on this subset with RL-based distillation and SFT-based distillation respectively.

Implementation Details. In training, we build our code based on Open-R1⁴, an open-source project for LLM’s reasoning. We use Pytorch 2.5.1 as the training framework and Deepspeed 0.15.4 for acceleration of parallel computing. In RL training, we use one Ascend 910B 64G NPU for online inference and four Ascend 910B 64G NPUs for training under deepspeed-zero3 setting. As for hyperparameters, we set per-device batch size as 2, gradient accumulation steps as 4, group size for GRPO as 4, temperature in online inference as 0.7. In evaluation, we use Lighteval⁵ as the toolkit and follow settings in Deepseek Guo et al. [2025] to set temperature as 0.6, max new tokens as 32768 and top-p as 0.95. We report the results of multiple runs to reduce the randomness.

4.2 Experimental Results

Main Results. Results about reasoning abilities of LLMs are shown in Table 1. In the training based on Qwen2.5-Math-7B, our RL-only method Qwen2.5-Math-7B-RLKD-Zero outperforms complex SFT + RL pipeline (Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct) and uses much less data (nearly 0.1%). In the training based on Deepseek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B (SFT-distilled LLM), baseline RL methods including PPO and GRPO can hardly bring about significant improvements on this basis while our RLKD is capable of further enhancing performance. The indicates that our RL-based distillation approach enables the SFT-distilled LLM to learn additional information beyond its memorization of the teacher’s reasoning paths. The relatively more significant improvements are observed in pass@k ($k > 1$). In this setting, LLM has the opportunity to explore multiple diverse paths to answer the question, which means that compared to SFT distillation, our method enables the student LLM to learn how to perform sampling from multiple potential paths by distilling the implicit multi-branch structure from the teacher, thereby increasing the probability of providing the correct answer.

Ablation Study. Figure 3 shows three metrics in RL training. We compare our RLKD with GRPO because RLKD is actually GRPO with the reward from our Generative Structure Reward Model

³obtained by gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct

⁴<https://github.com/huggingface/open-r1>

⁵<https://github.com/huggingface/lighteval>

Table 1: Reasoning abilities on AIME24, MATH-500 and GPQA-Diamond. The results are obtained based on generating multiple responses for each query to mitigate randomness and the best results are in **bold** font. Qwen2.5-Math-7B-RLKD-Zero is trained by our RLKD without any SFT (RL only).

(a) Performance on AIME24

Model	Data Size		AIME24										
	SFT	RL	pass@1					pass@4	pass@8	pass@16	pass@32	pass@64	
Number of running times for each question			1	4	8	16	32	64	4	8	16	32	64
Based on Qwen2.5-Math-7B													
Qwen2.5-Math-7B	0	0	13.3	11.7	11.7	11.3	11.0	10.3	20.0	26.7	30.0	30.0	43.3
Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct	2,895K	66K	16.7	15.8	15.8	15.8	14.7	14.6	33.3	43.3	43.3	50.0	50.0
Our: Qwen2.5-Math-7B-RLKD-Zero	0	3.2K	23.3	20.0	20.4	22.1	22.5	21.0	40.0	46.7	56.7	60.0	70.0
Based on Deepseek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B													
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B	800K	0	50.0	52.7	52.5	52.9	52.3	52.4	66.7	73.3	80.0	80.0	83.3
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B-PPO	800K	3.2K	46.7	52.1	53.0	52.7	52.9	52.9	66.7	73.3	73.3	80.0	83.3
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B-GRPO	800K	3.2K	50.0	52.5	53.3	53.3	53.3	52.3	66.7	73.3	80.0	83.3	83.3
Our: DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B-RLKD	800K	3.2K	53.3	56.7	55.4	53.3	52.9	53.6	73.3	80.0	86.7	86.7	86.7

(b) Performance on GPQA-Diamond and MATH-500

Model	Data Size		GPQA-Diamond					MATH-500		
	SFT	RL	pass@1			pass@4	pass@8	pass@1		pass@4
			1	4	8	4	8	1	4	4
Number of running times for each question										
Based on Qwen2.5-Math-7B										
Qwen2.5-Math-7B	0	0	29.3	27.8	27.5	61.1	79.3	54.8	56.2	81.0
Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct	2,895K	66K	30.3	30.2	30.1	66.7	82.3	82.4*	81.5*	89.4*
Our: Qwen2.5-Math-7B-RLKD-Zero	0	3.2K	34.9	34.2	32.7	69.2	86.4	74.4	73.9	87.8
Based on Deepseek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B										
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B	800K	0	47.9	50.8	50.2	74.7	83.8	92.4	93.2	97.4
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B-PPO	800K	3.2K	47.9	49.4	50.7	74.7	84.3	93.4	94.0	97.6
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B-GRPO	800K	3.2K	50.5	50.1	49.8	75.3	84.3	93.0	93.7	97.4
Our: DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B-RLKD	800K	3.2K	54.5	53.0	52.8	76.8	86.9	94.2	95.1	98.2

*means training set of MATH-500 has appeared in the SFT training data of Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct Yang et al. [2024].




Figure 3: The variations of metrics during the RL training process ((c) is not applicable to GRPO).

(GSRM). The results indicate that as the training progresses, GSRM enables RLKD to better optimize the accuracy of the task (Figure 3 (a)), primarily because the student gradually learns the teacher’s implicit multi-branch structure in reasoning (Figure 3 (c)). Please see Appendix for more ablation studies about hyperparameters such as reward weights.

4.3 Analysis of RL distillation vs. SFT distillation

Performance Trend Varying with Training Steps. This section compares the SFT-based distillation with our RL-based distillation (RLKD) by training Qwen2.5-Math-7B on the dataset has domain shift to AIME24 and is out of the domain of GPQA. This setting, where there exists a domain discrepancy between the training and testing sets for distillation, allows us to intuitively discern whether SFT-based distillation is merely mimicking and memorizing the teacher’s paths, and whether our RL-based distillation enables the student to learn authentic reasoning. The experimental results are shown in Figure 4. It is noteworthy that, as the training progresses, SFT and RLKD demonstrate completely opposite performance trends: RLKD can consistently enhance performance, even when




Figure 4: Comparison between SFT-based distillation and our RL-based distillation (RLKD) in domain shift and out-of-domain setting. SFT and RLKD see the same data (32 samples) at each step.




Figure 5: Diversity among different reasoning paths at each meta-reasoning step varying with training.

distilling on dataset that significantly diverges from the testing set, whereas SFT progressively undermines performance. It indicates that SFT distillation is easy to fall into the trap of simply imitating and memorizing the teacher’s reasoning paths, rather than learning authentic reasoning that can be stably generalized. Our RLKD makes the student learn to perform better sampling among potential branches at each step, which is the implicit multi-branch structure of teacher’s authentic reasoning.

Diversity of Reasoning Paths. The diversity of reasoning paths can reflect whether the student LLM has truly learned reasoning or is just memorizing the fixed teacher’s path in the training set. Figure 5 shows that our method brings the diversity-patterns of the student LLM closer to that of the teacher LLM in multi-step reasoning, suggesting that it allows the student LLM to learn authentic reasoning by distilling the implicit multi-branch structure. Specifically, we randomly sample 500 samples from Openthoughts-114K. On this sampled set, we set temperature to 0.8 and let LLM generate 16 responses for each question. We use the GSRM in Section 3.1.1 to generate a corresponding sequence containing multiple meta-reasoning-solving steps for each response, and calculate the diversity of the meta-reasoning-solving content within the 16 responses of each question at step-level. The diversity score D is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{i=1}^{16} \mathbf{e}_i, \quad D = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{16} \sum_{i=1}^{16} \frac{\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{e}_i\| \|\mathbf{u}\|}},$$

in which \mathbf{e}_i is the text embedding encoded by *gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct*⁶ for each meta-reasoning-solving content. As shown in Figure 5, the teacher LLM (Deepseek-R1) has a significantly different diversity-pattern from the SFT-distilled student LLM (DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B). Reasoning in the teacher has the higher diversity while the student is stuck in the relatively fixed paths. As the training of our method progresses (from step 20 to 100), the diversity of the student’s reasoning paths begins to increase and gradually approaches that of the teacher, which indicates that our method allows the student to successfully learn the teacher’s authentic reasoning paradigm.

5 Conclusion and Discussion

Conclusion. This work addresses a critical flaw in knowledge distillation in LLM’s reasoning: the failure of SFT to transfer the implicit multi-branch structure underlying authentic reasoning.

⁶<https://huggingface.co/Alibaba-NLP/gte-Qwen2-7B-instruct>

Drawing from cognitive neuroscience principles, we show that authentic reasoning involves dynamic meta-reasoning (sub-problem selection) and solving steps—a implicit multi-branch structure flattened by token-level SFT training. Our RLKD, the first RL-based distillation framework for reasoning, overcomes this paired with a Generative Structure Reward Model (GSRM), which decomposes reasoning paths into meta-reasoning-solving pairs and scores the structural alignment between teacher and student. Experiments across math and graduate-level QA tasks demonstrate RLKD’s superiority than SFT-based distillation, SFT-RL pipeline and RL baselines including PPO and GRPO, proving its ability to distill how teachers navigate latent reasoning branches rather than mimicking surface tokens. Further analysis confirms RLKD-trained students mirror teachers’ multi-branch exploration patterns, closing the imitation-authentic reasoning gap.

Limitations and Potential Impact. A key limitation of our work stems from computational constraints: while RLKD demonstrates effectiveness on 7B-scale models, its viability on larger LLMs (e.g., 70B+ parameters) remains unverified. The framework’s emphasis on structural distillation opens avenues for developing lightweight, generalizable LLMs, potentially reducing reliance on brute-force scaling—a timely direction given growing concerns about AI’s environmental and economic costs.

References

- Qianjun Pan, Wenkai Ji, Yuyang Ding, Junsong Li, Shilian Chen, Junyi Wang, Jie Zhou, Qin Chen, Min Zhang, Yulan Wu, et al. A survey of slow thinking-based reasoning llms using reinforced learning and inference-time scaling law. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.02665*, 2025.
- Wang Jiaqi, Li Xinliang, Liu Zhengliang, Wu Zihao, Zhong Tianyang, Shu Peng, Li Yiwei, Jiang Hanqi, Zhou Yifan, Chen Junhao, et al. Llm reasoning: from openai o1 to deepseek r1. 2025.
- Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. A theory for token-level harmonization in retrieval-augmented generation. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=tbx3u2oZAu>.
- Alex Havrilla, Yuqing Du, Sharath Chandra Raparthy, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Maksym Zhuravinskyi, Eric Hambro, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Roberta Raileanu. Teaching large language models to reason with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04642*, 2024.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- Fengli Xu, Qian Yue Hao, Zefang Zong, Jingwei Wang, Yunke Zhang, Jingyi Wang, Xiaochong Lan, Jiahui Gong, Tianjian Ouyang, Fanjin Meng, et al. Towards large reasoning models: A survey of reinforced reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09686*, 2025b.
- Tianzhe Chu, Yuexiang Zhai, Jihan Yang, Shengbang Tong, Saining Xie, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Sergey Levine, and Yi Ma. Sft memorizes, rl generalizes: A comparative study of foundation model post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17161*, 2025.
- Yang Yue, Zhiqi Chen, Rui Lu, Andrew Zhao, Zhaokai Wang, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. Does reinforcement learning really incentivize reasoning capacity in llms beyond the base model? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.13837*, 2025.
- Chong Zhang, Yue Deng, Xiang Lin, Bin Wang, Dianwen Ng, Hai Ye, Xingxuan Li, Yao Xiao, Zhanfeng Mo, Qi Zhang, et al. 100 days after deepseek-r1: A survey on replication studies and more directions for reasoning language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.00551*, 2025.
- Hugging Face. Open r1: A fully open reproduction of deepseek-r1, january 2025. URL <https://github.com/huggingface/open-r1>.
- Liang Wen, Yunke Cai, Fenrui Xiao, Xin He, Qi An, Zhenyu Duan, Yimin Du, Junchen Liu, Lifu Tang, Xiaowei Lv, et al. Light-r1: Curriculum sft, dpo and rl for long cot from scratch and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10460*, 2025.

- Hardy Chen, Haoqin Tu, Fali Wang, Hui Liu, Xianfeng Tang, Xinya Du, Yuyin Zhou, and Cihang Xie. Sft or rl? an early investigation into training rl-like reasoning large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.11468*, 2025.
- Chengwei Dai, Kun Li, Wei Zhou, and Songlin Hu. Beyond imitation: Learning key reasoning steps from dual chain-of-thoughts in reasoning distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19737*, 2024.
- Mark Stefik. Planning and meta-planning (molgen: Part 2). *Artificial Intelligence*, 16(2):141–169, 1981.
- Michael Cox and Anita Raja. Metareasoning: A manifesto. *BBN Technical*, 2007.
- Stuart Russell and Eric Wefald. Principles of metareasoning. *Artificial intelligence*, 49(1-3):361–395, 1991.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Dakota Mahan, Duy Van Phung, Rafael Rafailov, Chase Blagden, Nathan Lile, Louis Castricato, Jan-Philipp Fränken, Chelsea Finn, and Alon Albalak. Generative reward models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12832*, 2024.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, et al. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*, 2022.
- Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah A Smith, and Mike Lewis. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03350*, 2022.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:11809–11822, 2023.
- Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Michal Podstawski, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, et al. Graph of thoughts: Solving elaborate problems with large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 17682–17690, 2024.
- Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Huawei Shen, Xueqi Cheng, and Tat-Seng Chua. Search-in-the-chain: Interactively enhancing large language models with search for knowledge-intensive tasks. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024*, pages 1362–1373, 2024a.
- Ling Yang, Zhaochen Yu, Tianjun Zhang, Minkai Xu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Bin CUI, and Shuicheng YAN. Supercorrect: Advancing small LLM reasoning with thought template distillation and self-correction. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=PyjZ07oSw2>.
- Dacheng Li, Shiyi Cao, Tyler Griggs, Shu Liu, Xiangxi Mo, Eric Tang, Sumanth Hegde, Kourosh Hakhmaneshi, Shishir G Patil, Matei Zaharia, et al. Llms can easily learn to reason from demonstrations structure, not content, is what matters! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.07374*, 2025.
- Bespoke-Labs. Bespoke-stratos: The unreasonable effectiveness of reasoning distillation., january 2025. <https://huggingface.co/bespokelabs/Bespoke-Stratos-7B>.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Y Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.

- Qiyang Yu, Zheng Zhang, Ruofei Zhu, Yufeng Yuan, Xiaochen Zuo, Yu Yue, Tiantian Fan, Gaohong Liu, Lingjun Liu, Xin Liu, et al. Dapo: An open-source llm reinforcement learning system at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.14476*, 2025.
- OpenThoughts Team. Open Thoughts. <https://open-thoughts.ai>, January 2025.
- Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. Concrete problems in ai safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565*, 2016.
- Lauro Langosco Di Langosco, Jack Koch, Lee D Sharkey, Jacob Pfau, and David Krueger. Goal misgeneralization in deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12004–12019. PMLR, 2022.
- MAA. American invitational mathematics examination - aime, february 2024. In *American Invitational Mathematics Examination - AIME 2024*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*, 2021.
- David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R Bowman. Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024.
- Jingcheng Deng, Zihao Wei, Liang Pang, Hanxing Ding, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. Everything is editable: Extend knowledge editing to unstructured data in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15349*, 2024.
- Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Mo Yu, Fandong Meng, Huawei Shen, Xueqi Cheng, and Jie Zhou. Unsupervised information refinement training of large language models for retrieval-augmented generation. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 133–145, 2024b.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, et al. Qwen2. 5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12122*, 2024.
- Jingcheng Deng, Zhongtao Jiang, Liang Pang, Liwei Chen, Kun Xu, Zihao Wei, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. Following the autoregressive nature of llm embeddings via compression and alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11401*, 2025.

A Ablation study of Structured Fine-grained Training

Figure 6 shows the ablation study of our Structured Fine-grained Training method by showing the accuracy and structure matching varying with training steps. It indicates that generative structure reward model trained by our structured fine-grained training method can effectively optimize the task accuracy (Figure 6a) and reasoning structure matching (Figure 6b) between the teacher and the student a, which grows progressively as the training steps.

B Ablation study for Reward Weights

In this section, we conduct ablation study about the reward weights in RL training. The essential rewards in our method include accuracy reward (R_{acc}) for the specific tasks such as rule-based accuracy reward in math, and our structure matching reward (R_{gsrm}) obtained from generative structure reward model, so we primarily discuss the weight relationship between these two rewards. Specifically, we adjust the proportional relationship between R_{gsrm} and R_{acc} ($\frac{R_{gsrm}}{R_{acc}}$) from 0.2 to 2




Figure 6: Ablation study about our Structured Fine-grained Training method.




Figure 7: Ablation study about reward weights. Performance of pass@1 (n=16) and pass@16 (n=16) on AIME24 varying with ($\frac{R_{gsrm}}{R_{acc}}$).

in increments of 0.2, and observe the variations in pass@1 (n=16) and pass@16 (n=16) on AIME24. This experimental results are shown in Figure 7. We can see that when the weights of the two are equal $\frac{R_{gsrm}}{R_{acc}} = 1$, the LLM achieves a harmonized optimal effect in both the correctness of reasoning (pass@1) and the capability of sampling (pass@16). So in our experiments, we set the reward weights as: $R_{acc} : R_{gsrm} : R_{format} : R_{tag} = 3 : 3 : 2 : 2$, in which R_{format} is format reward and R_{tag} is tag count reward that assesses whether the thought content adheres to the specified format Guo et al. [2025].

C Prompt in Data Construction

Figure 8 to 11 shows the full prompt in data construction of training generative structure reward model.

Decompose the problem into multiple steps according to the thinking process for reasoning. Format the thinking content in the form of [Meta-reasoning]-[Sub-problem]-[Answer] for each step. When the [Answer] of a certain step gets the answer to the original question, stop reasoning, and the last answer should include a complete answer to the original question. [Meta-reasoning] represents the thinking process. It is necessary to analyze the previous and next steps as detailed as possible, explain in detail why this step is done to lead to the following query, and do not mention the answer of this step. [Sub-Problem] represents the problem that needs to be solved in the current step, and analyze it as detailed as possible. Each query contains only one question. [Answer] represents the answer to the Problem. Give the answer to the [Sub-Problem] directly and briefly without any reasoning steps and redundant statements. You should split it into more [Meta-reasoning]-[Sub-Problem]-[Answer] with finer granularity, but do not repeat the conditions given in the question. Here are some examples for {} task:

(a) Instruction

[Question]: Given real numbers a, b, c and a positive number λ such that the polynomial $f(x) = x^3 + ax^2 + bx + c$ has three real roots x_1, x_2, x_3 , and the conditions $x_2 - x_1 = \lambda$ and $x_3 > \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$ are satisfied, find the maximum value of $\frac{2a^3 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$.

[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so L... (too long to show here)

[Response]:

[Meta-reasoning 1]: To find the maximum value of $\frac{2a^3 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$, use Vieta's formulas to express coefficients a, b, c in terms of the roots x_1, x_2, x_3 . Parametrize the roots to satisfy $x_2 - x_1 = \lambda$ and $x_3 > \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$. Define $x_1 = t - \frac{\lambda}{2}$, $x_2 = t + \frac{\lambda}{2}$ and $x_3 = t + s$ where $s > 0$. This parametrization simplifies the problem by eliminating λ through symmetry.

[Sub-problem 1]: Express a, b, c in terms of t, s , and λ using the parametrized roots. [Answer 1]: $a = -3t - s$, $b = 3t^2 + 2ts - \frac{\lambda^2}{4}$, $c = -t^3 - t^2s + \frac{\lambda^2}{4}(t + s)$

[Meta-reasoning 2]: Substitute a, b, c into the expression $\frac{2a^3 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$. Simplify the expression by combining like terms. The result will depend only on s and λ , allowing further simplification by introducing $k = \frac{s}{\lambda}$. This reduces the problem to maximizing a cubic function in k .

[Sub-problem 2]: Simplify $\frac{2a^3 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$ after substitution. What is the simplified form in terms of k ? [Answer 2]: $-2k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k$.

[Meta-reasoning 3]: To maximize $Q(k) = -2k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k$, find its critical points by taking the derivative and solving for k . Verify that the critical point corresponds to a maximum using the second derivative test.

[Sub-problem 3]: Find the critical point of $Q(k) = -2k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k$. [Answer 3]: $k = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}$.

[Meta-reasoning 4]: Substitute $k = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}$ back into $Q(k)$ to compute the maximum value. Confirm the calculation to ensure no arithmetic errors.

[Sub-problem 4]: Calculate $Q(\frac{\sqrt{6}}{2})$. [Answer 4]: $\frac{27\sqrt{3}}{4}$.

[Meta-reasoning 5]: Verify that the critical point $k = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}$ satisfies all constraints (e.g., $s > 0$) and that the polynomial discriminant condition for three real roots is implicitly satisfied by the problem's given conditions. Confirm no additional constraints affect the result.

[Sub-problem 5]: Does $k = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}$ satisfy $s > 0$? [Answer 5]: Yes.

[Meta-reasoning 6]: Finalize the maximum value of the original expression based on the derived result.

[Sub-problem 6]: What is the maximum value of $\frac{2a^3 + 27c - 9ab}{\lambda^3}$? [Answer 6]: $\frac{81\sqrt{3}}{2}$.

So the final answer is: $\frac{81\sqrt{3}}{2}$.

(b) Example 1 in math

Figure 8: Full prompt in data construction of training generative structure reward model: Instruction and Example 1

[Question]: The duration of a process used to manufacture components is known to be normally distributed with a mean of 30 minutes and a standard deviation of 4 minutes. What is the probability of a time greater than 33 minutes being recorded?

[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so L... (too long to show here)

[Response]:

[Meta-reasoning 1]: To determine the probability that the process time exceeds 33 minutes, we first need to standardize the value using the z-score formula. This converts the normal distribution parameters (mean=30, standard deviation=4) into the standard normal distribution (mean=0, standard deviation=1), allowing us to use standard tables or tools for probability lookup.

[Sub-problem 1]: What is the z-score for a time of 33 minutes in this normal distribution? [Answer 1]: 0.75

[Meta-reasoning 2]: With the z-score calculated, the next step is to find the area under the standard normal curve to the right of this z-score, which corresponds to the probability of the process time being greater than 33 minutes. Since standard tables typically provide cumulative probabilities (area to the left), subtracting the cumulative probability from 1 gives the desired result.

[Sub-problem 2]: What is the cumulative probability (area to the left) for a z-score of 0.75 in the standard normal distribution? [Answer 2]: 0.7734

[Meta-reasoning 3]: Finally, subtract the cumulative probability from 1 to obtain the probability of the time exceeding 33 minutes. This completes the calculation.

[Sub-problem 3]: What is 1 minus the cumulative probability of 0.7734? [Answer 3]: 0.2266

So the final answer is: 0.2266.

(c) Example 2 in math

[Question]: Generate an executable Python function generated from the given prompt. The function should take n as input and print the output. Simply call the function after the definition. Yanya got an important task 'u2014 he should enumerate books in the library and label each book with its number. Each of the n books should be assigned with a number from 1 to n . Naturally, distinct books should be assigned distinct numbers. 'u2014 Yanya wants to know how many digits he will have to write down as he labels the books. 'u2014 Input:---- 'u2014 The first line contains integer n (1 'u2264 n 'u2264 10^9) 'u2014 Output:---- 'u2014 Print the number of digits needed to number all the books. 'u2014 Examples:---- 'u2014 Input: 13 'u2014 Output: 17 'u2014 Input: 7 'u2014 Output: 14 'u2014 Input: 4 'u2014 Output: 10 'u2014 Note:---- 'u2014 Note to the first test. The books get numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, which totals to 17 digits. 'u2014 Note to the second sample. The books get numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, which totals to 4 digits. 'u2014

[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so L... (too long to show here)

[Response]:

[Meta-reasoning 1]: The problem requires calculating the total number of digits written when labeling books from 1 to n . The approach involves iterating through each digit length (1-digit, 2-digits, etc.) and summing the contributions of each range. For example, numbers with d digits start at 10^{d-1} and end at $10^d - 1$. If n is within this range, calculate the count of numbers in the partial range.

[Sub-problem 1]: How to determine the contribution of numbers with a specific digit length d to the total digit count? [Answer 1]: For each d , calculate the start and end of the range. If $n \geq \text{end}$, add $(\text{end} - \text{start} + 1) * d$. If $n < \text{end}$, add $(n - \text{start} + 1) * d$.

[Meta-reasoning 2]: Implementing this requires iterating through each possible digit length until the start of the range exceeds n . The loop increments d and calculates the start and end for each iteration. The total accumulates the contributions from each valid range.

[Sub-problem 2]: How to structure the loop to iterate through digit lengths and accumulate the total digits? [Answer 2]: Initialize total=0, d=1. Loop while start <= n, update total based on current d's range, increment d.

[Meta-reasoning 3]: The code must read n from standard input, compute the total digits, and print the result. Handling edge cases like $n=1$ or $n=10^9$ correctly is ensured by checking the range boundaries.

[Sub-problem 3]: What is the Python function structure to read input, compute the total digits, and print the output? [Answer 3]: Read n with $\text{int}(\text{input}())$, loop through d starting at 1, calculate start and end, update total, then print(total).

[Meta-reasoning 4]: Finally, the function must be called after definition to execute when the script runs. The loop terminates when start exceeds n , ensuring all relevant digit lengths are covered.

[Sub-problem 4]: What is the complete Python function implementing the described logic?

[Answer 4]:

```
def count_digits():
    n = int(input())
    total = 0
    d = 1
    while True:
        start = 10 ** (d-1)
        if start > n:
            break
        end = 10 ** d - 1
        count = end - start + 1 if end <= n else n - start + 1
        total += count * d
        d += 1
    print(total)
count_digits()
```

So the final answer is:

```
def count_digits():
    n = int(input())
    total = 0
    d = 1
    while True:
        start = 10 ** (d-1)
        if start > n:
            break
        end = 10 ** d - 1
        count = end - start + 1 if end <= n else n - start + 1
        total += count * d
        d += 1
    print(total)
count_digits()
```

(d) Example 3 in code

Figure 9: Full prompt in data construction of training generative structure reward model: Example 2 and 3

[Question]: Generate an executable Python function generated from the given prompt. The function should take stdin as input and print the output. Simply call the function after the definition. You are given n days and for each day (d, [i]) you can select one of the following options: n/perform no task n/perform a high effort task (h, [i]) only if its the first day or if you chose no-task on the previous day n/perform a low effort task (l, [i]) n/Write a program to find the maximum amount of tasks you can perform within these n days. n/Example 1: n/output: 'm = 3 n/h[1] = (2,8,1) n/h[2] = (1,2,1)' n/output: 9 n/Explanation: n/Options on 1st day: h[0]=2, h[0]=1 or no-task n/Select no-task n/Options on 2nd day: h[1]=8, h[2]=1 or no-task n/Select high-effort task as no-task was selected n/In the previous day. n/Options on 3rd day: h[2]=1, h[2]=1 or no-task n/Select low-effort task as selecting high-effort task is only possible if you chose no-task on n/previous day n/Example 2: n/output: 'm = 5 n/h[1] = (3,6,8,7,6) n/h[2] = (1,5,4,5,3)' n/output: 20 n/Explanation: Perform high-effort task on first n/day and low-effort task on all remaining days n/In n/your Task n/You don't need to read input or print anything. Your task is to complete the function maxAmt() which accepts an integer n and two arrays h[] and l[] as input parameter and returns the maximum amount of tasks you can perform within these n days. n/Expected Time Complexity: O(n) n/Expected Auxiliary Space: O(n) n/Constraints: n/1 <= n <= 10^6 n/6 n/Use function Template for python3 n/Inclass Solution: n/ def maxAmt(self, n, hi, li): n/ # code here n/

[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so L... (too long to show here)

[Response]:

[Meta-reasoning 1]: To maximize the total task amount with constraints on high-effort tasks, dynamic programming is suitable. We need to track the maximum possible sum for each state (no-task, high, low) at each day, considering transitions based on previous choices.

[Sub-problem 1]: What are the possible states for each day and their transitions? [Answer 1]: States: no-task (0), high (1), low (2). Transitions: high can follow only no-task; others depend on max previous states.

[Meta-reasoning 2]: For each day, the current state's value depends on the previous day's states. For example, choosing high on day i requires the previous day to be no-task. We need to define recurrence relations for dynamic programming.

[Sub-problem 2]: What are the recurrence relations for each state? [Answer 2]: dp[i][0] = max(prev0, prev1, prev2); dp[i][1] = prev0 + hi[i]; dp[i][2] = max_prev + li[i].

[Meta-reasoning 3]: To optimize space, track only the previous day's states instead of a full DP array. This reduces space complexity to O(1) while maintaining O(n) time.

[Sub-problem 3]: How to implement the transitions using variables instead of a DP array? [Answer 3]: Use variables prev0, prev1, prev2 and update them iteratively.

[Meta-reasoning 4]: Initialize the states for day 0, then iterate from day 1 to n-1. After processing all days, the answer is the maximum of the final states.

[Sub-problem 4]: What is the Python function implementing this logic? [Answer 4]: Function uses a loop to update curr0, curr1, curr2 based on previous states and return their maximum.

So the final answer is:

```
python
class Solution:
    def maxAmt(self, n, hi, li):
        if n == 0:
            return 0
        prev0, prev1, prev2 = 0, hi[0], li[0]
        for i in range(1, n):
            curr0 = max(prev0, prev1, prev2)
            curr1 = prev0 + hi[i]
            curr2 = curr0 + li[i]
            prev0, prev1, prev2 = curr0, curr1, curr2
        return max(prev0, prev1, prev2)
```

(e) Example 4 in code

[Question]: What is the concentration (in mol/L) of a hydrochloric acid (HCl) solution if 25 mL of this solution requires 35 mL of a 0.1 M sodium hydroxide (NaOH) solution to reach the equivalence point in a titration reaction?

[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so L... (too long to show here)

[Response]:

[Meta-reasoning 1]: To determine the concentration of HCl, the first step is to write the balanced chemical equation for the reaction between HCl and NaOH. This establishes the stoichiometric relationship between the reactants, which is necessary for subsequent calculations.

[Sub-problem 1]: What is the balanced chemical equation for the reaction of HCl with NaOH, and what is the mole ratio between them? [Answer 1]: $\text{HCl} + \text{NaOH} \rightarrow \text{NaCl} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ (1:1 mole ratio)

[Meta-reasoning 2]: Since the mole ratio is 1:1, the moles of HCl will equal the moles of NaOH at equivalence. The moles of NaOH can be calculated using its concentration and volume, which will directly give the moles of HCl.

[Sub-problem 2]: How many moles of NaOH are present in 35 mL of a 0.1 M solution? [Answer 2]: 0.0035 mol

[Meta-reasoning 3]: With the moles of HCl determined (equal to moles of NaOH), the concentration of the HCl solution is calculated by dividing the moles of HCl by its volume in liters. This requires converting the given HCl volume from mL to L.

[Sub-problem 3]: What is the volume of the HCl solution in liters? [Answer 3]: 0.025 L

[Meta-reasoning 4]: Finally, divide the moles of HCl by its volume in liters to obtain the concentration. This completes the calculation.

[Sub-problem 4]: What is the concentration (mol/L) of HCl when 0.0035 mol is dissolved in 0.025 L? [Answer 4]: 0.14 mol/L

So the final answer is: 0.14 mol/L

(f) Example 5 in science

Figure 10: Full prompt in data construction of training generative structure reward model: Example 4 and 5

[Question]: A circular loop of radius 0.2 meters carries a current of 5 amperes. What is the magnetic field at a point located 0.1 meters from the center of the loop?

[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so L... (too long to show here)

[Response]:

[Meta-reasoning 1]: To determine the magnetic field at a point 0.1 meters from the center of a circular current-carrying loop, we first identify the relevant formula. Since the point's location is not explicitly stated as off-axis, we assume it lies along the loop's axis. The formula for the magnetic field on the axis of a circular loop is required here.

[Sub-problem 1]: What is the formula for the magnetic field at a point on the axis of a circular current-carrying loop? [Answer 1]: $B = (\mu_0 * I * R^2) / (2 * (R^2 + z^2)^{3/2})$

[Meta-reasoning 2]: Next, substitute the given values into the formula: current (I = 5 A), loop radius (R = 0.2 m), axial distance (z = 0.1 m), and permeability of free space ($\mu_0 = 4\pi \times 10^{-7}$ T·m/A). Compute each component stepwise to avoid errors.

[Sub-problem 2]: What is the value of $R^2 + z^2$ for R = 0.2 m and z = 0.1 m? [Answer 2]: 0.05 m²

[Meta-reasoning 3]: Calculate the term $(R^2 + z^2)^{3/2}$ which appears in the denominator of the formula. This involves first taking the square root and then cubing the result.

[Sub-problem 3]: What is (0.05 m^2) raised to the 3/2 power? [Answer 3]: 0.01118 m³

[Meta-reasoning 4]: Now compute the numerator of the formula: $\mu_0 * I * R^2$. Use $\mu_0 = 4\pi \times 10^{-7}$ T·m/A, I = 5 A, and R² = 0.04 m².

[Sub-problem 4]: What is the value of $\mu_0 * I * R^2$? [Answer 4]: 2.5133×10^{-7} T·m

[Meta-reasoning 5]: Finally, divide the numerator by the denominator ($2 * 0.01118 \text{ m}^3$) to obtain the magnetic field strength at the specified point.

[Sub-problem 5]: What is 2.5133×10^{-7} T·m divided by 0.02236 m³? [Answer 5]: 1.1237×10^{-4} T

So the final answer is: 1.1237×10^{-4} T

(g) Example 6 in science

[Question]: Where might jellyfish stay warm? n/A: atlantic ocean n/B: bikini bottom n/C: japanese restaurant n/D: store n/E: pacific ocean

[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so L... (too long to show here)

[Response]:

[Meta-reasoning 1]: To determine where jellyfish might stay warm, first identify their natural habitats. Jellyfish are marine creatures, so options related to oceans or aquatic environments are primary candidates. This narrows the focus to real-world oceans (A, E) or fictional underwater locations (B).

[Sub-problem 1]: Are jellyfish typically found in real oceans or fictional locations like Bikini Bottom? [Answer 1]: Real oceans

[Meta-reasoning 2]: Since jellyfish inhabit real oceans, eliminate fictional or non-marine options. The remaining choices are Atlantic Ocean (A) and Pacific Ocean (E). However, the question specifies "stay warm," implying a need to consider temperature variations within these oceans.

[Sub-problem 2]: Do both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have warm regions suitable for jellyfish? [Answer 2]: Yes

[Meta-reasoning 3]: Since both A and E are valid, re-examine the options for potential context clues. The inclusion of "Bikini Bottom" (a fictional warm underwater setting from SpongeBob SquarePants) suggests the question might reference pop culture rather than biology.

[Sub-problem 3]: Is "Bikini Bottom" a known fictional habitat for jellyfish in media? [Answer 3]: Yes

[Meta-reasoning 4]: Given the mix of real and fictional options, infer the question's intent: if it prioritizes humor or pop culture, Bikini Bottom (B) is likely the answer. If strictly biological, A/E would apply. However, the presence of B suggests a non-literal context.

[Sub-problem 4]: Which option aligns with a playful or media-reference interpretation of "stay warm"? [Answer 4]: B: Bikini Bottom

So the final answer is: B: Bikini Bottom

(h) Example 7 in puzzle

[Question]: As you live life you get wiser, it is a part of what? n/A: growing older n/B: death n/C: experience things n/D: toohosme n/E: breathe

[Reasoning Path]: Okay, so L... (too long to show here)

[Response]:

[Meta-reasoning 1]: The question asks to identify what gaining wisdom through living life is a part of. First, analyze the options to eliminate unrelated terms (e.g., "toohtosome" and "breathe" are irrelevant to wisdom). Then, focus on comparing plausible options like "growing older" and "experience things".

[Sub-problem 1]: Which options directly relate to the process of accumulating wisdom as stated in the question? [Answer 1]: A: growing older; C: experience things

[Meta-reasoning 2]: To differentiate between "growing older" and "experience things," evaluate whether wisdom arises purely from aging or from actively engaging with life. Wisdom typically stems from learning through actions and events rather than mere passage of time.

[Sub-problem 2]: Is gaining wisdom more closely tied to aging or to encountering and reflecting on life events? [Answer 2]: C: experience things

[Meta-reasoning 3]: Confirm that "experience things" logically encompasses the idea of learning and gaining wisdom through lived events, making it the most fitting answer.

[Sub-problem 3]: Which option explicitly connects wisdom to lived actions rather than passive aging? [Answer 3]: C: experience things

So the final answer is: C: experience things

(h) Example 8 in puzzle

Figure 11: Full prompt in data construction of training generative structure reward model: Example 6, 7 and 8