

Improving Value-based Process Verifier via Low-Cost Variance Reduction

Zetian Sun, Dongfang Li, Baotian Hu, Min Zhang

Harbin Institute of Technology (Shenzhen), Shenzhen, China

zetiansun.cs@gmail.com,

{lidongfang, hubaotian, zhangmin2021}@hit.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable success in a wide range of tasks. However, their reasoning capabilities, particularly in complex domains like mathematics, remain a significant challenge. Value-based process verifiers, which estimate the probability of a partial reasoning chain leading to a correct solution, are a promising approach for improving reasoning. Nevertheless, their effectiveness is often hindered by estimation error in their training annotations, a consequence of the limited number of Monte Carlo (MC) samples feasible due to the high cost of LLM inference. In this paper, we identify that the estimation error primarily arises from high variance rather than bias, and the MC estimator is a Minimum Variance Unbiased Estimator (MVUE). To address the problem, we propose the COMpound Monte Carlo Sampling (ComMCS) method, which constructs an unbiased estimator by linearly combining the MC estimators from the current and subsequent steps. Theoretically, we show that our method leads to a predictable reduction in variance, while maintaining an unbiased estimation without additional LLM inference cost. We also perform empirical experiments on the MATH-500 and GSM8K benchmarks to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method. Notably, ComMCS outperforms regression-based optimization method by 2.8 points, the non-variance-reduced baseline by 2.2 points on MATH-500 on Best-of-32 sampling experiment.

1 Introduction

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across various reasoning tasks that require complex multi-step reasoning, such as mathematics and programming (Hurst et al. 2024; Yang et al. 2024a,b; Dubey et al. 2024), yet they still make mistakes when solving challenging problems. To address this issue, verification-based method has recently emerged to improve LLM reasoning (Uesato et al. 2022; Lightman et al. 2024). In general, verification models are trained to evaluate and potentially correct the reasoning trajectories during the reasoning process, which can ensure higher accuracy




Figure 1: Illustration of the estimation variance across different ground-truth values. We compare variances with number of trials ranging from $\{8, 10, 16\}$, and variance applying ComMCS. The variance after using our method (8-trials, ComMCS) is approximately the variance obtained by using 25% more sampling samples (10-trials).

and consistency in LLM outputs by re-ranking candidate responses. They can also provide valuable feedback for further improvement of LLMs (Li et al. 2023; Wu et al. 2023).

Verification-based methods can be categorized by annotation granularity and strategy, with the value-based process verifier being one approach in this classification. Specifically, value-based process verifier is a kind of **process-supervised verifier**, as the training annotations are based on evaluations of each reasoning steps. Value-based process verifier is also a kind of **value-based verifier**, as the verifier aims at predicting the success rate of each reasoning steps, which is the empirical probability of this step leading to the correct final answer in mathematical reasoning scenario, i.e., the value of current step. The training data of value-based process verifier mainly relies on MC estimation. Typically, multiple reasoning trajectories are independently generated by LLMs, and the success rate is computed as the average outcome correctnesses across all trajectories. Outcome correctness is verified through reliable rule-based matching. However, the value estimation is inaccurate due to the limitation of sampling size, which is restricted due to the high cost of LLM inference (Zhang et al. 2025b). This motivates us to study the following research question: *is it possible to reduce the estimation error when estimating values without introducing additional LLM inference overhead?*

In this paper, we present an analysis about the MC estimation error in mathematical reasoning scenario from the perspective of Markov Decision Process (MDP) in §4.1. We build a bridge between the MC estimation and the Binomial distribution, and conclude that the MC estimation is the Minimal Variance Unbiased Estimator (MVUE). The conclusion implies that estimation error is due to estimation variance instead of biased estimation, and the variance cannot be reduced without introducing additional information.

Based on the analysis, we propose ComMCS in §4.2, an unbiased estimation method that utilizing compound MC sampling results to reduce variance without additional LLM inference overhead. This core idea is conceptually analogous to variance reduction techniques in reinforcement learning, such as Temporal Difference (TD) learning, where future value estimates are used to update current ones. We adapt this principle to the context of LLM verifiers. Specifically, we quantify the form of the variance of MC estimation that is based on current step, and the compound variance of MC estimation that is based on the subsequent few steps. Through theoretical analysis, we show that (1) *the linear combination of MC estimations of subsequent few steps is also an unbiased estimation of the value of current step*, and (2) *under specific conditions, the estimation variance can be reduced*. Typically, the condition is related to the distribution of future values and the coefficients of linear combinations.

We provide the practical implementation of ComMCS in §4.3, where we narrow down the linear combination into two items, the current step and its next step. We make several approximations. First of all, we use a categorical distribution to estimate the one-step value distribution, which models the shape of distribution of next step value and is used to estimate the variances. The categorical distribution is modeled by the output of our value-based process verifier, and the verifier is then optimized by cross entropy loss. Secondly, we assume that the one-step value distribution follows the Gaussian distribution class. Finally, we use the MC estimations of values as the proxy of true values to estimate the variances. These practical approximations allow us to calculate and compare variances, after which we find the suitable coefficients for items in the linear combination heuristically and optimize verifier iteratively. The simulated effect of our variance reduction method is shown in Figure 1, where we assume value distribution follows Gaussian distribution.

We then perform extensive experiments on two mathematical reasoning tasks: MATH-500 (Lightman et al. 2024) and GSM8K (Cobbe et al. 2021) to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method across different model series and search strategies. Compared with verifiers that preform return distribution modeling or regression, the value distribution modeling method can achieve comparable performances. After performing our method, we observe a consistent improvement across different settings. For example, our method trained on Deepseek-math-7b-instruct outperforms baselines by 2-3 points on Math-500 on Best-of-N sampling. In beam search experiments, our method trained on Deepseek-math-7b-instruct outperforms other baselines by 1-2 points on MATH-500.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We are the first to systematically identify and address the high variance of the MC estimator as the key bottleneck limiting the performance of value-based process verifiers.
- We propose **ComMCS**, a theoretically-grounded method that reduces variance by compounding estimators from subsequent steps without extra LLM inference cost.
- Our extensive experiments show that ComMCS achieves improved performance over baseline verifiers and demonstrate the potential for diversification in modeling the objective of value-based process verifiers.

2 Related Work

2.1 Test-time Scaling for Math Reasoning

Math reasoning task remains a significant challenge for LLMs (Lightman et al. 2024; Zheng et al. 2024). The test-time scaling technique requires models to generate long Chain-of-Thought (CoT) explicitly or implicitly as its reasoning steps, which can effectively improve the reasoning capabilities of LLMs. Prior efforts have explored different methodologies, such as training-based methods including pre-training (Azerbayev et al. 2024) and fine-tuning (Luo et al. 2025; Yu et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2023), and prompt-based methods like few-shot prompting (Wei et al. 2022) or in-context learning (Zhou et al. 2022). However, these approaches can be resource-intensive (Lu et al. 2024) or require human-crafted demonstrations (Qin et al. 2024). Unlike methods that directly modify parameters or prompts, our method is based on verification-based method, which focuses on training an additional verification model to select the desired output from the candidate model outputs.

2.2 Process-Supervised Verifier

Researchers have found that Process-Supervised Verifiers (PSV) that are trained on fine-grained annotations are effective for LLM reasoning, compared with Outcome-Supervised Verifiers (OSV, (Lightman et al. 2024)). Depending on the definition of fine-grained annotations, PSVs can be classified as several variants: (1) *Reward-based Process Verifiers*. The annotations are based on the correctness of current step (Lightman et al. 2024) or rule-based strategies like calculation errors and formatting errors (Xi et al. 2024; Zheng et al. 2024). (2) *Value-based Process Verifiers*. The annotations are based on the expected return of current step, which is collected by MC sampling methods (Wang et al. 2024; Luo et al. 2024). (3) *Generative Verifiers*. The annotations are based on the CoT capabilities of LLMs, which leads to rich definitions of fine-grained annotations (Zhang et al. 2025a). Among the many variants of PSVs, our work focus on optimizing value-based process verifier, which is able to balance short-term mistakes and long-term gains, i.e., achieve credit assignments (Setlur et al. 2024).

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Modeling Math Reasoning as an MDP

Given a question q , the answer generation process of LLM π can be broken down into several non-overlapped reasoning

steps. The atomic reasoning step can be a single line that is split by delimiters like “\n” (Lightman et al. 2024), sentence separated by supporting clauses (OpenAI 2025), or implicitly reflect (Shinn et al. 2023) on their past reasoning steps and do inner-monologue (Huang et al. 2022) with sentences that start with “wait”.

The reasoning process can thus be conceptualized as an MDP $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \gamma \rangle$, where the state $s_t \in \mathcal{S}$ denotes the concatenation of the question and the partial reasoning trace already generated by timestep $t - 1$ and $s_1 = q$ as the initial state. The action $a_t = \pi(\cdot | s_t) \in \mathcal{A}$ represents that for any time step t , the reasoning step a_t is generated by π given current state s_t . The state transition \mathcal{T} is deterministic in math reasoning scenario, as the state transition from state s_t to s_{t+1} is accomplished through a simple operation of concatenation. The reward \mathcal{R} is often outcome-based, where for each intermediate reasoning step, the reward is set to 0, as a common practice in previous studies (Wang et al. 2024; Lightman et al. 2024). Let T be the terminal state, the reward can be represented as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}(s_t, a_t) = \begin{cases} 1 & t = T \wedge [s_t; a_t] \text{ is correct} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

and the discount factor γ is set to 1.

The state value $V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}[G_t | S_t = s]$ is the expectation of the return G_t given state s , where return $G_t = \sum_{i=0}^T \gamma^i R_{t+i}$. The state-action value $Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[G_t | S_t = s, A_t = a]$ is the expectation of the return G_t when taking action a at state s . The state value $V^\pi(s)$ can be expressed as the expected value of $Q^\pi(s, a)$ under the policy π :

$$V^\pi(s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a | s) \cdot Q^\pi(s, a). \quad (2)$$

Following the MDP settings in math reasoning scenario, the return G_t depends on the outcome reward only:

$$G_t = \sum_{i=0}^T \gamma^i R_{t+i} = R_T, \quad (3)$$

which allows for an estimation of state value $V^\pi(s)$ via MC estimation that sampling different returns under the state s :

$$\begin{aligned} V^\pi(s) &= \mathbb{E}[G_t | S_t = s] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[R_T | S_t = s] \\ &\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau^{(i)} \sim \pi(\cdot | s)} [R_T^{(i)} | s, \tau^{(i)}], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\tau^{(i)}$ is the i -th trajectory sampled under π at state s .

3.2 Value-based Process Verifier

A value-based process verifier $f_\theta : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is trained to estimate $Q^\pi(s, a)$ for each intermediate or final state, acting as a surrogate for expensive MC sampling during the reasoning process, which is commonly used in previous studies (Snell et al. 2025; Luo et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2024).

Given state s and action a , we use policy π to acquire the estimated state-action value $\hat{Q}^\pi(s, a)$ by MC estimation.

Then an offline dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{s, a, \hat{Q}^\pi(s, a)\}$ is collected to train the value-based process verifier.

The value-based process verifier can be trained to model the return distribution of Q^π based on the binary support set $\{0, 1\}$. The verifier is then optimized by minimizing a soft Binary Cross-Entropy (BCE) loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{bce}(f_\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(s, a, \hat{Q}^\pi(s, a)) \sim \mathcal{D}} [-\hat{Q}^\pi(s, a) \log f_\theta(s, a)], \quad (5)$$

where $f_\theta(s, a) = 0 \cdot \mathbb{P}_\theta(y = 0 | s, a) + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}_\theta(y = 1 | s, a)$. As an alternative to the soft BCE loss, the value-based process verifier can be trained to predict value directly by minimizing a Mean-Squared Error (MSE) loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{mse}(f_\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(s, a, \hat{Q}^\pi(s, a)) \sim \mathcal{D}} [f_\theta(s, a) - \hat{Q}^\pi(s, a)]^2, \quad (6)$$

where $f_\theta(s, a)$ is a regression model that predicts $Q^\pi(s, a)$ directly. We provide more details in Appendix B.1.

4 Methodology

In this section, we start with an introduction about the statistics properties of MC estimation, which is used to estimate $Q^\pi(s, a)$ in every intermediate reasoning steps. Then, we formally introduce ComMCS, our variance reduction method that utilizing **Compound Monte Carlo Sampling** results, which aims at reducing the estimation variance while maintaining the unbiasedness property. Furthermore, we introduce the practical implementation of ComMCS by modeling value distribution of next state-action value distribution. All proofs are provided in Appendix A.

4.1 Analysis about MC Estimation

The following theorem holds under current MDP condition:

Theorem 4.1. (Equivalence of MC Value Estimation for Binary Returns and Binomial Distribution) *Suppose the minimal support set of the return distribution is $\{0, 1\}$. Let $V^\pi(s)$ be the true state value for given policy π , i.e., the expected return starting from state s and policy π . Suppose we estimate $V^\pi(s)$ via MC estimation, i.e.,*

- *Simulating N independent episodes starting from state s and following policy π .*
- *For each episode $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, observing the realized return $G^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}$.*
- *Estimating the value $V^\pi(s)$ as the empirical average of the observed returns: $\hat{V}^\pi(s) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N G^{(i)}$.*

Then, the MC estimation process is probabilistically equivalent to sampling from a binomial distribution, where the probability of success is $p = V^\pi(s)$ and the number of trials is N . Specifically, the sum of observed returns, $\sum_{i=1}^N G^{(i)}$, follows a binomial distribution $B(N, V^\pi(s))$.

The equivalence allows us to analyze the properties of MC estimation under a predefined distribution class, which is the binomial distribution class. Given the number of trials N and the true state value $V^\pi(s)$, define X as the sum of N Bernoulli trials, the expectation of MC estimation is

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}^\pi(s)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{X}{N}\right] = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[X] = V^\pi(s), \quad (7)$$




Figure 2: Illustration of our proposed **ComMCS** compared with baseline optimization methods, as discussed in § 4. Given any reasoning trajectory, the trajectory can be divided into several reasoning steps (top left). The value of each reasoning step is estimated by Monte Carlo sampling, which is the average sum of the outcome reward of each reasoning trajectory (top right, § 4.1). ①: Baseline optimization methods use MSE loss or BCE loss. These methods are based on regression and return distribution modeling respectively, which are trained on the estimated value of current state, i.e., $\hat{V}^\pi(s_n)$. ②: Our method, aiming at reducing the variance when perform MC estimation, is based on variance comparison (§ 4.2) and one-step value distribution modeling (§ 4.3), and is trained on the estimated value of current state and next state, i.e., $\hat{V}^\pi(s_n)$ and $\hat{V}^\pi(s_{n+1})$.

and the variance of MC estimation is

$$\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}^\pi(s)] = \mathbb{V}\left[\frac{X}{N}\right] = \frac{V^\pi(s) \cdot (1 - V^\pi(s))}{N}. \quad (8)$$

As the expectation of MC estimation is exactly $V^\pi(s)$, the estimation is unbiased. The variance of MC estimation is effected by the number of trials N and state value $V^\pi(s)$. For math reasoning scenario, the number of trials are restricted due to the high cost of LLM inference, which result in the unneglectable estimation error and inferior performance of models trained on the estimated values (Zhang et al. 2025b; Chen et al. 2025). However, it is difficult to reduce the variance while maintaining the unbiasedness, which is due to the MVUE property of MC estimation.

Theorem 4.2. (Optimality of the MC Estimator) *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) random variables following a Bernoulli distribution with parameter p , i.e.,*

$$X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p), i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Define the MC estimator as the sample mean: $\hat{p}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then, the MC estimator is the Minimum Variance Unbiased Estimator (MVUE).

The theorem implies that MC estimation achieves the minimum variance among all unbiased estimators, given the limited information (i.e., number of trials) defined by Fisher Information in Appendix A.2. In the following section, we introduce our approach towards reducing the variance of value estimation while maintaining the unbiasedness

of MC estimation by incorporating additional unbiased information, which is inspired by Temporal Difference (TD).

4.2 Variance Reduction via Compound Sampling

We now formally derive ComMCS, our variance reduction method that reduces the estimation variance while maintain the unbiasedness property. To put it simply, we try to compound the MC results of multiple steps as additional information to reduce the variance of the MC estimation of current step. We start with the Bellman Equation between state-action value $Q^\pi(s, a)$ and next state value $V^\pi(s')$ under deterministic transition scenario:

$$Q^\pi(s, a) = R(s, a) + \gamma V^\pi(s'), \quad (9)$$

where s' the next state transited from current state s and action a . Under the MDP condition defined in §3.1, the above expression can be further simplified assuming $V^\pi(s') = R(s')$ when s' being the terminal state:

$$Q^\pi(s, a) = V^\pi(s'). \quad (10)$$

Combining Eq. (2) and Eq. (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} V^\pi(s_n) &= \sum_{a_n \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a_n | s_n) \cdot V^\pi(s_{n+1}) \\ &= \sum_{[a_n; \dots; a_m] \in \mathcal{A}^{m-n+1}} \prod_{i=0}^{m-n} \pi(a_{n+i} | s_{n+i}) V^\pi(s_m) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi[V^\pi(s_m | s_n)], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where s_m is the m -th state subsequent to the current state s_n . The above equation implies that we are able to estimate the value of current step (i.e., $V^\pi(s_n)$) through MC sampling from any future step (e.g., $V^\pi(s_m|s_n)$). We can also estimate $V^\pi(s_n)$ through the linear combination of MC estimations based on several future steps. Let $\{c_i\}$ be the coefficients of different expectations with $\sum_i c_i = 1$, we have

$$V^\pi(s_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\{c_i\}|} c_i \cdot \mathbb{E}_\pi[V^\pi(s_{n+i}|s_n)]. \quad (12)$$

The MC estimation via Eq. (12) is an unbiased estimation due to the linear additivity of expectations.

Let σ_n^2 be the variance of a Bernoulli distribution with parameter $p = V^\pi(s_n)$. We can rewrite the variance of MC estimation at state s and policy π , given Eq. (8) and the total number of trials N :

$$\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}^\pi(s_n)] = \frac{1}{N} \sigma_n^2, \quad (13)$$

and rewrite the compound variance when estimating $V^\pi(s_n)$ via the linear combination of MC estimations of several future steps into the expression introduced in Theorem 4.3.

Theorem 4.3. (Compound variance of MC estimation) *Following c_i , σ_n^2 defined in Eq. (12) and (13). Let V_n , \hat{V}_n be the true value and the MC estimated value under state s_n , $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m}|s_n]$ be the compound variance when estimating V_n by the linear combination of the MC estimations of states from s_n to s_m conditioned on state s_n . The variance $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m}|s_n]$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m}|s_n] &= \sum_{i=n}^m c_i^2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2|s_n] + \mathbb{V}[V_i|s_n] \right) \\ &+ \sum_{n < i < j \leq m} 2c_i c_j \text{Cov}[\hat{V}_i, \hat{V}_j|s_n]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

To achieve that the compound variance is lower than the variance of MC estimation of current step, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_n|s_n] > \mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m}|s_n], \quad (15)$$

we need to model the value distribution of future states, and adjust the parameter c_i heuristically, which is theoretically intractable but can be practically approximated.

4.3 One-step Value Distribution Modeling

In this section, we provide a practically tractable approximation method to model the compound variance $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m}|s_n]$ and optimizing value-based process verifier.

Theorem 4.3 implies that for any subsequent states, the covariance should be accounted for due to shared dependencies from previous reasoning steps. Let $m = n + 1$, $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m}|s_n]$ can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m}|s_n] &= \sum_{i=n}^m c_i^2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2|s_n] + \mathbb{V}[V_i|s_n] \right) \\ &= c_n^2 \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sigma_n^2 + c_m^2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_m^2|s_n] + \mathbb{V}[V_m|s_n] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and the covariance term is 0 as proved in Appendix A.3. We focus on the case where $m = n + 1$ in the following part.

One-step Value Distribution. First of all, we introduce the definition of one-step value distribution.

Definition 4.4. (One-step Value Distribution) Given state s_n and policy π , the one-step value distribution $DV_1(s_n)$ is a continuous distribution within the interval $[0, 1]$. The cumulative distribution function of $DV_1(s_n)$ satisfies

$$F_X(b) - F_X(a) = \sum_{a_n \in \mathcal{A}'} \pi(a_n|s_n), \quad (17)$$

where \mathcal{A}' satisfies $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \forall a_n \in \mathcal{A}', Q^\pi(s_n, a_n) &\in (a, b], \\ \forall a_n \in \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}', Q^\pi(s_n, a_n) &\notin (a, b]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$DV_1(s_n)$ measures the distribution of next state value given current state s_n , whose expectation is exact $V^\pi(s_n)$. We can represent the expectation of variance $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_m^2|s_n]$ and the variance of expectation $\mathbb{V}[V_m|s_n]$ in Eq. (16) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_m^2|s_n] &= \int_0^1 f_X^{(n)}(x) \cdot x(1-x) dx \\ \mathbb{V}[V_m|s_n] &= \int_0^1 f_X^{(n)}(x) \cdot (x - V_n)^2 dx, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $X \sim DV_1(s_n)$, $f_X^{(n)}(x)$ is the probability density function of $DV_1(s_n)$. However, it is difficult to model the continuous distribution parametrically.

Categorical Distribution Approximation. We introduce the categorical distribution Z as a parametric approximation of the true value distribution $DV_1(s_n)$ under mild assumptions. We follow the definition of categorical distribution in (Farebrother et al. 2024), and project $DV_1(s_n)$ onto a histogram with bins of width $\xi = 1/|Z|$. These bins are centered at z_i , and the probabilities p_i for each bin are obtained by integrating over the interval $[z_i - \xi/2, z_i + \xi/2]$:

$$p_i = \int_{z_i - \xi/2}^{z_i + \xi/2} f_X^{(n)}(x) dx. \quad (20)$$

The locations $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^{|Z|}$ are evenly distributed within the interval $[0, 1]$. The Dirac delta function δ_{z_i} is defined as $\delta_{z_i} = z_i$.

The categorical distribution is equivalent to $DV_1(s_n)$ when the number of intervals satisfying $m \rightarrow \infty$. When m is limited, we make the assumption that for any action a_i whose state-action value $Q^\pi(s_n, a_i)$ lies within the interval $[z_i - \xi/2, z_i + \xi/2]$, $Q^\pi(s_t, a_i)$ is approximately equal to the bin center z_i . This approximation allows us to convert statistical expectations over the continuous value distribution into discrete summations over the categorical bins. Specifically, Eq. (19) can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_m^2|s_n] &= \sum_{i=1}^{|Z|} p_i \cdot z_i(1 - z_i) \\ \mathbb{V}[V_m|s_n] &= \sum_{i=1}^{|Z|} p_i \cdot (z_i - V_n)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

and then the variance $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m}|s_n]$ can be estimated. Our goal is to model one-step categorical distribution, as an approximation to the one-step value distribution, which is the optimization objective of the value-based process verifier f_θ .

Practical Verifier Optimization. We estimate the categorical distribution by assuming it belongs to a specific distribution class, specifically the Gaussian distribution. We provide an empirical analysis about the reasonableness of the Gaussian approximation in Appendix C.1. This assumption allows us to model the distribution effectively with limited sampled data. More precisely, we estimate the distribution’s first moment (mean) to be the linear combination of $\hat{V}^\pi(s_n)$ and $\hat{V}^\pi(s_{n+1})$, as introduced in previous section. Subsequently, the distribution’s second moment (variance) is estimated by using the difference between $\hat{V}^\pi(s_{n+1})$ and the calculated first moment for the standard deviation.

To determine the appropriate coefficients that satisfies Eq. (15), we employ a heuristic search over a predefined set of candidate coefficients, where we need to estimate $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_n|s_n]$ and $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow n+1}|s_n]$ respectively. Firstly, $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_n|s_n]$ is obtained by treating the MC estimation of $V^\pi(s_n)$ as an approximation of the true $V^\pi(s_n)$, and then applying the operation defined in Eq. (8). Secondly, $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow n+1}|s_n]$ is estimated by first deriving $DV_1(s_n)$ from the output of the value-based process verifier f_θ , and then performing the operations defined in Eq. (16) and Eq. (21). After all, the heuristic search will find the coefficients that satisfies Eq. (15). If no coefficient from the predefined set satisfies the criterion, the estimated state value remains to be \hat{V}_n , aiming at preventing the potential variance increase.

We then proceed to obtain a Gaussian distribution using the updated state value $\hat{V}^\pi(s_n)$ and the estimated state-action value $\hat{Q}^\pi(s_n, a_n)$. This Gaussian distribution is then mapped to the categorical distribution Z following the methodology as introduced in Eq. (20). The value-based verifier is optimized using a cross-entropy loss function, defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ce} = -\mathbb{E}_{(s_n, a_n) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{Z}|} f_\theta(z_i|s_n, a_n) \log p(z_i|s_n, a_n) \right],$$

where $p(z_i|s, a)$ is the probability of the categorical distribution Z at a specific location z_i and $f_\theta(z_i|s_n, a_n)$ denotes the output probability of the value-based process verifier at location z_i . To provide a clear image, we illustrate the variance reduction method and practical implementation in Figure 2 and Algorithm 1, as presented in Appendix A.4.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Settings

Tasks. We conduct experiments using the test split of two widely used math reasoning datasets: GSM8K (Cobbe et al. 2021) and MATH-500 (Lightman et al. 2024). Besides, we test our method on different base models across different model families: Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct (Yang et al. 2025) and Deepseek-math-7b-instruct (Shao et al. 2024). Following (Wang et al. 2024), the generator in our experiments is LLemma-7b (Azerbayev et al. 2024).

Baselines. For variants trained on different objective functions, we include the return distribution modeling method that trained on BCE loss (V_{BCE} , (Wang et al. 2024)), and

regression method that trained on MSE loss (V_{MSE} , (Lu et al. 2024)). For variants trained to modeling value distribution (V_{CE}) and with or without the variance reduction technique, we include the results of verifiers trained on cross-entropy loss only. We present more details in Appendix B.1.

Implementation Details. We train our generator first, then construct a dataset of 180,000 samples. In the training phase, we use 180,000 sampled solutions to train different verifiers for one epoch with a learning rate set to 2×10^{-6} . More details are provided in Appendix B.2.

Evaluation Metrics. Following Lightman et al. (2024); Wang et al. (2024); Lu et al. (2024), we conduct Best-of-N (BoN) sampling and beam search experiments as an evaluation of our method. We provide more details about evaluation metrics in Appendix B.3.

5.2 Results

We present the comparable performances of models trained with different methods for BoN sampling and beam search experiments in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. Our observations are as follows: **(1) Modeling value distribution is a meaningful replacement to methods that modeling return distribution, or regression.** The verifier trained on CE loss shows competitive performance in most cases, compared with that trained on BCE and MSE. For instance, V_{CE} based on Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct outperforms V_{MSE} and V_{BCE} on MATH-500 dataset in some cases. We also observe that V_{MSE} and V_{BCE} outperforms V_{CE} based on Deepseek-math-7b-instruct on MATH-500 dataset, showing that the value distribution modeling is not a complete upper-level replacement to modeling return distribution or performing regression. We also observe that V_{CE} outperforms V_{BCE} and V_{MSE} after performing ComMCS in most cases, showing that the value distribution modeling method can be further improved. **(2) Our variance reduction method improves value distribution modeling without additional LLM inference overhead.** We observe a consistent improvement after applying our variance reduction method when comparing the varieties of V_{CE} with or without using ComMCS in different tasks and different settings. The results show that the practical approximations we introduced in §4.3 is tolerable. We note that a similar performance for V_{CE} varieties based on Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct on MATH-500 dataset. We contribute the phenomenon as the limited accuracy of our distribution approximation and heuristic search method regarding to the coefficients, and thus there is still room for further optimization in terms of value distribution approximation. Similar results can also be observed in the beam search experiments.

6 Analysis and Discussions

6.1 Comparison between Static and Dynamic Coefficients

We conduct a further analysis of the coefficients of linear combination in our method. Specifically, we compare different coefficient selection strategies, including static coefficients ranging from $\{0.9, 0.99, 1.0\}$ and dynamic coeffi-

Method	MATH-500					GSM8K				
	8	16	32	64	128	8	16	32	64	128
Oracle	29.8	35.8	40.4	45.7	49.6	89.4	92.6	94.3	95.9	96.8
Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct										
V_{MSE}	24.2	26.8	28.6	29.8	30.6	85.1	87.3	88.5	89.8	90.4
V_{BCE}	24.2	26.6	28.4	30.4	31.4	85.6	87.4	88.2	89.5	90.0
V_{CE} w/o ComMCS (ours)	24.6	27.0	29.0	29.4	31.6	85.4	87.6	88.2	89.5	90.3
V_{CE} w/ ComMCS (ours)	24.4	27.2	29.0	30.6	31.8	85.7	88.0	88.6	90.3	91.1
Deepseek-math-7b-instruct										
V_{MSE}	21.0	23.2	23.0	23.6	24.4	82.1	82.8	83.5	83.6	83.5
V_{BCE}	21.8	23.6	23.6	24.2	25.8	82.8	84.6	84.9	85.4	85.6
V_{CE} w/o ComMCS (ours)	21.0	23.0	23.6	24.8	25.0	83.2	84.5	84.7	85.1	85.4
V_{CE} w/ ComMCS (ours)	21.4	24.4	25.8	26.2	26.6	83.5	85.1	85.1	86.6	86.6

Table 1: Performance of Best-of-N sampling on MATH-500 and GSM8K with different base models. The results are reported as the average accuracy across three random seeds. 8, 16, 32, 64, 128 denote the accuracy with Best-of-8/16/32/64/128, respectively. The oracle results are calculated as whether there is correct answer in the sampled N answers. V_{MSE} denotes verifiers trained with mean-squared error loss. V_{BCE} denotes verifiers trained with soft binary cross entropy loss. V_{CE} denotes verifiers trained with cross entropy loss, with (w/) or without (w/o) our method (ComMCS). The best results are marked as **bold**. All results are passed with significance test ($p < .05$).

Method	MATH-500	GSM8K
Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct		
V_{MSE}	56.0	88.2
V_{BCE}	55.2	88.6
V_{CE} w/o ComMCS (ours)	56.4	88.1
V_{CE} w/ ComMCS (ours)	57.8	88.9
Deepseek-math-7b-instruct		
V_{MSE}	42.6	81.0
V_{BCE}	46.8	84.7
V_{CE} w/o ComMCS (ours)	46.4	84.7
V_{CE} w/ ComMCS (ours)	47.2	84.8

Table 2: Performance of Beam Search sampling on MATH-500 and GSM8K with different base models. The results are reported as the average accuracy across three random seeds. The beam size of our experiments is set as 8.

CoefficientSetting	MATH-500				
	8	16	32	64	128
Oracle	29.8	35.8	40.4	45.7	49.6
Deepseek-math-7b-instruct					
Static (0.9)	21.0	23.2	25.8	25.8	25.8
Static (0.99)	21.4	23.8	25.2	25.8	25.6
Static (1.0)	21.0	23.0	23.6	24.8	25.0
Dynamic	21.4	24.4	25.8	26.2	26.6

Table 3: Performance of Best-of-N sampling on MATH-500 with different coefficient settings. The results are reported as the average accuracy across three random seeds. “Static” denotes using a fixed coefficient during the training loop, while “Dynamic” denotes using different coefficient that is decided by the variance comparison during the training loop.

Method	Δ	MATH-500				
		8	16	32	64	128
Deepseek-math-7b-instruct						
V_{CE} w/o ComMCS	1σ	21.0	23.0	23.6	24.8	25.0
V_{CE} w/ ComMCS	1σ	21.4	24.4	25.8	26.2	26.6
V_{CE} w/o ComMCS	2σ	21.6	24.2	24.6	24.8	24.6
V_{CE} w/ ComMCS	2σ	22.0	23.0	25.2	25.4	25.2
V_{CE} w/o ComMCS	3σ	21.6	24.2	24.6	25.4	24.8
V_{CE} w/ ComMCS	3σ	21.8	24.8	25.6	25.8	25.3

Table 4: Performance of Best-of-N sampling on MATH-500 with different scales. The results are reported as the average accuracy across three random seeds. Δ denotes the difference between the MC estimation of $V^\pi(s_n)$ (for static methods) or the updated estimation of $V^\pi(s_n)$ (for dynamic methods) and the MC estimation of $Q^\pi(s_n, a_n)$.

cients that are derived from heuristic search as introduced in Algorithm 1. We report the BoN results in Table 3. We observe that the verifier trained with dynamic coefficient shows a consistent improvement compared with those trained with static methods. In contrast, the performance between different static coefficients varies. We conclude that: **(1) Different estimation variance can result in different performances.** Although all the labels of the training dataset were obtained through unbiased estimation, the estimation variances in different experiments were not the same. The varying variances directly lead to the differences in experimental results. **(2) The optimal coefficient is not static.** Our experimental results show that the performance of models trained with different static coefficients can produce mutually competitive results under different experimental conditions. As implied by Theorem 4.3, the variance of linear combination of several reasoning steps is influenced by the value distributions of each states and the coefficients. Given the coefficient to

be static, it cannot take into account the differences between value distributions and thus cannot result in a minimal estimation variance for different value estimations. **(3) The dynamic coefficient works.** Through variance modeling and variance comparison, our distribution modeling and variance estimation method can help to achieve a better estimation while maintaining the condition of unbiased estimation.

6.2 Comparison between Different Value Distribution Hypothesis

We conduct a further analysis of our distribution hypothesis and the generalization ability of our method under different distributions. Specifically, we regard the difference between $\hat{V}^\pi(s_n)$ and $\hat{Q}^\pi(s_n, a_n)$ to be one, two or three standard deviations, which means that 68%, 95% or 99.7% of all sampled values are within the range of $[\hat{V}^\pi(s_n) - \hat{Q}^\pi(s_n, a_n), \hat{V}^\pi(s_n) + \hat{Q}^\pi(s_n, a_n)]$. When more standard deviations are used for estimation, the sampled $\hat{Q}^\pi(s_n, a_n)$ will be treated as a value that is more distant from distribution center, which makes the estimated distribution acute.

We report the BoN results in Table 4. We find that after variance reduction, the verifiers can achieve better performances compared with their baselines that trained without variance reduction in most cases. The result shows that under different distribution hypothesis, our method can provide a stable improvement without additional LLM inference cost, which reveals the generalization ability and solidness of our method.

7 Conclusion and Discussion

In this work, We introduced ComMCS, a theoretically-grounded method that reduce the estimation variance when performing MC estimations for the training annotations of value-base process verifiers without additional LLM inference cost. Utilizing the linear combination of MC estimations of current step and its subsequent step, we refine the state value of current step heuristically while maintaining the unbiased property of MC estimation. Our experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our method across various math reasoning tasks, outperforming existing value-based verifier optimization methods like MSE and BCE. Through detailed analysis, we highlight the effect of variance reduction and variance modeling. We also note that there are some potential limitations of our method. Firstly, our method relies on the Gaussian distribution hypothesis. While effective in practice, our method may not hold for all tasks or distributions. Secondly, applying ComMCS to other reasoning domains, such as code generation, presents an exciting avenue for research. We hope that our approach contributes valuable insights to the field of MC estimation optimization and value-based process verifier optimization.

References

Azerbayev, Z.; Schoelkopf, H.; Paster, K.; Santos, M. D.; McAleer, S. M.; Jiang, A. Q.; Deng, J.; Biderman, S.; and Welleck, S. 2024. Llemma: An Open Language Model for Mathematics. In *The Twelfth International Conference on*

Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024. OpenReview.net.

Chen, W.; He, W.; Xi, Z.; Guo, H.; Hong, B.; Zhang, J.; Zheng, R.; Li, N.; Gui, T.; Li, Y.; Zhang, Q.; and Huang, X. 2025. Better Process Supervision with Bi-directional Rewarding Signals. *CoRR*, abs/2503.04618.

Cobbe, K.; Kosaraju, V.; Bavarian, M.; Chen, M.; Jun, H.; Kaiser, L.; Plappert, M.; Tworek, J.; Hilton, J.; Nakano, R.; Hesse, C.; and Schulman, J. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. *CoRR*, abs/2110.14168.

Dubey, A.; Jauhri, A.; Pandey, A.; Kadian, A.; Al-Dahle, A.; Letman, A.; Mathur, A.; Schelten, A.; Yang, A.; Fan, A.; Goyal, A.; Hartshorn, A.; Yang, A.; Mitra, A.; Sra-vankumar, A.; Korenev, A.; Hinsvark, A.; Rao, A.; Zhang, A.; Rodriguez, A.; Gregerson, A.; Spataru, A.; Rozière, B.; Biron, B.; Tang, B.; Chern, B.; Caucheteux, C.; Nayak, C.; Bi, C.; Marra, C.; McConnell, C.; Keller, C.; Touret, C.; Wu, C.; Wong, C.; Ferrer, C. C.; Nikolaidis, C.; Allonsius, D.; Song, D.; Pintz, D.; Livshits, D.; Esiobu, D.; Choudhary, D.; Mahajan, D.; Garcia-Olano, D.; Perino, D.; Hupkes, D.; Lakomkin, E.; AlBadawy, E.; Lobanova, E.; Dinan, E.; Smith, E. M.; Radenovic, F.; Zhang, F.; Synnaeve, G.; Lee, G.; Anderson, G. L.; Nail, G.; Mialon, G.; Pang, G.; Cucurell, G.; Nguyen, H.; Korevaar, H.; Xu, H.; Touvron, H.; Zarov, I.; Ibarra, I. A.; Kloumann, I. M.; Misra, I.; Evtimov, I.; Copet, J.; Lee, J.; Geffert, J.; Vranes, J.; Park, J.; Mahadeokar, J.; Shah, J.; van der Linde, J.; Billoock, J.; Hong, J.; Lee, J.; Fu, J.; Chi, J.; Huang, J.; Liu, J.; Wang, J.; Yu, J.; Bitton, J.; Spisak, J.; Park, J.; Rocca, J.; Johnstun, J.; Saxe, J.; Jia, J.; Alwala, K. V.; Upasani, K.; Plawiak, K.; Li, K.; Heafield, K.; Stone, K.; and et al. 2024. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. *CoRR*, abs/2407.21783.

Farebrother, J.; Orbay, J.; Vuong, Q.; Taïga, A. A.; Chebotar, Y.; Xiao, T.; Irpan, A.; Levine, S.; Castro, P. S.; Faust, A.; Kumar, A.; and Agarwal, R. 2024. Stop Regressing: Training Value Functions via Classification for Scalable Deep RL. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net.

Hendrycks, D.; Burns, C.; Kadavath, S.; Arora, A.; Basart, S.; Tang, E.; Song, D.; and Steinhardt, J. 2021. Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset. In Vanschoren, J.; and Yeung, S., eds., *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1, NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks 2021, December 2021, virtual*.

Huang, W.; Xia, F.; Xiao, T.; Chan, H.; Liang, J.; Florence, P.; Zeng, A.; Tompson, J.; Mordatch, I.; Chebotar, Y.; et al. 2022. Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05608*.

Hurst, A.; Lerer, A.; Goucher, A. P.; Perelman, A.; Ramesh, A.; Clark, A.; Ostrow, A.; Welihinda, A.; Hayes, A.; Radford, A.; Madry, A.; Baker-Whitcomb, A.; Beutel, A.; Borzunov, A.; Carney, A.; Chow, A.; Kirillov, A.; Nichol, A.; Paino, A.; Renzin, A.; Passos, A. T.; Kirillov, A.; Christakis, A.; Conneau, A.; Kamali, A.; Jabri, A.; Moyer, A.;

- Tam, A.; Crookes, A.; Tootoonchian, A.; Kumar, A.; Val-lone, A.; Karpathy, A.; Braunstein, A.; Cann, A.; Codispoti, A.; Galu, A.; Kondrich, A.; Tulloch, A.; Mishchenko, A.; Baek, A.; Jiang, A.; Pelisse, A.; Woodford, A.; Gosalia, A.; Dhar, A.; Pantuliano, A.; Nayak, A.; Oliver, A.; Zoph, B.; Ghorbani, B.; Leimberger, B.; Rossen, B.; Sokolowsky, B.; Wang, B.; Zweig, B.; Hoover, B.; Samic, B.; McGrew, B.; Spero, B.; Giertler, B.; Cheng, B.; Lightcap, B.; Walkin, B.; Quinn, B.; Guarraci, B.; Hsu, B.; Kellogg, B.; Eastman, B.; Lugaresi, C.; Wainwright, C. L.; Bassin, C.; Hudson, C.; Chu, C.; Nelson, C.; Li, C.; Shern, C. J.; Conger, C.; Barette, C.; Voss, C.; Ding, C.; Lu, C.; Zhang, C.; Beaumont, C.; Hal-lacy, C.; Koch, C.; Gibson, C.; Kim, C.; Choi, C.; McLeavey, C.; Hesse, C.; Fischer, C.; Winter, C.; Czarnecki, C.; Jarvis, C.; Wei, C.; Koumouzelis, C.; and Sherburn, D. 2024. GPT-4o System Card. *CoRR*, abs/2410.21276.
- Li, Y.; Lin, Z.; Zhang, S.; Fu, Q.; Chen, B.; Lou, J.-G.; and Chen, W. 2023. Making language models better reasoners with step-aware verifier. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 5315–5333.
- Lightman, H.; Kosaraju, V.; Burda, Y.; Edwards, H.; Baker, B.; Lee, T.; Leike, J.; Schulman, J.; Sutskever, I.; and Cobbe, K. 2024. Let’s Verify Step by Step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Lu, J.; Dou, Z.; Wang, H.; Cao, Z.; Dai, J.; Feng, Y.; and Guo, Z. 2024. AutoPSV: Automated Process-Supervised Verifier. In Globersons, A.; Mackey, L.; Belgrave, D.; Fan, A.; Paquet, U.; Tomczak, J. M.; and Zhang, C., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, December 10 - 15, 2024*.
- Luo, H.; Sun, Q.; Xu, C.; Zhao, P.; Lou, J.; Tao, C.; Geng, X.; Lin, Q.; Chen, S.; Tang, Y.; and Zhang, D. 2025. Wizard-Math: Empowering Mathematical Reasoning for Large Language Models via Reinforced Evol-Instruct. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net.
- Luo, L.; Liu, Y.; Liu, R.; Phatale, S.; Lara, H.; Li, Y.; Shu, L.; Zhu, Y.; Meng, L.; Sun, J.; and Rastogi, A. 2024. Improve Mathematical Reasoning in Language Models by Automated Process Supervision. *CoRR*, abs/2406.06592.
- OpenAI. 2025. o3-mini System Card. Accessed: 2025-01-31.
- Qin, C.; Zhang, A.; Chen, C.; Dagar, A.; and Ye, W. 2024. In-Context Learning with Iterative Demonstration Selection. In Al-Onaizan, Y.; Bansal, M.; and Chen, Y.-N., eds., *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, 7441–7455. Miami, Florida, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Setlur, A.; Garg, S.; Geng, X.; Garg, N.; Smith, V.; and Kumar, A. 2024. RL on incorrect synthetic data scales the efficiency of llm math reasoning by eight-fold. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37: 43000–43031.
- Shao, Z.; Wang, P.; Zhu, Q.; Xu, R.; Song, J.; Zhang, M.; Li, Y. K.; Wu, Y.; and Guo, D. 2024. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models. *CoRR*, abs/2402.03300.
- Shinn, N.; Cassano, F.; Gopinath, A.; Narasimhan, K.; and Yao, S. 2023. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 8634–8652.
- Snell, C. V.; Lee, J.; Xu, K.; and Kumar, A. 2025. Scaling LLM Test-Time Compute Optimally Can be More Effective than Scaling Parameters for Reasoning. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net.
- Uesato, J.; Kushman, N.; Kumar, R.; Song, H. F.; Siegel, N. Y.; Wang, L.; Creswell, A.; Irving, G.; and Higgins, I. 2022. Solving math word problems with process- and outcome-based feedback. *CoRR*, abs/2211.14275.
- Wang, P.; Li, L.; Chen, L.; Song, F.; Lin, B.; Cao, Y.; Liu, T.; and Sui, Z. 2023. Making Large Language Models Better Reasoners with Alignment. *CoRR*, abs/2309.02144.
- Wang, P.; Li, L.; Shao, Z.; Xu, R.; Dai, D.; Li, Y.; Chen, D.; Wu, Y.; and Sui, Z. 2024. Math-Shepherd: Verify and Reinforce LLMs Step-by-step without Human Annotations. In Ku, L.; Martins, A.; and Srikumar, V., eds., *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, *ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, 9426–9439. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wei, J.; Wang, X.; Schuurmans, D.; Bosma, M.; Ichter, B.; Xia, F.; Chi, E. H.; Le, Q. V.; and Zhou, D. 2022. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In Koyejo, S.; Mohamed, S.; Agarwal, A.; Belgrave, D.; Cho, K.; and Oh, A., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Wu, Z.; Hu, Y.; Shi, W.; Dziri, N.; Suhr, A.; Ammanabrolu, P.; Smith, N. A.; Ostendorf, M.; and Hajishirzi, H. 2023. Fine-grained human feedback gives better rewards for language model training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 59008–59033.
- Xi, Z.; Chen, W.; Hong, B.; Jin, S.; Zheng, R.; He, W.; Ding, Y.; Liu, S.; Guo, X.; Wang, J.; Guo, H.; Shen, W.; Fan, X.; Zhou, Y.; Dou, S.; Wang, X.; Zhang, X.; Sun, P.; Gui, T.; Zhang, Q.; and Huang, X. 2024. Training Large Language Models for Reasoning through Reverse Curriculum Reinforcement Learning. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Yang, A.; Yang, B.; Hui, B.; Zheng, B.; Yu, B.; Zhou, C.; Li, C.; Li, C.; Liu, D.; Huang, F.; Dong, G.; Wei, H.; Lin, H.; Tang, J.; Wang, J.; Yang, J.; Tu, J.; Zhang, J.; Ma, J.; Yang, J.; Xu, J.; Zhou, J.; Bai, J.; He, J.; Lin, J.; Dang, K.; Lu, K.; Chen, K.; Yang, K.; Li, M.; Xue, M.; Ni, N.; Zhang, P.; Wang, P.; Peng, R.; Men, R.; Gao, R.; Lin, R.; Wang, S.;

Bai, S.; Tan, S.; Zhu, T.; Li, T.; Liu, T.; Ge, W.; Deng, X.; Zhou, X.; Ren, X.; Zhang, X.; Wei, X.; Ren, X.; Liu, X.; Fan, Y.; Yao, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Wan, Y.; Chu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Cui, Z.; Zhang, Z.; Guo, Z.; and Fan, Z. 2024a. Qwen2 Technical Report. *CoRR*, abs/2407.10671.

Yang, A.; Yu, B.; Li, C.; Liu, D.; Huang, F.; Huang, H.; Jiang, J.; Tu, J.; Zhang, J.; Zhou, J.; Lin, J.; Dang, K.; Yang, K.; Yu, L.; Li, M.; Sun, M.; Zhu, Q.; Men, R.; He, T.; Xu, W.; Yin, W.; Yu, W.; Qiu, X.; Ren, X.; Yang, X.; Li, Y.; Xu, Z.; and Zhang, Z. 2025. Qwen2.5-1M Technical Report. *CoRR*, abs/2501.15383.

Yang, A.; Zhang, B.; Hui, B.; Gao, B.; Yu, B.; Li, C.; Liu, D.; Tu, J.; Zhou, J.; Lin, J.; Lu, K.; Xue, M.; Lin, R.; Liu, T.; Ren, X.; and Zhang, Z. 2024b. Qwen2.5-Math Technical Report: Toward Mathematical Expert Model via Self-Improvement. *CoRR*, abs/2409.12122.

Yu, L.; Jiang, W.; Shi, H.; Yu, J.; Liu, Z.; Zhang, Y.; Kwok, J. T.; Li, Z.; Weller, A.; and Liu, W. 2024. MetaMath: Bootstrap Your Own Mathematical Questions for Large Language Models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.

Zhang, L.; Hosseini, A.; Bansal, H.; Kazemi, M.; Kumar, A.; and Agarwal, R. 2025a. Generative Verifiers: Reward Modeling as Next-Token Prediction. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net.

Zhang, Z.; Zheng, C.; Wu, Y.; Zhang, B.; Lin, R.; Yu, B.; Liu, D.; Zhou, J.; and Lin, J. 2025b. The Lessons of Developing Process Reward Models in Mathematical Reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2501.07301.

Zheng, C.; Zhang, Z.; Zhang, B.; Lin, R.; Lu, K.; Yu, B.; Liu, D.; Zhou, J.; and Lin, J. 2024. ProcessBench: Identifying Process Errors in Mathematical Reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2412.06559.

Zhou, H.; Nova, A.; Larochelle, H.; Courville, A. C.; Neyshabur, B.; and Sedghi, H. 2022. Teaching Algorithmic Reasoning via In-context Learning. *CoRR*, abs/2211.09066.

A Proofs and Derivations

A.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. Define a random variable X representing the return from a single episode starting from state s using policy π . The range of X is $\{0, 1\}$. The probability mass function of X is:

$$\begin{aligned} P(X = 1) &= P(G_t = 1 | S_t = s; \pi) \\ P(X = 0) &= P(G_t = 0 | S_t = s; \pi) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Given the relationship between state value $V^\pi(s)$ and return G_t defined in Eq. (4), by the definition of the expectation of a discrete random variable:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X] &= 1 \cdot P(X = 1) + 0 \cdot P(X = 0) \\ &= 1 \cdot P(G_t = 1 | S_t = s; \pi) + 0 \cdot P(G_t = 0 | S_t = s; \pi) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[G_t | S_t = s; \pi] \\ &= V^\pi(s), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which means that for any single episode, the observed return $G^{(i)}$ is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter $p = V^\pi(s)$. Considering the MC estimation process. We simulate N independent episodes starting from state s and following policy π . This means we obtain N independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables: $\{G^{(i)}\}^N$, where each $G^{(i)} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(V^\pi(s))$.

Let K be the sum of these observed returns:

$$K = \sum_{i=1}^N G^{(i)}. \quad (24)$$

By the definition of a binomial distribution, for N i.i.d. Bernoulli trials with the same probability of success p , the total number of successes (K) follows a binomial distribution $B(N, p)$. In our case, the probability of success p equals to the state value $V^\pi(s)$, i.e.,

$$K \sim B(N, V^\pi(s)). \quad (25)$$

Finally, the MC estimate $\hat{V}^\pi(s)$ is defined as the empirical average:

$$\hat{V}^\pi(s) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N G^{(i)} = \frac{K}{N}, \quad (26)$$

which is probabilistically equivalent to sampling from the binomial distribution $B(N, V^\pi(s))$, and completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof. To prove that the MC estimator is the minimum variance unbiased estimator (MVUE), we will prove the unbiasedness and minimum variance properties respectively.

- Unbiasedness. According to Theorem 4.1, the MC estimation is probabilistically equivalent to sampling from the binomial distribution $B(N, V^\pi(s))$, where N is the number of trials. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}^\pi(s)] = \frac{1}{N} \cdot N \cdot V^\pi(s) = V^\pi(s), \quad (27)$$

which means the MC estimator is unbiased.

- Minimum Variance. To prove that the MC estimator has the minimum variance, we need to prove that the estimated $\hat{V}^\pi(s)$ achieves the Cramér-Rao lower bound (CRLB), which is the minimum of the variance of the unbiased estimator. First of all, the variance of the MC estimator is

$$\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}^\pi(s)] = \frac{V^\pi(s) \cdot (1 - V^\pi(s))}{N}. \quad (28)$$

Given the probability mass function of the Bernoulli distribution

$$f(X_i; p) = p^{X_i} (1 - p)^{1 - X_i}, \quad (29)$$

we have the logarithmic likelihood function

$$\ell(p; X_i) = X_i \log p + (1 - X_i) \log(1 - p) \quad (30)$$

and the score function, which is the derivative of the logarithmic likelihood function

$$\text{score}(p; X_i) = \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial p} = \frac{X_i}{p} - \frac{1 - X_i}{1 - p}. \quad (31)$$

We can thus calculate the Fisher Information:

$$\begin{aligned} I(p) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial p}\right)^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{X_i}{p} - \frac{1 - X_i}{1 - p}\right)^2\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] - 2 \frac{1}{p(1-p)} \mathbb{E}[X_i(1 - X_i)] + \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \mathbb{E}[(1 - X_i)^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] + \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \mathbb{E}[(1 - X_i)^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E}[X_i] + \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \mathbb{E}[(1 - X_i)] \\ &= \frac{1}{p^2} \cdot p + \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} \cdot (1-p) \\ &= \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{(1-p)} \\ &= \frac{1}{p(1-p)} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

For N i.i.d. trials, the Fisher Information is $N \cdot I(p) = \frac{N}{p(1-p)}$, and the CRLB is:

$$\text{CRLB} = \frac{1}{N \cdot I(p)} = \frac{p(1-p)}{N}. \quad (33)$$

The CRLB is equivalent to the the variance of the MC estimator in Eq. (28) when $p = V^\pi(s)$, which completes the proof of Theorem 4.2. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 4.3

Proof. Given state s_n , the variance $\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m} = \sum_{i=n}^m c_i \hat{V}_i$. For any i, j that satisfies $n < i < j \leq m$, \hat{V}_i and \hat{V}_j are not independent random variables given state s_n due to the shared dependencies from reasoning steps $\{a_n, a_{n+1}, \dots, a_{i-1}\}$. Then, both of the self-variance for each term and the covariance between any subsequent states should be accounted for to calculate $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m} | s_n]$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m} | s_n] &= \mathbb{V}\left[\sum_{i=n}^m c_i \hat{V}_i\right] \\ &= \sum_{i=n}^m c_i^2 \mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_i | s_n] + \sum_{n \leq i < j \leq m} 2c_i c_j \text{Cov}(\hat{V}_i, \hat{V}_j | s_n). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In the following part, we provide the expression of the self-variance and covariance respectively.

- Self-variance. $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_i | s_n]$ is the variance of \hat{V}_i given initial state s_n . To obtain the estimation \hat{V}_i , one should first sample the trajectory $s_n \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow s_i$ given policy π , then perform MC sampling N times given state s_i . Following the Law of Total Variance, we can rewrite the self-variance $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_i | s_n]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_i | s_n] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_i | s_i] | s_n] + \mathbb{V}[\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_i | s_i] | s_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sigma_i^2}{N} \mid s_n\right] + \mathbb{V}[V_i | s_n] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2 | s_n] + \mathbb{V}[V_i | s_n] \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where σ_i^2 follows the definition in Eq. (13).

- **Covariance.** $\text{Cov}(\hat{V}_i, \hat{V}_j | s_n)$ is the covariance between \hat{V}_i and \hat{V}_j given initial state s_n . As the MC sampling process starting from s_i and s_j are independent to each other, the covariance is derived from the dependency based on the shared reasoning steps starting from s_n to s_i .

Now, let's prove that when $i = n$, the covariance $\text{Cov}(\hat{V}_i, \hat{V}_j | s_n) = 0$.

Given $i = n$, for any $j = [n + 1, n + 2, \dots, m]$, the covariance

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{V}_i, \hat{V}_j | s_n) &= \mathbb{E}[(\hat{V}_n - \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_n | s_n])(\hat{V}_j - \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_j | s_n]) | s_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\hat{V}_n - V_n)(\hat{V}_j - V_n) | s_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_j | s_n} [\mathbb{E}[(\hat{V}_n - V_n)(\hat{V}_j - V_n) | s_n, s_j]]. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The last step is derived by the Law of Total Expectation. Given s_n and s_j , the conditional estimated value \hat{V}_n and \hat{V}_j are independent random variables, as the former is sampled from $\pi(\cdot | s_n)$ and the latter is sampled from $\pi(\cdot | s_j)$. As a result, the inner expectation $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{V}_n - V_n)(\hat{V}_j - V_n) | s_n, s_j]$ in Eq. (36) can be further simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{V}_n - V_n)(\hat{V}_j - V_n) | s_n, s_j] &= (\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_n - V_n | s_n, s_j]) \cdot (\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_j - V_n | s_n, s_j]) \\ &= (\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_n | s_n] - V_n) \cdot (\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_j | s_j] - V_n) \\ &= (V_n - V_n) \cdot (V_j - V_n) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Substituting the result into Eq. (36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{V}_n, \hat{V}_j | s_n) &= \mathbb{E}_{s_j | s_n} [\mathbb{E}[(\hat{V}_n - V_n)(\hat{V}_j - V_n) | s_n, s_j]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_j | s_n} [0] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Putting the result of self-variance and covariance together, the original statement Eq. (34) can be converted into

$$\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}_{n \rightarrow m} | s_n] = \sum_{i=n}^m c_i^2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2 | s_n] + \mathbb{V}[V_i | s_n] \right) + \sum_{n < i < j \leq m} 2c_i c_j \text{Cov}(\hat{V}_i, \hat{V}_j | s_n), \quad (39)$$

which is same as the expression in Theorem 4.3 and thus completes the proof. \square

A.4 Illustrating our Low-Cost Variance Reduction Method in §4

Firstly, we provide an example to demonstrate the mathematical reasoning task and the corresponding MDP condition in Figure 3 for better understanding. Then, we demonstrate our variance reduction method and the practical implementation in Figure 2 and Algorithm 1. The additional computational cost regarding to heuristic search and variance estimation can result to an increase in training time of less than 1%, as neither of the two parts of calculation involves model-related operations.

B Training and Evaluation Details

B.1 Baselines

BCE-based Implementation (V_{BCE} , (Wang et al. 2024)). As introduced in §3.2, verifiers trained on BCE loss model the binary return distribution. The estimated value of each state (intermediate or final) is computed as the expectation of this distribution, which corresponds to the bin value representing the probability of the return being equal to one. We implement V_{BCE} by adding a linear head on top of each base model. The linear head will transform the output hidden states into vectors of length 2, representing the binary return distribution. When performing value prediction, we use the bin value representing the probability of the return being equal to one as the estimate state value.

MSE-based Implementation (V_{MSE} , (Lu et al. 2024)). As introduced in §3.2, verifiers trained on MSE loss preform regression. We implement V_{MSE} by adding a special token, “<score>”, into the vocabulary of each base model. We then utilize the sigmoid function to transform the logits of the special token into a probability ranging 0 to 1.

CE-based Implementation (V_{CE}). Similar to V_{CE} , we add a linear head on top of each base model to model the categorical value distribution. We use the expectation of the categorical distribution to represent the estimated value of each state (intermediate or final), i.e., the weighted sum of the probabilities of all categories in the categorical distribution, where weights are evenly distributed within the range of 0 to 1. In all experiments, we set the number of categories to be 9 to represent value intervals $\{0, \frac{1}{8}, \dots, \frac{7}{8}, 1\}$, matching the range of MC estimation with 8 rollouts.

Question: Remmy wants to divide 10 by 2/3, but he cannot remember how to do that. By what number should he multiply 10 to get the answer?	$s_1 = q$
Solution: <u>To divide by a fraction, we can multiply by its reciprocal.</u> <request> $\hat{V}^\pi(s_2) = 0.317$	$s_2 = [s_1; a_1]$
So, to divide 10 by 2/3, we can multiply 10 by 3/2. <request> $\hat{V}^\pi(s_3) = 0.179$	$s_3 = [s_2; a_2]$
This gives us $10 \cdot 3/2 = (10 \cdot 3)/2 = 30/2 = \boxed{15}$. <request> $\hat{V}^\pi(s_4) = 0.0$	$s_4 = [s_3; a_3]$
The answer is: 15 <request> $\hat{V}^\pi(s_5) = 0.0$	$s_5 = [s_4; a_4]$

Figure 3: Illustration of the MC estimation of state value and the MDP condition in mathematical reasoning scenario. For any state s_t , it is a concatenation of the last state s_{t-1} and last action a_{t-1} . For each action a_t , it is the atomic reasoning step. We mark the first action a_1 with underline. The first state is the question q , as defined in §3.1. We use the brackets “[]” and semicolon “;” to denote the concatenation operation between s_{t-1} and a_{t-1} . The state value is calculated at the end position of each state, i.e., the “<request>” token position.

B.2 Implementation Details

We train our generator on MetaMath dataset (Yu et al. 2024). To construct the training dataset for the process verifier, we leverage the train split of the MATH dataset (Hendrycks et al. 2021). Specifically, we use the trained generator to sample 15 candidate solutions per problem. Following (Lightman et al. 2024) and (Wang et al. 2024), each solution is then segmented into individual steps using predefined rule-based strategies, i.e., “\n” as the newlines. For every step, we concatenate it with its subsequent steps to form an incomplete solution. We then perform MC estimation by sampling 8 rollouts for each incomplete solution to annotate its state value. In total, this process yields $15 \times 8 = 120$ samples per problem, culminating in a comprehensive training dataset of 180,000 samples. Following (Wang et al. 2024), we replace the rule-based delimiter of the reasoning steps, i.e., “\n” with an unseen token. In our case, we add a new token into the vocabulary of each base models, we name it the request token “<request>”. The value prediction and loss calculation is extracted from and based on model hidden state corresponding to the <request> token position. The hyper-parameters we used to train generator and verifiers are shown in Table 5.

Parameter	Value	
	Generator	Verifier
Epochs	3	1
Learning Rate	2.0×10^{-6}	2.0×10^{-6}
Batch size (per device)	4	2
Gradient Accumulation Steps	8	8
Max Sequence Length	1024	1024
Float Point Precision	torch.bfloat16	torch.bfloat16
GPUs	$4 \times A100$	$4 \times A100$

Table 5: The hyper-parameters used when training generator and verifiers, respectively.

B.3 Evaluation Metrics

BoN sampling is a commonly used evaluation metric for value-based process verifiers (Lightman et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2024; Lu et al. 2024). For each problem p , we generate N candidate solutions. These candidates are then re-ranked based on the scores assigned by the verifier, with the highest-scoring candidate being designated as the final solution. The correctness of this solution is subsequently determined by comparing it against the ground-truth answer, and a statistical success rate is reported. The beam search experiments consider the search ability for verifiers. In this paradigm, we define a number of beams N and a beam size M . During the solution generation process for a given problem p , the verifier is tasked with scoring each intermediate step. At each iteration, N existing beams individually generate M next-step candidates. The verifier then selects

Algorithm 1 Practical Implementation of ComMCS

```
1: Input: dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , value-based process verifier  $f_\theta$ , set of coefficients  $\mathcal{C}$ 
2: for  $(s_t, a_t, \hat{V}^\pi(s_t), \hat{Q}^\pi(s_t, a_t)) \in \mathcal{D}$  do
3:   Estimate  $DV_1(s_t)$  via predicted categorical distribution  $Z_\theta = (\{z_i\}, f_\theta(z_i|s_t))$ 
4:   Estimate  $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}^\pi(s_t)]$  following Eq. (8) and Eq. (13) using the MC estimation  $\hat{V}^\pi(s_t)$ 
5:   for  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  do
6:     Estimate  $\mathbb{V}[\hat{V}^\pi(s_t \rightarrow s_{t+1})]$  via Eq. (16) using the MC estimation  $\hat{V}^\pi(s_t)$  and  $\hat{Q}^\pi(s_t, a_t)$ , coefficient  $c$  and categorical distribution  $Z_\theta$ .
7:     if  $\hat{V}^\pi(s_t) > \hat{V}^\pi(s_t \rightarrow s_{t+1})$  then
8:        $\hat{V}^\pi(s_t) \leftarrow c \cdot \hat{V}^\pi(s_t) + (1 - c) \cdot \hat{V}^\pi(s_{t+1})$ 
9:       break
10:    end if
11:    break if the estimated value  $\hat{V}^\pi(s_t)$  has updated.
12:  end for
13:   $\mu \leftarrow \hat{V}^\pi(s_t); \sigma \leftarrow |\mu - \hat{Q}^\pi(s_t, a_t)|$ 
14:  Construct Gaussian Distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , mapping to a categorical distribution  $Z = (\{z_i\}, p(z_i))$  following Eq. (20).
15:  Optimize  $f_\theta$  via the cross-entropy loss function:
```

$$\mathcal{L}_{ce} = - \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{Z}|} f_\theta(z_i|s_t) \log p(z_i),$$

```
16: end for
```


the top N candidates from the combined pool of $N \times M$ possibilities to form the beams for the subsequent iteration. This iterative process continues until N complete solution is generated, after which a final solution will be obtained by selecting the candidate having the top score. Similar to the best-of- N experiment, the final solution’s consistency with the ground-truth answer is evaluated, and a statistical success rate is subsequently reported. For all experiments, we use the grader open-sourced by OpenAI (Lightman et al. 2024) to compare the consistency between predicted answer and ground-truth answer.

C Additional Experiment Results


C.1 The reasonableness of the Gaussian approximation

We provide an empirical analysis about the reasonableness of the Gaussian approximation. To conduct the experiment, we generate one reasoning trajectory for each question in the test split of MATH dataset using the trained LLemma-7b, the same generator as the training dataset for verifiers does. For each reasoning trajectory, we split it into reasoning steps by the newline symbol “\n” as the delimiter. Then, we annotate the value of each reasoning step by performing MC estimation, as introduced in §B.2. We generate 128 independent reasoning trajectories for each reasoning step. We filter the annotated dataset for a better visualization effect. More precisely, we preserve reasoning trajectories that has more than 5 reasoning steps and value of first step is neither 0 (i.e., the question cannot be solved) nor 1 (i.e., the question is too easy). At last, we randomly select five questions and their corresponding reasoning trajectories.


For the reasoning steps of each reasoning trajectory, we estimate DV_1 following the three procedures. First, we generate 128 independent next steps. Then, we annotate the value of next step by performing MC estimations where 128 independent reasoning trajectories are generated given the current state and next reasoning step. Then, we record the 128 values by their frequencies, as an estimation of the one-step value distribution. We plot the estimated one-step value distribution for different states in Figure 4 to 8. Similar to Appendix B.2, we use “<request>” to represent the newline symbol (i.e., “\n”) in the reasoning trajectories for a better visualization effect. As shown in the figures, the estimated value distribution are bell-shaped, thus allowing us to approximate the value distribution using a Gaussian distribution.




(a) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “First, we simplify the division: $\frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \div \frac{12}{20} = \frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \cdot \frac{20}{12}$.”



(b) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “First, we simplify the division: $\frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \div \frac{12}{20} = \frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \cdot \frac{20}{12}$.<request>Next, we simplify the multiplication: $\frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \cdot \frac{20}{12} = \frac{1 \cdot 8 \cdot 20}{5 \cdot 7 \cdot 12}$.”




(c) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “First, we simplify the division: $\frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \div \frac{12}{20} = \frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \cdot \frac{20}{12}$.<request>Next, we simplify the multiplication: $\frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \cdot \frac{20}{12} = \frac{1 \cdot 8 \cdot 20}{5 \cdot 7 \cdot 12}$.<request>Then, we simplify the numerator and denominator separately: $\frac{1 \cdot 8 \cdot 20}{5 \cdot 7 \cdot 12} = \frac{160}{840}$.”




(d) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “First, we simplify the division: $\frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \div \frac{12}{20} = \frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \cdot \frac{20}{12}$.<request>Next, we simplify the multiplication: $\frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \cdot \frac{20}{12} = \frac{1 \cdot 8 \cdot 20}{5 \cdot 7 \cdot 12}$.<request>Then, we simplify the numerator and denominator separately: $\frac{1 \cdot 8 \cdot 20}{5 \cdot 7 \cdot 12} = \frac{160}{840}$.<request>Finally, we simplify the fraction: $\frac{160}{840} = \frac{2}{10} = \boxed{\frac{1}{5}}$.”


Figure 4: Visualization of the estimation one-step value distribution given problem “Simplify $\frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{8}{7} \div \frac{12}{20}$.”




(a) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ Since $n \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$, we can write $n = 7k + 2$ for some integer k . ”.




(b) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ Since $n \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$, we can write $n = 7k + 2$ for some integer k .
 <request>Substituting this into $(n + 2)(n + 4)(n + 6)$, we get ”.




(c) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ Since $n \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$, we can write $n = 7k + 2$ for some integer k .
 <request>Substituting this into $(n + 2)(n + 4)(n + 6)$, we get
 <request>[[$(7k + 2 + 2)(7k + 2 + 4)(7k + 2 + 6)$].] ”.



(d) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ Since $n \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$, we can write $n = 7k + 2$ for some integer k .
 <request>Substituting this into $(n + 2)(n + 4)(n + 6)$, we get
 <request>[[$(7k + 2 + 2)(7k + 2 + 4)(7k + 2 + 6)$].]
 <request>Expanding this expression, we have ”.




(e) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ Since $n \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$, we can write $n = 7k + 2$ for some integer k .
 <request>Substituting this into $(n + 2)(n + 4)(n + 6)$, we get
 <request>[[$(7k + 2 + 2)(7k + 2 + 4)(7k + 2 + 6)$].]
 <request>Expanding this expression, we have
 <request>[[$(7k + 4)(7k + 6)(7k + 8)$].] ”.




(f) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ Since $n \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$, we can write $n = 7k + 2$ for some integer k .
 <request>Substituting this into $(n + 2)(n + 4)(n + 6)$, we get
 <request>[[$(7k + 2 + 2)(7k + 2 + 4)(7k + 2 + 6)$].]
 <request>Expanding this expression, we have
 <request>[[$(7k + 4)(7k + 6)(7k + 8)$].]
 <request>Since $7k + 4 \equiv 4 \pmod{7}$, $7k + 6 \equiv 6 \pmod{7}$, and $7k + 8 \equiv 1 \pmod{7}$, ”.


Figure 5: Visualization of the estimation one-step value distribution given problem “If $n \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$, then find the remainder when $(n + 2)(n + 4)(n + 6)$ is divided by 7.”. The steps after the 6-th step are excluded to save space. Their values concentrate at the position of 0.




(a) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ If two-thirds of the students take music, then the ratio of students who take music to the total number of students is 2:3. ”.




(b) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ If two-thirds of the students take music, then the ratio of students who take music to the total number of students is 2:3. <request>We can set up a proportion to find the total number of students: ”.




(c) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ If two-thirds of the students take music, then the ratio of students who take music to the total number of students is 2:3. <request>We can set up a proportion to find the total number of students: <request> $\frac{2}{3} = \frac{834}{x}$, where x is the total number of students. ”.



(d) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ If two-thirds of the students take music, then the ratio of students who take music to the total number of students is 2:3. <request>We can set up a proportion to find the total number of students: <request> $\frac{2}{3} = \frac{834}{x}$, where x is the total number of students. <request>Cross multiplying, we get $2x = 3(834)$. ”.




(e) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ If two-thirds of the students take music, then the ratio of students who take music to the total number of students is 2:3. <request>We can set up a proportion to find the total number of students: <request> $\frac{2}{3} = \frac{834}{x}$, where x is the total number of students. <request>Cross multiplying, we get $2x = 3(834)$. <request>Dividing both sides by 2, we get $x = \frac{3(834)}{2}$. ”.




(f) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ If two-thirds of the students take music, then the ratio of students who take music to the total number of students is 2:3. <request>We can set up a proportion to find the total number of students: <request> $\frac{2}{3} = \frac{834}{x}$, where x is the total number of students. <request>Cross multiplying, we get $2x = 3(834)$. <request>Dividing both sides by 2, we get $x = \frac{3(834)}{2}$. <request>Simplifying, we get $x = 1261$. ”.


Figure 6: Visualization of the estimation one-step value distribution given problem “Two-thirds of the students at Baker Middle School take music. There are 834 students who take music. How many students are there at Baker Middle School?”.




(a) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “The total number of cards dealt is 54, so we have the equation $xy = 54$.”.




(b) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “The total number of cards dealt is 54, so we have the equation $xy = 54$.
.<request>We want to find the number of possible values of x .”.




(c) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “The total number of cards dealt is 54, so we have the equation $xy = 54$.
.<request>We want to find the number of possible values of x .
.<request>Since x and y are positive integers, we can list out the factors of 54: ”.



(d) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “The total number of cards dealt is 54, so we have the equation $xy = 54$.
.<request>We want to find the number of possible values of x .
.<request>Since x and y are positive integers, we can list out the factors of 54: <request>1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 18, 27, 54.”.




(e) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “The total number of cards dealt is 54, so we have the equation $xy = 54$.
.<request>We want to find the number of possible values of x . <request>Since x and y are positive integers, we can list out the factors of 54: <request>1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 18, 27, 54. <request>However, we need to exclude $x = 1$ and $x = 2$ since they are not at least 2.”.




(f) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “The total number of cards dealt is 54, so we have the equation $xy = 54$.
.<request>We want to find the number of possible values of x . <request>Since x and y are positive integers, we can list out the factors of 54: <request>1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 18, 27, 54. <request>However, we need to exclude $x = 1$ and $x = 2$ since they are not at least 2. <request>Therefore, there are 6 possible values of x .”.


Figure 7: Visualization of the estimation one-step value distribution given problem “I have a deck of 54 cards, and I deal all of the cards to x players, with each player getting y cards. If x is at least 2 and y is at least 5, then how many possible values of x are there?”.




(a) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ By the Remainder Theorem, we can evaluate the expression by substituting $x = -2$. ”.




(b) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ By the Remainder Theorem, we can evaluate the expression by substituting $x = -2$. <request>Note that $(5x + 9)^{611} = (-2 + 9)^{611} = 7^{611}$, ”.




(c) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ By the Remainder Theorem, we can evaluate the expression by substituting $x = -2$. <request>Note that $(5x + 9)^{611} = (-2 + 9)^{611} = 7^{611}$, <request> $(x + 5)^{11} = (-2 + 5)^{11} = 3^{11}$, ”.



(d) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ By the Remainder Theorem, we can evaluate the expression by substituting $x = -2$. <request>Note that $(5x + 9)^{611} = (-2 + 9)^{611} = 7^{611}$, <request> $(x + 5)^{11} = (-2 + 5)^{11} = 3^{11}$, <request>and $(x - 1)^{11} = (-2 - 1)^{11} = (-3)^{11}$, ”.



(e) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ By the Remainder Theorem, we can evaluate the expression by substituting $x = -2$. <request>Note that $(5x + 9)^{611} = (-2 + 9)^{611} = 7^{611}$, <request> $(x + 5)^{11} = (-2 + 5)^{11} = 3^{11}$, <request>and $(x - 1)^{11} = (-2 - 1)^{11} = (-3)^{11}$. <request>Thus, the expression becomes $7^{611} + 3^{11} + (-3)^{11} + 3(-2)^2 + 1$. ”.



(f) Estimated One-step value distribution given state “ By the Remainder Theorem, we can evaluate the expression by substituting $x = -2$. <request>Note that $(5x + 9)^{611} = (-2 + 9)^{611} = 7^{611}$, <request> $(x + 5)^{11} = (-2 + 5)^{11} = 3^{11}$, <request>and $(x - 1)^{11} = (-2 - 1)^{11} = (-3)^{11}$. <request>Thus, the expression becomes $7^{611} + 3^{11} + (-3)^{11} + 3(-2)^2 + 1$. <request>It is easy to see that $7^{611} \equiv 7^{11} \equiv 3^{11} \equiv 9 \pmod{2}$, <request>so the remainder when the expression is divided by $x + 2$ is $\boxed{9}$. ”.

Figure 8: Visualization of the estimation one-step value distribution given problem “Find the remainder when $(5x + 9)^{611} + (x + 5)^{11} + (x - 1)^{11} + 3x^2 + 1$ is divided by $x + 2$. ”.