
Is Your Model Really A Good Math Reasoner? Evaluating Mathematical Reasoning with Checklist

Zihao Zhou^{1,2*}, Shudong Liu^{3*}, Maizhen Ning^{1,2}, Wei Liu⁴
Jindong Wang⁵, Derek F. Wong³, Xiaowei Huang², Qiufeng Wang¹, Kaizhu Huang⁶
¹Xi'an Jiaotong-liverpool University ²University of Liverpool ³University of Macau
⁴HKUST ⁵Microsoft Research Asia ⁶Duke Kunshan University
<https://mathcheck.github.io/>

Abstract

Exceptional mathematical reasoning ability is one of the key features that demonstrate the power of large language models (LLMs). How to comprehensively define and evaluate the mathematical abilities of LLMs, and even reflect the user experience in real-world scenarios, has emerged as a critical issue. Current benchmarks predominantly concentrate on problem-solving capabilities, which presents a substantial risk of model overfitting and fails to accurately represent genuine mathematical reasoning abilities. In this paper, we argue that if a model really understands a problem, it should be robustly and readily applied across a diverse array of tasks. Motivated by this, we introduce **MATHCHECK**, a well-designed checklist for testing task generalization and reasoning robustness, as well as an automatic tool to generate checklists efficiently. **MATHCHECK** includes multiple mathematical reasoning tasks and robustness test types to facilitate a comprehensive evaluation of both mathematical reasoning ability and behavior testing. Utilizing **MATHCHECK**, we develop **MATHCHECK-GSM** and **MATHCHECK-GEO** to assess mathematical textual reasoning and multi-modal reasoning capabilities, respectively, serving as upgraded versions of benchmarks including GSM8k, GeoQA, UniGeo, and Geometry3K. We adopt **MATHCHECK-GSM** and **MATHCHECK-GEO** to evaluate over 20 LLMs and 11 MLLMs, assessing their comprehensive mathematical reasoning abilities. Our results demonstrate that while frontier LLMs like GPT-4o continue to excel in various abilities on the checklist, many other model families exhibit a significant decline. Further experiments indicate that, compared to traditional math benchmarks, **MATHCHECK** better reflects true mathematical abilities and represents mathematical intelligence more linearly, thereby supporting our design. On our **MATHCHECK**, we can easily conduct detailed behavior analysis to deeply investigate models. We hope that our practice and observation can constitute a significant stride towards a more comprehensive evaluation of reasoning ability.

1 Introduction

In the development of large language models (LLMs), mathematical reasoning ability stands as a crucial test-bed for LLMs' artificial general intelligence [63; 58; 49]. The artificial intelligence community places significant emphasis on mathematical reasoning as a means to explore the upper limits of intelligence in LLMs [2; 57; 41; 26]. Meanwhile, a large number of investigations have been made on how to enhance mathematical reasoning abilities during different training stages. In pre-training, [62; 51; 32; 69] study the impact of the quality of mathematical corpus; in post-training,

*The first two authors contributed equally.

Email: zihao.zhou@liverpool.ac.uk; nlp2ct.shudong@gmail.com

	Problem Solving	Answerable Judging	Outcome Judging	Process Judging	
Original Problem	A robe takes 2 bolts of blue fiber and half that much white fiber. How many bolts in total does it take? "answer": 3.0 ⭐ Seed Data	A robe takes bolts of blue fiber and half that much white fiber. How many bolts in total does it take? "answer": Unanswerable	A robe takes 2 bolts of blue fiber ... How many bolts in total does it take? "solution": Step 1: 2 bolts of blue fiber...The answer is 4 bolts in total. "answer": Incorrect	A robe takes 2 bolts of blue fiber ... How many bolts in total does it take? "solution": Step 1: Identify the amount ... Step 3: Multiply the bolts of blue and white fiber together to find the total number of bolts. The answer is 2 bolts. "answer": Step 3	Reasoning Robustness
Problem Understanding	To make a robe, you need 2 bolts of blue fiber and half as many bolts of white fiber compared to blue. What is the total number of bolts required for the robe? "answer": 3.0	To make a robe, you need need bolts of blue fiber and half as many bolts of white fiber compared to blue. What is the total number of bolts required for the robe? "answer": Unanswerable	To make a robe, you need 2 bolts ... What is the total number of bolts required for the robe? "solution": Step 1: Calculate the number of blue bolts... So, 2 (blue)+ 1 (white) = 3.The answer is 3 . "answer": Correct	To make a robe, you need 2 bolts ... What is the total number of bolts required for the robe? "solution": Step 1: ... Step 2: Determine the number of white bolts, which as many as blue bolts The answer is 4. "answer": Step 2	
Irrelevant Disturbance	A tailor is crafting a luxurious robe. The design requires 2 bolts of blue fiber and half that amount of white fiber. To add grandeur, the tailor also considered using 3 bolts of golden thread from the sun's rays, but eventually decided it would be too gaudy for the ceremony. How many bolts in total are needed for the robe, disregarding the golden thread? "answer": 3.0	A tailor is crafting a luxurious robe. The design requires 2 bolts of blue fiber and half that amount of white fiber. ... How many bolts in total are needed for the robe, disregarding the golden thread? "answer": Answerable	A tailor is crafting a luxurious robe. The design requires 2 bolts of blue fiber and half that amount of white fiber. ... How many bolts in total are needed for the robe, disregarding the golden thread? "solution": Step 1: Calculate the amount of blue fiber. The design requires ... The answer is: 300 yards . "answer": Incorrect	A tailor is crafting a luxurious robe. The design requires 2 bolts of blue fiber and half that amount of white fiber. ... How many bolts in total are needed for the robe, disregarding the golden thread? "solution": Step 1: ... Step 2: Calculate the amount of white fiber required, which is double the blue fiber amount, so 2 bolts * 2 = 4 bolts . Step 3: ... The answer is 6 bolts. "answer": Step 2	
Scenario Understanding	A robe takes x bolts of blue fiber and half that much white fiber. It takes 3 bolts in total. What is the value of unknown variable x? "answer": 2.0	A robe takes x bolts of blue fiber and fewer white fiber. It takes 3 bolts in total. What is the value of unknown variable x? "answer": Unanswerable	A robe takes x bolts of blue fiber and half that ... What is the value of unknown variable x? "solution": Step 1: Let's say the value of x is ... The answer is 2 . "answer": Correct	A robe takes x bolts of blue fiber and half that ... What is the value of unknown variable x? "solution": Step 1: Let's ... Step 3: To find out how many bolts of fiber are needed in total, the equation should be x - 0.5x = 3 ... The answer is x equals 6. "answer": Step 3	

Task Generalization

Figure 1: Overview of MATHCHECK design. The horizontal axis examines the task generalization of four math tasks while the vertical axis examines the reasoning robustness through four problem varieties. All data are generated from seed data, which is also from mainstream benchmark paradigm.

[66; 65; 28; 28] augment a huge number of synthesis data, and then develop supervised fine-tuning (SFT) for math problem-solving. Recently, [37] and [55] have explored variants of reinforcement learning (RL) to achieve further improvements.

To pursue high mathematical reasoning ability, it is crucial to fairly evaluate the performance of LLMs. Current mainstream methods rely on the performance across math problem-solving tasks of varying difficulty levels, such as GSM8k [15] of elementary level, MATH [22] of high school level, and TheromQA [12] of university level. Recently, some mathematical datasets that are more challenging, diverse, and multi-modal have been proposed to enhance the mathematical evaluation [21; 33; 35; 68]. However, these current evaluation methods focus on individual tasks (most of which are solving) and robustness tests for each problem. In other words, they do not provide comprehensive guidance on whether LLMs really achieve mathematical reasoning ability. In this paper, we argue that: *if a model really understands a problem, it should robustly work across various tasks about this problem*. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate models by multi-tasks with diverse robustness testing. Through such investigation, the real reasoning ability of the models can be comprehensively evaluated. As a result, we can also perform detailed behavior tests on models [48].

Drawing motivations from this insight, we introduce **MATHCHECK**, a well-designed checklist for testing task generalization and reasoning robustness. MATHCHECK includes general mathematical reasoning tasks and diverse robustness testing types to facilitate a comprehensive evaluation of mathematical reasoning ability and reasoning behavior testing. As shown in Figure 1, on the horizontal axis, we examine the task generalization including problem solving, answerable judging, outcome judging, and process judging. On the vertical axis, we test the reasoning robustness through the original problem and its three robustness variants consisting of problem understanding, irrelevant disturbance, and scenario understanding. The data of each cell in the checklist corresponds to a

specific robustness type problem and task form. To facilitate the construction of checklist, we propose an (M)LLMs-driven generation framework to automatically generate this data. Figure 2 illustrates the MATHCHECK data collection process, where the seed solving problem is firstly rewritten to its robustness problems, next all generated solving data are utilized to construct other task forms.

Utilizing MATHCHECK, we propose **MATHCHECK-GSM**, a MATHCHECK dataset generated from GSM8k [15]. It contains a total of 3,096 high-quality data consisting of 129 groups checklist matrix, which can be used to evaluate mathematical textual reasoning ability comprehensively. Besides, acknowledging the community’s focus on multi-modal reasoning capabilities, we further propose **MATHCHECK-GEO** to evaluate the multi-modal geometry reasoning ability. Generated from GeoQA [11], UniGeo [10], and Geometry3K [36], it contains a total of 1,440 data with a checklist matrix of 60 groups. It is noteworthy that the construction pipeline of MATHCHECK can be applied to most mathematical datasets to dynamically establish a comprehensive and flexible evaluation benchmark, thereby mitigating data contamination [72; 75; 76].

We conduct extensive experiments on 20 LLMs and 11 MLLMs including different scales, API-base and open source, generalist and mathematical models. We find that frontier LLMs like GPT-4o continue to achieve superior performance in our MATHCHECK, but many other model families exhibit a significant decline. Further experiments indicate that compared to solving original problems which is the paradigm of mainstream benchmark, our MATHCHECK evaluation aligns more accurately with the genuine mathematical reasoning ability of the model. Finally, we extensively analyze the models’ behaviors including training on massive solving data, reasoning consistency, performance on different complexity problems and applying different prompting technologies.

2 MATHCHECK

MATHCHECK is a well-designed checklist that includes general mathematical reasoning tasks and diverse robustness testing types for comprehensive evaluation, as well as a tool to automatically generate a large number of test cases in the manner of checklist. In our checklist, various mathematical tasks are arranged in rows to assess task generalization, whereas diverse variants of mathematical problems are placed in columns to evaluate reasoning robustness. We will elaborate on the task types in Section 2.1, problem variants in Section 2.2, and how we construct checklist data in Section 2.3.

2.1 Task Generalization

Testing models across different tasks on the same domain not only offers a comprehensive and profound evaluation of their capabilities [19] but also caters to the practical demands and complexities of real-world applications [25]. In MATHCHECK, we incorporate four math tasks including Problem Solving, Answerable Judging, Outcome Judging, and Process Judging.

Problem Solving. In this task, we ask the models to solve a given math problem. As the most widely used method to test mathematical reasoning ability in contemporary research [15; 22], it necessitates the model to analyze the problem, recall and apply appropriate math knowledge, and finally conclude reasoning results.

Answerable Judging. Given a math problem, models need to determine whether the problem provides sufficient information to answer the question. This task requires the model to analyze the question, then identify the essential conditions required for solving this question, subsequently verify whether these conditions are provided within the problem statement. Previous works utilized it to examine whether the model is a reasoner with critical thinking instead of a random parrot [29; 54; 38].

Outcome Judging. Given a math problem and one of its solutions, let the model determine whether the final answer of the given solution is correct. Outcome-Judging is a coarse-grained judgment of solutions since the model only focuses on the correctness of the final answer. Researchers often apply the outcome-judging ability of models to verify the correctness of augmented data [56] and provide outcome rewards in reinforcement learning [37].

Process Judging. Given a math problem along with its wrong solution, the model is required to identify the step where the errors begin. Compared with the outcome-judging, the process-judging task is a more fine-grained judgment on the solution, which demands the model to judge step by step until the wrong step is located. It can help to debug the given wrong solution.




Figure 2: MATHCHECK generation pipeline.

2.2 Reasoning Robustness

A model that truly understands the inherent mathematical logic of a problem will exhibit reasoning robustness to diverse variations of this problem [53]. Motivated by this, we utilize four problem forms including the original problem and its three rewritten variants to examine the reasoning robustness of models.

Original Problem. It is the seed problem of other adversarial problems. At a minimum functionality test, it can check whether the model has the basic mathematical capabilities when no modifications have been made.

Problem Understanding. It refers to transforming the original problem into a new one that uses different wording or different sentence structures but does not change the mathematical logic of its original version [47; 74; 29]. It pays more attention to semantic robustness, and aims to examine whether models can correctly reason when dealing with different descriptions of the same mathematical logic.

Irrelevant Disturbance. It refers to inserting irrelevant conditions that are related to the topic of the original question, but have no impact on the final answer. Previous studies have disclosed that large language models are easily distracted by such perturbations [52]. It needs the model to distinguish which conditions are necessary and which are irrelevant to the problem.

Scenario Understanding. When models comprehend the scenario of a math problem and its underlying logic, they should be able to solve other questions within that scenario [34; 65; 73]. Therefore, we alter the original question to evaluate whether the models have a comprehensive understanding of the scenario. For example, as shown in Figure 1, we ask the question “the number of blue bolts” instead of “the number of total bolts”.

2.3 Checklist Construction

Creating MATHCHECK data is a labor-intensive and time-consuming process. The advent of LLMs has introduced a new level of flexibility and quality to generate mathematical content [43; 29]. Therefore, we employ (M)LLMs (e.g., GPT-4-Turbo in our experiments) as engines to automatically generate our MATHCHECK data. The data construction pipeline is shown in Figure 2. Users first assemble a collection of math problems with labels as seed data. Second, (M)LLMs initially rewrite these problems into their robustness varieties to make up the robustness problem set. Third, each problem in this set will be extended to construct multiple mathematical tasks about this problem. Finally, all data are manually checked to form MATHCHECK dataset.

Based on the seed data, we automatically generate another three robustness problems as shown in the first column of Figure 1. *Problem Understanding* and *Irrelevant Disturbance* are the tasks of rewriting problems without altering the final answer. Hence, we prompt the model to rewrite our math problems while maintaining the original answer. For *Scenario Understanding*, we will first extract a variable from the problem as a new answer, then prompt the model to change the question based on the extracted variable. Once we obtain the four robustness reasoning problems of the solving task, we rewrite them respectively to construct multiple tasks, including *Answerable Judging*, *Outcome Judging* and *Process Judging* as shown in the corresponding row of Figure 1. For the *Answerable Judging* task, we prompt the model to eliminate a condition from the original problem which is crucial for solving it to obtain an unanswerable problem. For *Outcome Judging* task, we ask the model to solve the problem and acquire candidate solutions, then these solutions are labeled (Correct or Incorrect) according to the final answer. For *Process Judging* task, we apply the solution rewritten

ability of (M)LLMs to construct process-judging data. Specifically, given a problem along with its correct solution, we prompt the model to make mistakes from the given steps and results in a wrong answer. In such a way, we can get a wrong solution while its mistake steps remain simultaneously. All our prompts are listed in Appendix E.2.

3 Experiments

3.1 Datasets

We use MATHCHECK to comprehensively measure the mathematical reasoning ability across textual and multi-modal settings. Consequently, two benchmarks MATHCHECK-GSM and MATHCHECK-GEO are introduced.

MATHCHECK-GSM is a MATHCHECK dataset generated from GSM8k [15]. We choose GSM8k as the seed benchmark, which is most widely used for evaluating mathematical textual reasoning capability. We first collect a test-mini set of GSM8k, which includes 129 problems sampled evenly according to the difficulty. Subsequently, we generate 129 MATHCHECK style groups, totaling 3,096 high-quality data by MATHCHECK. It can be used to evaluate the real mathematical reasoning ability of LLMs on GSM8k-level problems. A group of GSM case problems are listed in Appendix F.1.

MATHCHECK-GEO is a dataset for geometry problems, which is the representative task for evaluating multi-modal reasoning capability. First, we collect seed geometry problems from GeoQA [11], UniGeo [10], and Geometry3K [36], containing 60 problems in both English and Chinese. Subsequently, we generate 60 MATHCHECK style groups, totaling 1,440 high-quality data. Notably, this is the first geometry problem dataset involving answerable, outcome, and process judgment tasks. A group of GEO case problems are shown in Appendix F.2.

All datasets are checked with meticulous manual validation to ensure high quality and reliability. To this end, we recruit three graduate students who underwent training tailored to the requirements of our research. This rigorous verification process not only enhances the quality of our data but also reinforces the validity of our findings. Finally, our automatic data generation pipeline can achieve an average pass rate of 84.61%. The detailed data statistics of our checklist are reported in Appendix C.

3.2 Experimental Setup

To systematically benchmark the mathematical reasoning capabilities of existing LLMs, we include a comprehensive evaluation of 31 models, comprising 20 LLMs and 11 MLLMs. These models are principally divided into two categories: generalist models encompassing both API-based commercial LLMs and open-sourced LLMs (large and small scale), and specialized mathematical models. We use the F1 metric for Outcome Judging and Answerable Judging tasks, and the Acc metric for the other two tasks. The list of selected models and details of evaluation setup can be found in Appendix D.

3.3 Main Results

Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the performance of various models on the MATHCHECK-GSM and MATHCHECK-GEO, respectively. The leftmost column represents the average performance across all tasks and all question variants. The middle four columns detail the performance on various mathematical reasoning tasks, while the right four columns display performance across different question variants. Consequently, each model is represented by a 4×4 checklist table, which showcases the model’s performance in various dimensions. The details of all checklist tables are further elaborated in Appendix A and B.

On MATHCHECK-GSM (Table 1), GPT-4o exhibits outstanding performance with an impressive overall score of 92.0, achieving the highest levels in most tasks and question variants. GPT-4 is closely followed with a score of 90.9 and demonstrates top performance on the answerable judging task. These outcomes indicate that strong foundational models still possess formidable and robust performance across a variety of mathematical reasoning tasks. Among the open-source LLMs, LLaMa3-70B-Instruct achieves the highest score of 84.7 and performs excellently across a range of tasks and problem variants. Notably, Qwen-72B underperforms in tasks other than problem solving, which we suspect is due to its special optimization of the solving task. This phenomenon is also observed

Models	All	PS	AJ	OJ	PJ	OP	PU	ID	SU
<i>Generalist Models</i>									
GPT-4o	92.0	95.0	95.0	90.1	87.8	94.6	91.6	92.0	89.6
GPT-4-Turbo-20240409	90.9	93.8	95.9	87.8	86.0	93.8	90.4	90.8	88.6
GPT-3.5-Turbo	61.4	73.5	64.3	48.3	59.5	65.4	64.6	60.1	55.4
Gemini-1.5-Pro	86.3	88.6	89.5	87.6	75.0	88.0	90.2	85.0	82.0
Claude-3-opus-20240229	83.5	81.6	92.0	78.7	81.8	86.3	85.6	81.9	80.3
Claude-3-sonnet-20240229	75.0	77.9	88.9	65.1	68.0	76.5	77.8	73.7	71.9
Claude-3-haiku-20240229	57.5	79.7	49.9	44.3	56.0	61.9	62.4	55.9	49.6
Llama-3-70B-Instruct	84.7	90.1	87.5	84.6	76.7	87.7	86.7	84.7	79.9
DeepSeek V2	82.2	86.8	82.6	82.5	76.9	85.1	84.4	83.5	75.9
Mixtral 8 x 7B-Instruct	59.9	56.0	58.1	63.9	61.6	62.8	61.5	58.8	56.4
Mixtral 8 x 7B-Base	44.7	40.9	50.8	51.8	35.3	50.6	47.8	41.2	39.1
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	50.6	71.1	64.2	31.9	35.1	57.0	51.1	43.6	50.6
Phi-3-Medium-4K-Instruct	72.0	89.7	70.8	63.2	64.1	77.6	78.7	71.1	60.4
Phi-3-Mini-4K-Instruct	64.1	71.3	64.5	62.9	57.6	68.5	66.6	61.2	60.0
Llama3-8B-Instruct	64.2	68.6	61.4	64.9	61.8	67.8	68.8	62.9	57.1
ChatGLM3-6B	36.5	32.6	41.7	50.1	21.7	39.7	35.9	31.3	39.1
<i>Mathematical Models</i>									
DeepSeek-Math-7B-RL	50.7	79.5	50.0	45.1	28.1	53.3	51.2	47.5	50.6
DeepSeek-Math-7B-Instruct	50.2	70.0	64.8	40.4	25.8	51.6	54.4	45.8	49.2
DeepSeek-Math-7B-Base	44.0	49.8	51.5	44.0	30.8	49.0	46.0	37.0	44.1
MetaMath-LLama2-70B	45.7	70.0	35.7	45.3	31.6	49.9	51.5	43.4	37.8

Table 1: Model performance on MATHCHECK-GSM. **PS**: Problem Solving, **AJ**: Answerable Judging, **OJ**: Outcome Judging, **PJ**: Process Judging, **OP**: Original Problem, **PU**: Problem Understanding, **ID**: Irrelevant Disturbance, **SU**: Scenario Understanding. Each score is the average score of related units. For example, 'All' means all units, 'PS' includes solving units on four problem types, 'OP' includes original problems on four tasks units.

Models	All	PS	AJ	OJ	PJ	OP	PU	ID	SU
<i>Generalist Models</i>									
GPT-4o	65.3	57.5	75.5	69.5	58.8	65.2	67.0	64.3	64.8
GPT-4-Turbo-20240409	61.7	51.3	72.3	64.0	59.2	63.2	62.9	61.7	58.9
GPT-4-Vision-Preview	60.0	46.7	71.1	63.6	58.8	59.3	62.8	57.8	60.2
Gemini-1.5-Pro	58.7	47.5	67.4	55.0	64.6	62.3	58.6	57.1	56.9
Gemini-1.5-Flash	56.8	45.0	75.1	50.6	56.7	56.8	59.7	53.8	57.1
Claude-3-opus-20240229	47.2	34.2	60.6	46.7	47.5	47.2	49.1	42.4	50.2
Claude-3-sonnet-20240229	49.9	35.8	59.0	51.6	52.9	51.2	53.0	44.7	50.4
Claude-3-haiku-20240307	36.7	27.9	41.3	41.7	35.8	39.2	38.8	33.3	35.4
InternVL-1.5-Chat	37.6	22.1	54.9	46.8	26.7	42.9	34.8	37.3	35.5
Phi-3-Vision-128k-Instruct	29.6	12.9	35.0	48.6	22.9	32.6	31.8	28.2	26.0
CogVLM2-LLama3-Chat-19B	24.6	7.9	26.4	46.3	17.9	27.2	28.0	22.4	20.9

Table 2: Model performance on MATHCHECK-GEO.

across all math-customized models, which tend to be trained on similar mathematical problems and problem-solving processes, resulting in a relatively narrow scope of reasoning capabilities.

On MATHCHECK-GEO (Table 2), GPT-4o also demonstrates the best performance, achieving a top score of 65.3 in the All category. The performance of GPT4-turbo-20240409 and GPT4-Vision-Preview is similar, reaching scores of 61.7 and 60.0, respectively. In particular, the performance of Claude-3-sonnet is slightly superior in visual contexts compared to that of its larger counterpart, Claude-3-opus. Among the open-source MLLMs, all of them exhibited poor problem-solving performance. This suggests that the multi-modal reasoning capabilities of open-source MLLMs still have significant room for improvement, meriting further exploration by the research community.




Figure 3: Correlation with GSM1k [67], a dataset that reflects real mathematical reasoning ability. p and e represent the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, and Root Mean Square Error, respectively.

3.4 MathCheck Represents Mathematical Intelligence More Linearly

One desiderata of a good mathematical benchmark is to reflect real mathematical intelligence perfectly. We follow previous works [67; 23] to assess “intelligence” from practical standpoints and use performance on private data [67] and compression efficiency [18; 23] as surrogates to assess the genuine mathematical abilities of models. By examining the correlation between **MATHCHECK** and these surrogates, we can verify whether our design effectively reflects mathematical intelligence, and how it compares to traditional benchmarks.

Correlation with Private Data. Unlike traditional open-sourced benchmarks, private data is less likely to be contaminated or overfitted, making it an appropriate proxy of genuine mathematical intelligence. We adopt GSM1k [67], a new private GSM8k-level dataset, to measure the real mathematical reasoning of models. We compare the correlation of model performance between GSM1k and **MATHCHECK-GSM/GSM8K**. As shown in Figure 3, the left part illustrates the correlation between GSM8k and GSM1k. It reveals that most LLMs achieve scores up to 80% on GSM8k, with scores concentrated in the top half of the graph. However, on GSM1k, the scores are evenly distributed, indicating that some LLMs, such as deepseek-math-7B-RL, have inflated scores on GSM8k. This suggests that the GSM8k score is not a reliable benchmark for assessing the true mathematical reasoning ability of the models. In the right sub-figure, **MATHCHECK-GSM** and GSM1k display a good positive correlation, and some models that do not perform well on GSM1k can be detected by **MATHCHECK-GSM**. By comparing the Pearson correlation coefficient and the root mean square error, it shows that **MATHCHECK** has a higher correlation coefficient with GSM1k, mitigating bias evaluation caused by overfitting and data contamination.

Correlation with Compression Efficiency. Compression efficiency has been empirically proven that represent intelligence well [18] even linearly [23], well aligned with the belief that compression is closely connected to intelligence [16]. Following [23], we use BPC-Loss in Arxiv papers tagged with “Math” to measure compression efficiency as a surrogate. Figure 4 shows the correlation between BPC-Loss and GSM8K/MathCheck-GSM. The left sub-figure reveals that a single traditional benchmark like GSM8K cannot adequately reflect genuine mathematical ability, as indicated by the low Pearson correlation coefficient ($p = -0.822$). Many models, such as the Qwen series, deviate significantly from the regression line. In contrast, the right sub-figure displays the correlation with our **MATHCHECK-GSM**, demonstrating that **MATHCHECK-GSM** exhibits a significantly better correlation with genuine intelligence, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of $p = -0.915$. Our method shows that many models, such as the Qwen series, have scores on our benchmark that align more accurately with their true mathematical abilities. This shows that our design can represent mathematical intelligence more linearly compared to traditional benchmarks.

4 Behavior Analysis

MATHCHECK contains multi-dimensional information for evaluation, therefore we can observe the behaviors of the models on it to help analyze the models.

Behavior of Math Models. Recently, some works claim that math reasoning ability is greatly improved by training on massive amounts of math solving data, but this may not necessarily be true.




Figure 4: Performance correlation with BPC-loss, which reflects compression efficiency [23]. The lower BPC-loss represents the higher compression efficiency.




Figure 5: Behavior of mathematical models trained on massive solving data.

To validate whether their mathematical reasoning ability really improves, we examine the behaviors of the math models and their base models on MATHCHECK. As shown in Figure 5, compared with the base model, the performance of DeepSeek-Math-7B-Instruct/RL on solving units is greatly improved. However, the performance improvement on other units is limited, or even downward. The same phenomenon can be observed on MetaMath. It implies that training solely on massive solving data is not the right direction to improve mathematical reasoning ability. Instead, training models with high-quality and diverse mathematical data, beyond just solving, should be considered.

Reasoning Consistency. We analyze the reasoning consistency of generalist models across each unit in MATHCHECK, and the detailed results are shown in Appendix A and B. We can see most of them show good reasoning consistency since they achieve similar scores on each unit, such as GPT series, Llama-3 series and Mixtral series on MATHCHECK-GSM and GPT series on MATHCHECK-GEO. This is an interesting finding as it substantiates our assertion: *a model that really understands a problem can robustly work well on multiple related tasks*. Meanwhile, we also find that some models perform reasoning inconsistently. For example, Qwen1.5-72B-chat, Claude-3-Haiku and Phi-3-Medium show excellent performance on the solving task but much worse in other units of MATHCHECK-GSM. On MATHCHECK-GSM, Internet-VL achieves a high score of 40.0 on the original problem solving but decreases considerably when the problem switches to other robustness variants. These abnormal inconsistency behaviors of generalist models are highly similar to those mathematical models, revealing that they may conduct excessive decoration on original benchmarks.

Behavior on Different Complexity Levels. We categorize the complexity of problems based on the number of reasoning steps of the original problems, and select representative models of varying sizes for evaluation, as depicted in Figure 6. We can observe that the models’ accuracy on the original problem solving fluctuates and does not show an obvious downward trend as the problems are more difficult. While the score “All” shows a steady downward trend, it implies that MATHCHECK better demonstrates the reasoning skills and capabilities required when problems become difficult.

Behavior on Different Prompting Technologies. We evaluate five prompting techniques including Zero-shot, Few-shot [9], CoT [63], Least to Most prompting [71], and Plan-and-Solve prompting [60]. The results of GPT-3.5-Turbo on MATHCHECK-GSM are illustrated in Figure 7. Overall, Chain of Thought (CoT) and Plan-and-Solve (PS) in the zero-shot setting demonstrate superior performance, though this is not consistently the case across all tasks and settings. In contrast, the Few-shot prompt generally yields poorer results than the Zero-shot prompt, particularly in Outcome Judging and Process Judging tasks. Our analysis of the model prediction results indicates that the few-shot setting




Figure 6: Performance on different complexity levels (i.e., reasoning steps) of MATHCHECK-GSM.




Figure 7: Different prompting technologies on MATHCHECK-GSM.

tends to diminish and abbreviate the reasoning steps. Plan-and-Solve (PS) prompt also does not achieve satisfactory results, potentially due to its problem-decomposition method being less effective for tasks beyond Problem Solving.

5 Related Work

Benchmarks of Textual Mathematical Reasoning. Numerous benchmarks have been proposed to evaluate the mathematical reasoning capabilities of AI models, including [4; 15; 20]. Some datasets, such as the elementary-level GSM8k [15], exhibit phenomena of performance saturation or data contamination. Consequently, more challenging datasets have been introduced, including those at the high-school level [22], and university level [50; 70]. Additionally, to provide a more comprehensive assessment of models’ mathematical reasoning abilities, numerous benchmarks have been developed that measure the robustness of mathematical reasoning through various means [29], including semantic perturbations [59; 74], reverse problem-solving [65; 8], and the presence of irrelevant contextual distractions [52; 30]. Distinct from the aforementioned benchmarks, which focus on a single task (typically problem-solving), our benchmark explores the task generalizability of mathematical reasoning. It also covers different types of robustness assessment across various tasks, providing a holistic and comprehensive evaluation of mathematical reasoning capabilities.

Benchmarks of Visual Mathematical Reasoning. Recently, multi-modal large language models, particularly large vision-language models, have demonstrated exceptional capabilities in visual-language reasoning tasks [3; 13; 64; 57]. A bunch of benchmarks [31; 6; 24; 39; 42] have been introduced to assess the visual reasoning capabilities of multi-modal large language models across various modalities including abstract scenes, geometric diagrams, graphics, and charts [36; 11; 10; 40; 27]. To integrate various math-related visual reasoning tasks, [35] collect multiple datasets to construct an integrated benchmark, MathVista, designed to evaluate mathematical reasoning in visual contexts. Currently, research on visually-based mathematical reasoning remains at a relatively preliminary stage, particularly with regard to the problem-solving capabilities of open-source MLLMs, which exhibit rudimentary problem-solving performance (see our experimental results in Section 3.3). Our benchmark focuses on the universality of tasks and robustness of question formulation within visual contexts, offering a comprehensive evaluation and testing platform for the research community.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we contend that if a model really understands a problem, it should robustly apply to various tasks and variations of that problem. Based on this premise, we introduce **MATHCHECK**, a well-designed checklist for testing task generalization and reasoning robustness, along with an automatic tool for swiftly generating checklist for most math datasets. **MATHCHECK** allows the research community to clearly observe model performance across different dimensions, yielding more comprehensive and objective evaluation results. Using **MATHCHECK**, we develop **MATHCHECK-GSM** for textual reasoning and **MATHCHECK-GEO** for multi-modal reasoning, and evaluate

these using 20 LLMs and 11 MLLMs. Most of the models exhibit similar scores across each cell on the checklist. Notably, exceptions are found with some math task-specific models and likely benchmark-tailored models, which exhibit artificially elevated performance on the original benchmarks. Compared to the previous mainstream benchmarks, **MATHCHECK** more accurately aligns with the authentic reasoning abilities. We encourage researchers and developers to adopt such more holistic benchmarks in evaluating the mathematical reasoning abilities of AI systems.

7 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Yu Gu from Ohio State University for insightful discussion and valuable feedback. Additionally, we thank Changwei Li, Chenjing Dou, Guangping Zhang from University of Liverpool for ensuring data quality.

References

- [1] Marah Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat Behl, et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*, 2024.
- [2] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [3] Emily Allaway, Jena D Hwang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Kathleen McKeown, Doug Downey, and Yejin Choi. Penguins don't fly: Reasoning about generics through instantiations and exceptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11658*, 2022.
- [4] Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Peter Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Mathqa: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13319*, 2019.
- [5] Anthropic. Claude 3, 2024.
- [6] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2425–2433, 2015.
- [7] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- [8] Lukas Berglund, Meg Tong, Max Kaufmann, Mikita Balesni, Asa Cooper Stickland, Tomasz Korbak, and Owain Evans. The reversal curse: Llms trained on "a is b" fail to learn "b is a". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12288*, 2023.
- [9] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [10] Jiaqi Chen, Tong Li, Jinghui Qin, Pan Lu, Liang Lin, Chongyu Chen, and Xiaodan Liang. Unigeo: Unifying geometry logical reasoning via reformulating mathematical expression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.02746*, 2022.
- [11] Jiaqi Chen, Jianheng Tang, Jinghui Qin, Xiaodan Liang, Lingbo Liu, Eric P Xing, and Liang Lin. Geoqa: A geometric question answering benchmark towards multimodal numerical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14517*, 2021.
- [12] Wenhui Chen, Ming Yin, Max Ku, Pan Lu, Yixin Wan, Xueguang Ma, Jianyu Xu, Xinyi Wang, and Tony Xia. Theoremqa: A theorem-driven question answering dataset. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023.

- [13] Xi Chen, Josip Djolonga, Piotr Padlewski, Basil Mustafa, Soravit Changpinyo, Jialin Wu, Carlos Riquelme Ruiz, Sebastian Goodman, Xiao Wang, Yi Tay, et al. Pali-x: On scaling up a multilingual vision and language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18565*, 2023.
- [14] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Zhong Muyan, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14238*, 2023.
- [15] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [16] Gregoire Deletang, Anian Ruoss, Paul-Ambroise Duquenne, Elliot Catt, Tim Genewein, Christopher Mattern, Jordi Grau-Moya, Li Kevin Wenliang, Matthew Aitchison, Laurent Orseau, Marcus Hutter, and Joel Veness. Language modeling is compression. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [17] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 320–335, 2022.
- [18] Zhengxiao Du, Aohan Zeng, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Understanding emergent abilities of language models from the loss perspective, 2024.
- [19] Michael C Frank. Baby steps in evaluating the capacities of large language models. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 2(8):451–452, 2023.
- [20] Simon Frieder, Luca Pinchetti, Ryan-Rhys Griffiths, Tommaso Salvatori, Thomas Lukasiewicz, Philipp Petersen, and Julius Berner. Mathematical capabilities of chatgpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [21] Chaoqun He, Renjie Luo, Yuzhuo Bai, Shengding Hu, Zhen Leng Thai, Junhao Shen, Jinyi Hu, Xu Han, Yujie Huang, Yuxiang Zhang, et al. Olympiadbench: A challenging benchmark for promoting agi with olympiad-level bilingual multimodal scientific problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14008*, 2024.
- [22] 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.
- [23] Yuzhen Huang, Jinghan Zhang, Zifei Shan, and Junxian He. Compression represents intelligence linearly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09937*, 2024.
- [24] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709, 2019.
- [25] Hyangeun Ji, Insook Han, and Yujung Ko. A systematic review of conversational ai in language education: Focusing on the collaboration with human teachers. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 55(1):48–63, 2023.
- [26] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [27] Mehran Kazemi, Hamidreza Alvari, Ankit Anand, Jialin Wu, Xi Chen, and Radu Soricut. Geomverse: A systematic evaluation of large models for geometric reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12241*, 2023.
- [28] Chen Li, Weiqi Wang, Jingcheng Hu, Yixuan Wei, Nanning Zheng, Han Hu, Zheng Zhang, and Houwen Peng. Common 7b language models already possess strong math capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04706*, 2024.

- [29] Qintong Li, Leyang Cui, Xueliang Zhao, Lingpeng Kong, and Wei Bi. Gsm-plus: A comprehensive benchmark for evaluating the robustness of llms as mathematical problem solvers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19255*, 2024.
- [30] Zekun Li, Baolin Peng, Pengcheng He, and Xifeng Yan. Do you really follow me? adversarial instructions for evaluating the robustness of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10819*, 2023.
- [31] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6-12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014.
- [32] Zhenghao Lin, Zhibin Gou, Yeyun Gong, Xiao Liu, Yelong Shen, Ruochen Xu, Chen Lin, Yujiu Yang, Jian Jiao, Nan Duan, et al. Rho-1: Not all tokens are what you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07965*, 2024.
- [33] Hongwei Liu, Zilong Zheng, Yuxuan Qiao, Haodong Duan, Zhiwei Fei, Fengzhe Zhou, Wenwei Zhang, Songyang Zhang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. Mathbench: Evaluating the theory and application proficiency of llms with a hierarchical mathematics benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12209*, 2024.
- [34] Qianying Liu, Wenyu Guan, Sujian Li, Fei Cheng, Daisuke Kawahara, and Sadao Kurohashi. Roda: Reverse operation based data augmentation for solving math word problems. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 30:1–11, 2021.
- [35] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [36] Pan Lu, Ran Gong, Shibiao Jiang, Liang Qiu, Siyuan Huang, Xiaodan Liang, and Song-Chun Zhu. Inter-gps: Interpretable geometry problem solving with formal language and symbolic reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04165*, 2021.
- [37] Trung Quoc Luong, Xinbo Zhang, Zhanming Jie, Peng Sun, Xiaoran Jin, and Hang Li. Refit: Reasoning with reinforced fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08967*, 2024.
- [38] Jingyuan Ma, Damai Dai, and Zhifang Sui. Large language models are unconscious of unreasonability in math problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19346*, 2024.
- [39] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. Ok-vqa: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/cvf conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3195–3204, 2019.
- [40] Ahmed Masry, Do Xuan Long, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq Joty, and Enamul Hoque. Chartqa: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10244*, 2022.
- [41] Meta. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>, 2024.
- [42] Shaghayegh Mobasher, Ghazal Zamaninejad, Maryam Hashemi, Melika Nobakhtian, and Sauleh Eetemadi. Parsvqa-caps: A benchmark for visual question answering and image captioning in persian. *people*, 101:404, 2022.
- [43] Kole Norberg, Husni Almoubayyed, Stephen E Fancsali, Logan De Ley, Kyle Weldon, April Murphy, and Steven Ritter. Rewriting math word problems with large language models. In *AIED23: artificial intelligence in education, empowering education with LLMs workshop*, 2023.
- [44] OpenAI. Gpt-3.5-turbo. 2022.
- [45] OpenAI. Gpt-4o, 2024.

- [46] OpenAI. Gpt-4v, 2024.
- [47] Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. Are nlp models really able to solve simple math word problems? In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2080–2094, 2021.
- [48] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Tongshuang Wu, Carlos Guestrin, and Sameer Singh. Beyond accuracy: Behavioral testing of nlp models with checklist. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04118*, 2020.
- [49] Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohammadamin Barekatin, Alexander Novikov, Matej Balog, M Pawan Kumar, Emilien Dupont, Francisco JR Ruiz, Jordan S Ellenberg, Pengming Wang, Omar Fawzi, et al. Mathematical discoveries from program search with large language models. *Nature*, 625(7995):468–475, 2024.
- [50] Tomohiro Sawada, Daniel Paleka, Alexander Havrilla, Pranav Tadepalli, Paula Vidas, Alexander Kranias, John J Nay, Kshitij Gupta, and Aran Komatsuzaki. Arb: Advanced reasoning benchmark for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13692*, 2023.
- [51] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Y Wu, and Daya Guo. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [52] Freda Shi, Xinyun Chen, Kanishka Misra, Nathan Scales, David Dohan, Ed Chi, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Large language models can be easily distracted by irrelevant context. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 31210–31227, 2023.
- [53] Alessandro Stolfo, Zhijing Jin, Kumar Shridhar, Bernhard Schoelkopf, and Mrinmaya Sachan. A causal framework to quantify the robustness of mathematical reasoning with language models. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- [54] YuHong Sun, Zhangyue Yin, Qipeng Guo, Jiawen Wu, Xipeng Qiu, and Hui Zhao. Benchmarking hallucination in large language models based on unanswerable math word problem. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 2178–2188, 2024.
- [55] Zhiqing Sun, Longhui Yu, Yikang Shen, Weiyang Liu, Yiming Yang, Sean Welleck, and Chuang Gan. Easy-to-hard generalization: Scalable alignment beyond human supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09472*, 2024.
- [56] Zhengyang Tang, Xingxing Zhang, Benyou Wan, and Furu Wei. Mathscale: Scaling instruction tuning for mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02884*, 2024.
- [57] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [58] Trieu H Trinh, Yuhuai Wu, Quoc V Le, He He, and Thang Luong. Solving olympiad geometry without human demonstrations. *Nature*, 625(7995):476–482, 2024.
- [59] Haoyu Wang, Guozheng Ma, Cong Yu, Ning Gui, Linrui Zhang, Zhiqi Huang, Suwei Ma, Yongzhe Chang, Sen Zhang, Li Shen, et al. Are large language models really robust to word-level perturbations? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11166*, 2023.
- [60] Lei Wang, Wanyu Xu, Yihuai Lan, Zhiqiang Hu, Yunshi Lan, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, and Ee-Peng Lim. Plan-and-solve prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning by large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04091*, 2023.
- [61] Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, Jiazheng Xu, Bin Xu, Juanzi Li, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, and Jie Tang. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models, 2023.

- [62] Zengzhi Wang, Rui Xia, and Pengfei Liu. Generative ai for math: Part i–mathpile: A billion-token-scale pretraining corpus for math. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17120*, 2023.
- [63] 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.
- [64] Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Kevin Lin, Jianfeng Wang, Chung-Ching Lin, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. The dawn of Imms: Preliminary explorations with gpt-4v (ision). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17421*, 9(1):1, 2023.
- [65] Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12284*, 2023.
- [66] Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. Mammoth: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05653*, 2023.
- [67] Hugh Zhang, Jeff Da, Dean Lee, Vaughn Robinson, Catherine Wu, Will Song, Tiffany Zhao, Pranav Raja, Dylan Slack, Qin Lyu, et al. A careful examination of large language model performance on grade school arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00332*, 2024.
- [68] Renrui Zhang, Dongzhi Jiang, Yichi Zhang, Haokun Lin, Ziyu Guo, Pengshuo Qiu, Aojun Zhou, Pan Lu, Kai-Wei Chang, Peng Gao, et al. Mathverse: Does your multi-modal llm truly see the diagrams in visual math problems? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14624*, 2024.
- [69] Yifan Zhang, Yifan Luo, Yang Yuan, and Andrew C Yao. Autonomous data selection with language models for mathematical texts. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Navigating and Addressing Data Problems for Foundation Models*, 2024.
- [70] Kunhao Zheng, Jesse Michael Han, and Stanislas Polu. Minif2f: a cross-system benchmark for formal olympiad-level mathematics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00110*, 2021.
- [71] 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.
- [72] Kun Zhou, Yutao Zhu, Zhipeng Chen, Wentong Chen, Wayne Xin Zhao, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, Ji-Rong Wen, and Jiawei Han. Don’t make your llm an evaluation benchmark cheater. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01964*, 2023.
- [73] Zihao Zhou, Maizhen Ning, Qiufeng Wang, Jie Yao, Wei Wang, Xiaowei Huang, and Kaizhu Huang. Learning by analogy: Diverse questions generation in math word problem. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 11091–11104. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [74] Zihao Zhou, Qiufeng Wang, Mingyu Jin, Jie Yao, Jianan Ye, Wei Liu, Wei Wang, Xiaowei Huang, and Kaizhu Huang. Mathattack: Attacking large language models towards math solving ability. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19750–19758, 2024.
- [75] Kaijie Zhu, Jiaao Chen, Jindong Wang, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, Diyi Yang, and Xing Xie. Dyval: Dynamic evaluation of large language models for reasoning tasks. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [76] Kaijie Zhu, Jindong Wang, Qinlin Zhao, Ruochen Xu, and Xing Xie. Dyval 2: Dynamic evaluation of large language models by meta probing agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14865*, 2024.

A Heatmap of MATHCHECK-GSM

We present all the checklist tables in the form of heatmaps, as shown below. The horizontal comparisons represent task generalization, with columns from left to right labeled as Problem Solving, Answerable Judging, Outcome Judging, and Process Judging. The vertical comparisons indicate reasoning robustness, with rows from top to bottom labeled as Original Problem (Seed Question), Problem Understanding, Irrelevant Disturbance, and Scenario Understanding.




Figure 8: Visualized heatmap of MATHCHECK-GSM.

B Heatmap of MATHCHECK-GEO




Figure 9: The visualized heatmap of MATHCHECK-GEO.

C Data Statistics

C.1 Overview of Data

Table 3 and Table 4 show the data statistics of MATHCHECK-GSM and MATHCHECK-GEO. Table 5 shows the data statistics of each group in MATHCHECK-GSM and MATHCHECK-GEO. In each group, since answerable judging and outcome judging are binary-classification tasks, we try our best to include two different labels in these units for fair evaluation.

	Problem Solving	Answerable Judging	Outcome Judging	Process Judging
Original Problem	129	358	358	129
Problem Understanding	129	358	358	129
Irrelevant Disturbance	129	358	358	129
Scenario Understanding	129	358	358	129

Table 3: The overview of MATHCHECK-GSM

	Problem Solving	Answerable Judging	Outcome Judging	Process Judging
Original Problem	60	120	120	60
Problem Understanding	60	120	120	60
Irrelevant Disturbance	60	120	120	60
Scenario Understanding	60	120	120	60

Table 4: Overview of MATHCHECK-GEO

	Problem Solving	Answerable Judging	Outcome Judging	Process Judging
Original Problem	1	2	2	1
Problem Understanding	1	2	2	1
Irrelevant Disturbance	1	2	2	1
Scenario Understanding	1	2	2	1

Table 5: Overview of each group in MATHCHECK-GSM and MATHCHECK-GEO

C.2 Effectiveness of GPT-4-turbo Rewriting

In the process of human evaluation, we conduct statistics on the pass rate of MATHCHECK-GSM rewritten by GPT4-turbo, as shown in Table 6. It can be seen that the rewriting pass rate is high, which reflects the effectiveness of our generation method. The success rate of Problem Understanding and Scenario Understanding is higher than 90%. There is a pass rate of 86.82% in the Irrelevant Disturbance and 81.40% in Wrong Step Rewriting. It provides references when we use MATHCHECK generation.

Rewriting Type	Problem Understanding	Irrelevant Disturbance	Scenario Understanding	Unanswerable Question Rewriting	Wrong Step Rewriting
Human Pass Rate	93.02	86.82	91.47	85.38	81.40

Table 6: Pass rate checked by human annotators for the data generated by GPT4-turbo.

D Evaluation Setup

We conduct evaluations of multiple representative generalist and mathematical models on our MATHCHECK benchmark. For MATHCHECK-GSM, the evaluation models encompass: (a) Generalist models, including proprietary models such as GPT-4o [45], GPT-4-Turbo [2], GPT-3.5-Turbo [44], Gemini-1.5-Pro [57], Claude-3 [5], Llama-3², DeepSeek V2 [51], Mixtral 8 x 7B [26], Qwen1.5 [7], Phi-3 [1], and ChatGLM3 [17]; (b) Mathematical models, including DeepSeek-Math [51] and MetaMath [65]. For MATHCHECK-GEO, we conduct evaluations on generalist models: (a) proprietary models such as GPT-4o [45], GPT-4-Turbo [2], GPT-4-version [46], Gemini-1.5-Pro [57], and Claude-3 [5]; (b) open-source models including InternVL-1.5 [14], Phi-3-Vision [1], and CogVLM2-Llama3 [61].

For Problem Solving and Process Judging tasks, we employ accuracy as the evaluation measure. For Outcome Judging and Answerable Judging tasks, we utilize Macro-F1 as the metric. We employ a zero-shot setting for generalist models and a few-shot setting (two-shot) for base models and mathematical models to enhance their ability to follow specific instructions and tasks. All the prompts used for evaluating (M)LLMs are provided in Appendix E.1.

For all the close-resourced models, we utilize the default hyper-parameters, setting the temperature to 0 and the max tokens to 1,024. Similarly, for all open-source models, the parameters are uniformly

²<https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>

configured as follows: *do_sample* is set to False, *max_gen_len* is set to 512, and the temperature is set to 0.1.

E Prompt List

E.1 Evaluation Prompt

```
You are an AI assistant that determines whether math problems are
solved correctly. Answer the question. Finally give the answer in the
format:
The answer is: ...

Question: [QUESTION]
Answer:
```

Zero-shot Prompt of Problem Solving

```
You are an AI assistant that determines whether math problems are
solved correctly. I will first give you a math problem and its
solution, help me judge whether the final answer is correct or
incorrect. Give your judgment between Correct or Incorrect. Finally
summarize your answer in the format:
The answer is: ...

Question: [QUESTION]
Solution: [SOLUTION]
Judgement:
```

Zero-shot Prompt of Outcome Judging

```
You are an AI assistant that identify which step begins the error in
solution. I will give you a math problem along with a wrong solution.
Please help me identify the step where the errors begin. Finally give
the wrong step in the format:
The answer is: Step i

Question: [QUESTION]
Solution: [SOLUTION]
Judgement:
```

Zero-shot Prompt of Process Judging

```
You are an AI assistant that determines whether math problems are
answerable or unanswerable. Please analyze whether the question
provides sufficient information to obtain an answer. Give your
judgment between Answerable or Unanswerable. Finally summarize your
answer in the format:
The answer is: ...

Question: [QUESTION]
Judgement:
```

Zero-shot Prompt of Answerable Judging

```
You are an AI assistant to help me solve math problems. Answer the
question. Finally give the answer in the format: The answer is: ...
Follow the given examples and answer the question.

Question: Leah had 32 chocolates and her sister had 42. If they ate
35, how many pieces do they have left in total?
Answer: Step 1: Originally, Leah had 32 chocolates.
```

Step 2: Her sister had 42. So in total they had $32 + 42 = 74$.
Step 3: After eating 35, they had $74 - 35 = 39$.
The answer is 39.

Question: Jason had 20 lollipops. He gave Denny some lollipops. Now Jason has 12 lollipops. How many lollipops did Jason give to Denny?
Answer: Step 1: Jason started with 20 lollipops.
Step 2: Then he had 12 after giving some to Denny.
Step 3: So he gave Denny $20 - 12 = 8$.
The answer is 8.

Question: [QUESTION]
Answer:

Few-shot Prompt of Problem Solving

You are an AI assistant that determines whether math problems are solved correctly. I will first give you a math problem and its solution, help me judge whether the final answer is correct or incorrect.

Give your judgment between Correct or Incorrect. Finally summarize your answer in the format: The answer is: ...
Follow the given examples and give your judgment.

Question: Leah had 32 chocolates and her sister had 42. If they ate 35, how many pieces do they have left in total?
Solution: Step 1: Originally, Leah had 32 chocolates.
Step 2: Her sister had 42. So in total they had $32 + 42 = 74$.
Step 3: After eating 35, they had $74 - 35 = 39$.
The answer is 39.
Judgment: Step 1 and Step 2 accurately calculate the total number of chocolates they both had originally.
Step 3 correctly calculates how many they have left after eating 35 chocolates.
The answer is: Correct.

Question: Jason had 20 lollipops. He gave Denny some lollipops. Now Jason has 12 lollipops. How many lollipops did Jason give to Denny?
Solution: Step 1: Jason started with 20 lollipops.
Step2: Then he had 12 after giving some to Denny.
Step3: So he gave Denny $20 + 12 = 8$.
The answer is 32.
Judgment: Jason ended up with 12 lollipops after giving some to Denny, having started with 20. Therefore, the calculation to find out how many lollipops Jason gave to Denny should be: $20 - 12 = 8$.
The answer is: Incorrect.

Question: [QUESTION]
Solution: [SOLUTION]
Judgement:

Few-shot Prompt of Outcome Judging

You are an AI assistant that identify which step begins the error in solution. I will give you a math problem along with a wrong solution. Please help me identify the step where the errors begin.

Finally give the wrong step in the format: The answer is: Step I
Follow the given examples and give your judgment.

Question: Leah had 32 chocolates and her sister had 42. If they ate 35, how many pieces do they have left in total?

Solution: Step 1: Originally, Leah had 32 chocolates.

Step 2: Her sister had 42. So in total they had $32 + 42 = 84$.

Step 3: After eating 35, they had $84 - 35 = 49$.
The answer is 49.

Judgment: The judgment of the given steps is as follows:

Step 1: Correctly states Leah's initial amount of chocolates.

Step 2: Incorrectly calculates the total number of chocolates both Leah and her sister had originally.

The answer is: Step 2.

Question: Jason had 20 lollipops. He gave Denny some lollipops. Now Jason has 12 lollipops. How many lollipops did Jason give to Denny?

Solution: Step 1: Jason started with 20 lollipops.

Step 2: Then he had 12 after giving some to Denny.

Step 3: So he gave Denny $20 - 12 = 8$.

The answer is 32.

Judgment: The correct method to find out how many lollipops Jason gave to Denny would be to subtract the amount he had left from the amount he started with: $20 - 12 = 8$. Thus, The reasoning error begins at Step 3.

The answer is: Step 3.

Question: [QUESTION]

Solution: [SOLUTION]

Judgement:

Few-shot Prompt of Process Judging

You are an AI assistant that determines whether math problems are answerable or unanswerable. Please analyze whether the question provides sufficient information to obtain an answer.

Give your judgment between Answerable or Unanswerable. Finally summarize your answer in the format: The answer is: ...

Follow the given examples and give your judgment.

Question: Leah had 32 chocolates and her sister had 42. If they ate 35, how many pieces do they have left in total?

Judgment: The question provides all necessary information to perform the calculation.

The answer is: Answerable.

Question: Jason had 20 lollipops. He gave Denny some lollipops. How many lollipops did Jason give to Denny?

Judgment: The question is not answerable as given. The reason is that there is insufficient information to determine the exact number of lollipops Jason gave to Denny.

The answer is: Unanswerable.

Question: [QUESTION]

Judgement:

Few-shot Prompt of Answerable Judging

E.2 Data Generation Prompt

Your objective is to rewrite a given math question using the following perturbation strategy. The rewritten question should be reasonable, understandable, and able to be responded to by humans.

Perturbation strategy: Problem Understanding: It refers to transforming the original problem into a new problem that uses different wording or different sentence structures but does not change the solution of the original problem.

The given question: {QUESTION}
Answer of the given question: {ANSWER}

Please rewrite the question using the specified perturbation strategy while minimizing edits to avoid significant deviation in the question content.

It is important to ensure that the rewritten question has only one required numerical answer. You just need to print the rewritten question without answer.

The rewritten question:

Question: {QUESTION}

Answer: {ANSWER}

Given step: {STEP}

The rewritten answer:

Prompt of Problem Understanding Rewriting

Your objective is to rewrite a given math question using the following perturbation strategy. The rewritten question should be reasonable, understandable, and able to be responded to by humans.

Perturbation strategy: Irrelevant Disturbance: It involves introducing distracting conditions that have no impact on the final answer. These introduced conditions should be relevant to the topic of the original question and preferably include numerical values. However, the rewritten problem must maintain an identical solution to that of the original problem.

The given question: {QUESTION}
Answer of the given question: {ANSWER}

Please rewrite the question using the specified perturbation strategy while minimizing edits to avoid significant deviation in the question content.

It is important to ensure that the rewritten question has only one required numerical answer. You just need to print the rewritten question without answer.

The rewritten question:

Question: {QUESTION}

Answer: {ANSWER}

Given step: {STEP}

The rewritten answer:

Prompt of Irrelevant Disturbance Rewriting

Your objective is to rewrite a given math question using the following perturbation strategy. The rewritten question should be reasonable, understandable, and able to be responded to by humans.

Perturbation strategy: Unanswerable question: It refers to eliminating a condition from the original question that is crucial for solving it while keeping the rest of the content unchanged. The rewritten problem should no longer have a valid answer, as it lacks the constraint that was removed.

The given question: {QUESTION}
Answer of the given question: {ANSWER}

Please rewrite the question using the specified perturbation strategy while minimizing edits to avoid significant deviation in the question content.
It is important to ensure that the rewritten question has only one required numerical answer. You just need to print the rewritten question without answer.
The rewritten question:
Question: {QUESTION}
Answer: {ANSWER}
Given step: {STEP}
The rewritten answer:

Prompt of Unanswerable Question Rewriting

You are an AI assistant to help me rewrite question into a declarative statement when its answer is provided.
Follow the given examples and rewrite the question.

Question: How many cars are in the parking lot? The answer is 5.
Result: There are 5 cars in the parking lot.

Question: How many trees did the grove workers plant today? The answer is 6.
Result: The grove workers planted 6 trees today.

Question: If they ate 35, how many pieces do they have left in total? The answer is 39.
Result: They have 39 pieces left in total if they ate 35.

Question: How many lollipops did Jason give to Denny? The answer is 8.
Result: Jason gave 8 lollipops to Denny.

Question: How many toys does he have now? The answer is 9.
Result: He now has 9 toys.

Question: How many computers are now in the server room? The answer is 29.
Result: There are 29 computers now in the server room.

Question: How many golf balls did he have at the end of wednesday? The answer is 33.
Result: He had 33 golf balls at the end of Wednesday.

Question: How much money does she have left? The answer is 8.
Result: She has 8 money left.

Question: {QUESTION} The answer is {ANSWER}.
Result:

Prompt to Rewrite Question and Answer into a Declarative Statement

Following is a question and its correct solution. Rewrite the solution according to following requirements: (1) Do not change the format (2) Keep those steps before the given step unchanged (3) Make minor changes to the given step so that the reasoning of this step and subsequent steps are incorrect, resulting in an incorrect answer.

Question: {QUESTION}
Answer: {ANSWER}
Given step: {STEP}
The rewritten answer:

Prompt to Generate the Wrong Step

F Case Problems

F.1 Case Problems in MATHCHECK-GSM. Problem Group ID: GSM-54

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores 4 points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. How many total points did he score?
[Answer]: 9.0

Problem Solving - Original Problem

[Question]: During a 40-minute ping pong session, Mike scores 4 points in the initial half. In the latter half, he manages to increase his score by 25% compared to the first half. What is the total score Mike achieved in this session?
[Answer]: 9.0

Problem Solving - Problem Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong in a local tournament and decides to practice for 40 minutes before the first match. During his practice session, in the first 20 minutes, while intermittently checking his phone and hydrating, he manages to score 4 points. In the following 20 minutes, feeling more warmed up and despite a short break to adjust his paddle's grip tape, he scores 25% more points than in the first session. Considering these distractions, how many total points did Mike score in his 40-minute practice session?
[Answer]: 9.0

Problem Solving - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores x points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. He scored 9 total points. What is the value of unknown variable x ?
[Answer]: 4.0

Problem Solving - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores 4 points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. How many total points did he score?
[Answer]: Answerable

Answerable Judging (*Answerable*) - Original Problem

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores 4 points. In the second 20 minutes, his performance increases by 25%. How many total points did he score?
[Answer]: Unanswerable

Answerable Judging (*Unanswerable*) - Original Problem

[Question]: During a 40-minute ping pong session, Mike scores 4 points in the initial half. In the latter half, he manages to increase his score by 25% compared to the first half. What is the total score Mike achieved in this session?
[Answer]: Answerable

Answerable Judging (*Answerable*) - Problem Understanding

[Question]: During a 40-minute ping pong session, Mike scores points in the initial half. In the latter half, he manages to increase his score by 25% compared to the first half. What is the total score Mike achieved in this session?

[Answer]: Unanswerable

Answerable Judging (*Unanswerable*) - Problem Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong in a local tournament and decides to practice for 40 minutes before the first match. During his practice session, in the first 20 minutes, while intermittently checking his phone and hydrating, he manages to score 4 points. In the following 20 minutes, feeling more warmed up and despite a short break to adjust his paddle's grip tape, he scores 25% more points than in the first session. Considering these distractions, how many total points did Mike score in his 40-minute practice session?

[Answer]: Answerable

Answerable Judging (*Answerable*) - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong in a local tournament and decides to practice for 40 minutes before the first match. During his practice session, in the first 20 minutes, while intermittently checking his phone and hydrating, he manages to score points. In the following 20 minutes, feeling more warmed up and despite a short break to adjust his paddle's grip tape, he scores 25% more points than in the first session. Considering these distractions, how many total points did Mike score in his 40-minute practice session?

[Answer]: Unanswerable

Answerable Judging (*Unanswerable*) - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores x points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. He scored 9 total points. What is the value of unknown variable x ?

[Answer]: Answerable

Answerable Judging (*Answerable*) - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores x points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. What is the value of unknown variable x ?

[Answer]: Unanswerable

Answerable Judging (*Unanswerable*) - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores 4 points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. How many total points did he score?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Find the number of points Mike scored in the second 20 minutes. To do this, take the number of points he scored in the first 20 minutes, which is 4 points, and increase this by 25%.

Step 2: To calculate 25% of 4, divide 4 by 4 which gives 1 (since 25% is the same as 1/4th).

Step 3: Add this 25% (which is 1 point) to the original 4 points to find out how many points he scored in the second 20 minutes. So, 4 points + 1 point = 5 points.

Step 4: Now, to find the total number of points Mike scored in the 40 minutes, add the points scored in the first 20 minutes to the points scored in the second 20 minutes.

So, 4 points (first 20 minutes) + 5 points (second 20 minutes) = 9 points.
The answer is 9 points.
[Answer]: Correct

Outcome Judging (*Correct*) - Original Problem

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores 4 points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. How many total points did he score?
[Solution]:
Step 1: Mike scores 4 points in the first 20 minutes.
Step 2: Mike scores 25% more points in the second 20 minutes.
Step 3: Mike's total points are the sum of his points in the first and second 20 minutes.
The answer is 28 points.
[Answer]: Incorrect

Outcome Judging (*Incorrect*) - Original Problem

[Question]: During a 40-minute ping pong session, Mike scores 4 points in the initial half. In the latter half, he manages to increase his score by 25% compared to the first half. What is the total score Mike achieved in this session?
[Solution]:
Step 1: Calculate Mike's score in the first half, which is given as 4 points.
Step 2: Calculate the 25% increase in score for the second half.
 $(25\% \text{ of } 4 = \frac{25}{100} \times 4 = 1)$.
Step 3: Add this increase to the initial score to find the score for the second half. $(4 + 1 = 5)$.
Step 4: Combine the scores from both halves to get the total score.
 $(4 \text{ (first half)} + 5 \text{ (second half)} = 9)$.
The answer is 9.
[Answer]: Correct

Outcome Judging (*Correct*) - Problem Understanding

[Question]: During a 40-minute ping pong session, Mike scores 4 points in the initial half. In the latter half, he manages to increase his score by 25% compared to the first half. What is the total score Mike achieved in this session?
[Solution]:
Step 1: Mike scores 4 points in the initial half, so his score after 20 minutes is 20 minutes \times 4 points/20 minutes = 8 points.
Step 2: In the latter half, Mike's score increases by 25% compared to the first half, so his score after 20 minutes is 8 points + (8 points \times 25% increase) = 8 points + 2 points = 10 points.
Step 3: Therefore, Mike's total score after 40 minutes is 10 points + 4 points (from the initial half) = 14 points.
The answer is 14 points.
[Answer]: Incorrect

Outcome Judging (*Incorrect*) - Problem Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong in a local tournament and decides to practice for 40 minutes before the first match. During his practice session, in the first 20 minutes, while intermittently checking his phone and hydrating, he manages to score 4 points. In the following 20 minutes, feeling more warmed up and despite a short break to adjust his paddle's grip tape, he scores 25% more points than in the first session. Considering these distractions, how many total points did Mike score in his 40-minute practice session?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Identify the points scored by Mike in the first 20 minutes, which is 4 points.
Step 2: Calculate the number of points scored in the next 20 minutes by finding 25% more than the points scored in the first session. 25% of 4 points is 1 (which is $0.25 * 4$).
Step 3: Add the additional points to the first session's points to find the total points scored in the second session. So, 4 points + 1 point = 5 points in the second session.
Step 4: To find the total points scored in the 40-minute practice session, add the points from the first and second sessions together. So, 4 points + 5 points = 9 points.\n\nThe answer is 9 points.

[Answer]: Correct

Outcome Judging (*Correct*) - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong in a local tournament and decides to practice for 40 minutes before the first match. During his practice session, in the first 20 minutes, while intermittently checking his phone and hydrating, he manages to score 4 points. In the following 20 minutes, feeling more warmed up and despite a short break to adjust his paddle's grip tape, he scores 25% more points than in the first session. Considering these distractions, how many total points did Mike score in his 40-minute practice session?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Calculate the points scored in the first 20 minutes.\n4 points in 20 minutes = 2 points per minute
Step 2: Calculate the points scored in the second 20 minutes.\n25% more points than in the first session = $1.25 * 2$ points/minute = 2.5 points/minute
Step 3: Calculate the total points scored in the 40-minute practice session.\n2 points/minute x 20 minutes = 40 points\n2.5 points/minute x 20 minutes = 50 points
Step 4: Add the points scored in the first and second sessions.\n40 points + 50 points = 90 points
The answer is 90 points.

[Answer]: Incorrect

Outcome Judging (*Incorrect*) - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores x points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. He scored 9 total points. What is the value of unknown variable x ?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Define the given information: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes, scores x points in the first 20 minutes, and scores 25% more points in the second 20 minutes.
Step 2: Since he scores 25% more points in the second 20 minutes, we can express the points scored in the second 20 minutes as $(x + 0.25x)$.
Step 3: This can be simplified as $(1.25x)$, representing the points scored in the second 20 minutes.
Step 4: Since he scored 9 points in total, we can write the equation:\n $x + 1.25x = 9$
Step 5: By simplifying the equation, we combine like terms:\n $2.25x = 9$
Step 6: To find the value of x , we divide both sides of the equation by 2.25:\n $x = \frac{9}{2.25}$
Step 7: Simplify the division:\n $x = 4$
The answer is $x = 4$.

[Answer]: Correct

Outcome Judging (*Correct*) - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores x points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. He scored 9 total points. What is the value of unknown variable x ?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Let's first find out how many points Mike scored in the first 20 minutes.

Step 2: Since Mike scored x points in the first 20 minutes, we know that $x/2 = 9$ (since he scored 9 points in total).

Step 3: Now, we know that $x = 2(9) = 18$.

The answer is $x = 18$.

[Answer]: Incorrect

Outcome Judging (*Incorrect*) - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores 4 points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. How many total points did he score?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Find the number of points Mike scored in the second 20 minutes. To do this, take the number of points he scored in the first 20 minutes, which is 4 points, and increase this by 25%.

Step 2: To calculate 25% of 4, divide 4 by 4 which gives 1 (since 25% is the same as 1/4th).

Step 3: Add this 25% (which is 2 points) to the original 4 points to find out how many points he scored in the second 20 minutes. So, 4 points + 2 points = 6 points.

Step 4: Now, to find the total number of points Mike scored in the 40 minutes, add the points scored in the first 20 minutes to the points scored in the second 20 minutes. So, 4 points (first 20 minutes) + 6 points (second 20 minutes) = 10 points.

The answer is 10 points.

[Answer]: Step 3

Process Judging - Original Problem

[Question]: During a 40-minute ping pong session, Mike scores 4 points in the initial half. In the latter half, he manages to increase his score by 25% compared to the first half. What is the total score Mike achieved in this session?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Calculate Mike's score in the first half, which is given as 4 points.

Step 2: Calculate the 25% increase in score for the second half. $(4 \div 25 = 0.16)$.

Step 3: Add this increase to the initial score to find the score for the second half. $(4 + 0.16 = 4.16)$.

Step 4: Combine the scores from both halves to get the total score. $(4 \text{ (first half)} + 4.16 \text{ (second half)} = 8.16)$.

The answer is 8.16.

[Answer]: Step 2

Process Judging - Problem Understanding

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong in a local tournament and decides to practice for 40 minutes before the first match. During his practice session, in the first 20 minutes, while intermittently checking his phone and hydrating, he manages to score 4 points. In the following 20 minutes, feeling more warmed up and despite a short break to adjust his paddle's grip tape, he scores 25% more points than in the first session. Considering these distractions, how many total points did Mike score in his 40-minute practice session?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Identify the points scored by Mike in the first 20 minutes, which is 4 points.
 Step 2: Calculate the number of points scored in the next 20 minutes by finding 25% more than the points scored in the first session. 25% of 4 points is 1 (which is $0.25 * 4$).
 Step 3: Add the additional points to the first session's points to find the total points scored in the second session. So, 4 points + 1 point = 6 points in the second session.
 Step 4: To find the total points scored in the 40-minute practice session, add the points from the first and second sessions together. So, 4 points + 6 points = 10 points.
 The answer is 10 points.
 [Answer]: Step 3

Process Judging - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes. In the first 20 minutes, he scores x points. In the second 20 minutes, he scores 25% more points. He scored 9 total points. What is the value of unknown variable x ?
 [Solution]:
 Step 1: Define the given information: Mike plays ping pong for 40 minutes, scores x points in the first 20 minutes, and scores 25% more points in the second 20 minutes.
 Step 2: Since he scores 25% more points in the second 20 minutes, we can express the points scored in the second 20 minutes as $(x + 0.25x)$.
 Step 3: This can be simplified as $(1.25x)$, representing the points scored in the second 20 minutes.
 Step 4: Since he scored 9 points in total, we can write the equation:
 $x + 1.25x = 9$
 Step 5: By simplifying the equation, we combine like terms:
 $2.25x = 9$
 Step 6: To find the value of x , we divide both sides of the equation by 2.25:
 $x = \frac{9}{2.25}$
 Step 7: Simplify the division:
 $x = 5$
 The answer is $x = 5$.
 [Answer]: Step 7

Process Judging - Scenario Understanding

E2 Case Problems in MATHCHECK-GEO. Problem Group ID: GEO-15



Figure 10: Geometry diagram for geometry problems in group 15.

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF , $\angle DCF = 20.0$, then $\angle EOD$ is equal to $()^\circ$
 [Answer]: 40.0

Problem Solving - Original Problem

[Question]: In the circle with center O , diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF , and the measure of angle DCF is 20 degrees . Determine the measurement of angle EOD in degrees.
[Answer]: 40.0

Problem Solving - Problem Understanding

[Question]: In the figure of circle O , the diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF . The length of the chord EF is 7.5 cm, which is irrelevant to our angle measurements. The angle $\angle DCF$ is given to be 20.0 degrees. We need to calculate the angle $\angle EOD$. What is the measure of this angle in degrees?
[Answer]: 40.0

Problem Solving - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF , $\angle DCF = x$, $\angle EOD$ is equal to 40° . What is the value of unknown variable x ?
[Answer]: 20.0

Problem Solving - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF , $\angle DCF = 20.0$, then $\angle EOD$ is equal to $()^\circ$
[Answer]: Answerable

Answerable Judging (*Answerable*) - Original Problem

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses chord EF , $\angle DCF = 20.0$, then $\angle EOD$ is equal to $()^\circ$
[Answer]: Unanswerable

Answerable Judging (*Unanswerable*) - Original Problem

[Question]: In the circle with center O , diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF , and the measure of angle DCF is 20 degrees . Determine the measurement of angle EOD in degrees.
[Answer]: Answerable

Answerable Judging (*Answerable*) - Problem Understanding

[Question]: In the circle with center O , diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF . Determine the measurement of angle EOD in degrees.
[Answer]: Unanswerable

Answerable Judging (*Unanswerable*) - Problem Understanding

[Question]: In the figure of circle O , the diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF . The length of the chord EF is 7.5 cm, which is irrelevant to our angle measurements. The angle $\angle DCF$ is given to be 20.0 degrees. We need to calculate the angle $\angle EOD$. What is the measure of this angle in degrees?
[Answer]: Answerable

Answerable Judging (*Answerable*) - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: In the figure of circle O , the diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF . The length of the chord EF is 7.5 cm, which is irrelevant to our angle measurements. We need to calculate the angle $\angle EOD$. What is the measure of this angle in degrees?
[Answer]: Unanswerable

Answerable Judging (*Unanswerable*) - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF , $\angle DCF = x$, $\angle EOD$ is equal to 40° . What is the value of unknown variable x ?
[Answer]: Answerable

Answerable Judging (*Answerable*) - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF , $\angle DCF = x$. What is the value of unknown variable x ?
[Answer]: Unanswerable

Answerable Judging (*Unanswerable*) - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF , $\angle DCF = 20.0$, then $\angle EOD$ is equal to $()^\circ$
[Solution]:
Step 1: Identify that the angle DCF is an angle formed by a chord (CF) and a tangent (CD) at the point C .
Step 2: Recognize that the angle between a chord and a tangent at the point of contact is equal to the angle in the alternate segment, which is angle ECF in this case.
Step 3: Thus, the measure of angle ECF is also 20 degrees.
Step 4: Observe that the diameter CD passes through the center O of the circle and cuts the chord EF at its midpoint G .
Step 5: Recall that a line drawn from the center of the circle to the midpoint of a chord is perpendicular to the chord.
Step 6: Therefore, triangle EOG is a right-angled triangle at G .
Step 7: Understand that angle EOD is double the angle ECF because angle EOD is the angle at the center whereas angle ECF is at the circumference based on the Circle Theorem.
Step 8: Calculate angle EOD as 2 times angle ECF , which is $2 * 20$ degrees.
Step 9: Perform the multiplication: $2 * 20$ degrees = 40 degrees.
The answer is: Angle EOD measures 40 degrees.
[Answer]: Correct

Outcome Judging (*Correct*) - Original Problem

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF , $\angle DCF = 20.0$, then $\angle EOD$ is equal to $()^\circ$
[Solution]:
Step 1: Notice that chord EF is bisected by diameter CD at point G .
Step 2: Recognize that $\angle DCF$ is an angle formed by the diameter CD and chord EF , so it is inscribed in the semicircle of $\odot O$.
Step 3: Recall that an angle inscribed in a semicircle is a right angle; hence $\angle DCF = 90^\circ$ (not the given 20° , which seems to be a mistake).
Step 4: Realize that $\angle EOD$ is the angle at the center of the circle, and it stands on the arc EF .
Step 5: Understand that the angle at the center of a circle is twice the angle at the circumference when both stand on the same arc.

Step 6: Since $\angle DCF$ is a right angle (90°) and $\angle EOD$ is twice that angle at the center, $\angle EOD$ is $2 * 90^\circ$.
 Step 7: Calculate $2 * 90^\circ$ to get 180° .
 The answer is $\angle EOD$ is equal to 180° .
 [Answer]: Incorrect

Outcome Judging (*Incorrect*) - Original Problem

[Question]: In the circle with center O , diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF , and the measure of angle DCF is 20 degrees. Determine the measurement of angle EOD in degrees.
 [Solution]:
 Step 1: Identify that the angle DCF is an angle formed by a chord (CF) and a tangent (CD) at the point C .
 Step 2: Recognize that the angle between a chord and a tangent at the point of contact is equal to the angle in the alternate segment, which is angle ECF in this case.
 Step 3: Thus, the measure of angle ECF is also 20 degrees.
 Step 4: Observe that the diameter CD passes through the center O of the circle and cuts the chord EF at its midpoint G .
 Step 5: Recall that a line drawn from the center of the circle to the midpoint of a chord is perpendicular to the chord.
 Step 6: Therefore, triangle EOG is a right-angled triangle at G .
 Step 7: Understand that angle EOD is double the angle ECF because angle EOD is the angle at the center whereas angle ECF is at the circumference based on the Circle Theorem.
 Step 8: Calculate angle EOD as 2 times angle ECF , which is $2 * 20$ degrees.
 Step 9: Perform the multiplication: $2 * 20$ degrees = 40 degrees.
 The answer is: Angle EOD measures 40 degrees.
 [Answer]: Correct

Outcome Judging (*Correct*) - Problem Understanding

[Question]: In the circle with center O , diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF , and the measure of angle DCF is 20 degrees. Determine the measurement of angle EOD in degrees.
 [Solution]:
 Step 1: Identify that chord EF is intersected at its midpoint G by the diameter CD ; this implies that triangle CGF is isosceles with $CG = GF$.
 Step 2: Recognize that angle DCF is given as 20 degrees and that angle DGF is also 20 degrees because CGF is an isosceles triangle and angle CGF equals angle DGF .
 Step 3: Realize that angle EOF is twice angle DGF since angle EOF is the angle subtended at the center by chord EF , and angle DGF is the angle subtended at the circumference by the same chord (the Angle at the Center Theorem).
 Step 4: Calculate angle EOF as $2 * \text{angle } DGF$ which is $2 * 20$ degrees = 40 degrees.
 Step 5: Note that angle EOD is twice angle EOF because EO is a diameter of the circle, and therefore angle EOD subtends a semicircle, making it a straight angle or 180 degrees.
 Step 6: Divide 180 degrees by the angle EOF to find angle EOD . Since EOF is 40 degrees, angle EOD is $180 \text{ degrees} / 40 \text{ degrees} = 4.5$ times EOF .
 Step 7: Determine that there is a mistake in the previous step: angle EOF is part of angle EOD and not the other way around. Therefore, angle EOD consists of two EOF angles plus the straight angle DOF , which is 180 degrees.
 Step 8: Sum up the angles to find angle EOD : angle EOF (40 degrees) + angle DOF (180 degrees) + angle EOF (40 degrees) which is $40 + 180 + 40$.

Step 9: Add the angles to get the measurement of angle EOD: $40 + 180 + 40 = 260$ degrees.
 The answer is 260 degrees.
 [Answer]: Incorrect

Outcome Judging (*Incorrect*) - Problem Understanding

[Question]: In the figure of circle O, the diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF. The length of the chord EF is 7.5 cm, which is irrelevant to our angle measurements. The angle $\angle DCF$ is given to be 20.0 degrees. We need to calculate the angle $\angle EOD$. What is the measure of this angle in degrees?
 [Solution]:
 Step 1: Recognize that $\angle DCF$ is an angle formed by intersecting a chord (EF) and a diameter (CD) of the circle.
 Step 2: Acknowledge that an angle formed by a chord and a tangent (or in this case a diameter) at the point of contact is equal to the angle in the alternate segment, which means $\angle DCF$ is equal to angle $\angle EOF$.
 Step 3: Consider that CD is a diameter, so triangle COD is an isosceles triangle with $CO = OD$ (both are radii of the circle).
 Step 4: Recall that the base angles in an isosceles triangle are equal, which means $\angle CDO = \angle DCO$.
 Step 5: Since $\angle CDF$ is given as 20.0 degrees and $\angle CDO = \angle DCO$, each of these angles is also 20.0 degrees.
 Step 6: Understand that $\angle EOD$ is the sum of $\angle EOF$ and $\angle FOD$ (since $\angle EOF$ and $\angle FOD$ are adjacent angles).
 Step 7: Since $\angle EOF$ is equal to $\angle DCF$, which is 20.0 degrees, then $\angle EOF$ is also 20.0 degrees.
 Step 8: Calculate the measure of $\angle EOD$ by adding the measures of $\angle EOF$ and $\angle FOD$, which are both 20.0 degrees.
 Step 9: Perform the calculation: $\angle EOD = \angle EOF + \angle FOD = 20.0 \text{ degrees} + 20.0 \text{ degrees}$.
 Step 10: Conclude that $\angle EOD$ measures 40.0 degrees.
 The answer is 40.0 degrees.
 [Answer]: Correct

Outcome Judging (*Correct*) - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: In the figure of circle O, the diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF. The length of the chord EF is 7.5 cm, which is irrelevant to our angle measurements. The angle $\angle DCF$ is given to be 20.0 degrees. We need to calculate the angle $\angle EOD$. What is the measure of this angle in degrees?
 [Solution]:
 Step 1: Calculate the points scored in the first 20 minutes.
 $4 \text{ points in } 20 \text{ minutes} = 2 \text{ points per minute}$
 Step 2: Calculate the points scored in the second 20 minutes.
 $25\% \text{ more points than in the first session} = 1.25 \times 2 \text{ points/minute} = 2.5 \text{ points/minute}$
 Step 3: Calculate the total points scored in the 40-minute practice session.
 $2 \text{ points/minute} \times 20 \text{ minutes} = 40 \text{ points}$
 $2.5 \text{ points/minute} \times 20 \text{ minutes} = 50 \text{ points}$
 Step 4: Add the points scored in the first and second sessions.
 $40 \text{ points} + 50 \text{ points} = 90 \text{ points}$
 The answer is 90 points.
 [Answer]: Incorrect

Outcome Judging (*Incorrect*) - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF, $\angle DCF = x$, $\angle EOD$ is equal to 40° . What is the value of unknown variable x?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Recognize that diameter CD of circle O passes through the center of the circle (point O) and bisects chord EF at point G.
Step 2: Since CD is a diameter, it creates a semicircle from E to F passing through C.
Step 3: Recognize that $\angle EOD$ is the angle subtended by the diameter and thus is a right angle (90°) because it is an angle in a semicircle.
Step 4: Understand that triangle EOD is a right triangle with $\angle EOD$ being 90° and $\angle EOF$ being half of $\angle EOD$ because O is the center of the circle and EOF is half of the circle (an arc of 180°).
Step 5: Since $\angle EOD$ is 40° as given, $\angle EOF$ must be half of that, so $\angle EOF = 40^\circ / 2 = 20^\circ$.
Step 6: Notice that $\angle DCF$ and $\angle EOF$ are vertical angles and hence are equal. Therefore, $x = \angle DCF = \angle EOF$.
Step 7: Substitute the value from Step 5 into the equation for x, therefore $x = 20^\circ$.
The answer is $x = 20^\circ$.
[Answer]: Correct

Outcome Judging (Correct) - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF, $\angle DCF = x$, $\angle EOD$ is equal to 40° . What is the value of unknown variable x?

[Solution]:

Step 1: Recognize that angle $\angle EOD$ lies on the diameter of the circle, which means it's a central angle and the arc ED it intercepts is $2x\angle EOD = 2x40^\circ = 80^\circ$.
Step 2: Since CD is a diameter, any angle formed on the circumference by diameter CD is a right angle (90°). Hence, angles $\angle CFE$ and $\angle CED$ are 90° each.
Step 3: The arc EG is half the circumference of the circle intercepted by angle $\angle CFE$, so the measure of arc EG is 180° since $\angle CFE$ is a right angle.
Step 4: Arc GF is the same as arc EG because G is the midpoint of EF, hence arc GF is also 180° .
Step 5: The entire arc EF, which is the sum of arcs EG and GF, is $180^\circ + 180^\circ = 360^\circ - 80^\circ = 280^\circ$ since the circle is 360° and we must subtract arc ED (80°) which is not part of arc EF.
Step 6: The angle $\angle DCF$ is an inscribed angle that intercepts arc EF. The measure of an inscribed angle is half the measure of the arc it intercepts.
Step 7: Calculate the measure of angle $\angle DCF$ which is half of the measure of arc EF: $x = 1/2 * 280^\circ = 140^\circ$.
The answer is 140° .
[Answer]: Incorrect

Outcome Judging (Incorrect) - Scenario Understanding

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF, $\angle DCF = 20.0$, then $\angle EOD$ is equal to $()^\circ$

[Solution]:

Step 1: OE and OF are the radius of the circle, so OE=OF.
Step 2: G is the midpoint of EF, so EG=FG.
Step 3: Because triangle OGE and triangle OGF are congruent triangles.
Step 4: so the angle EOD is equal to the angle FOG.
Step 5: because the angle FOG is the outer angle of the triangle COF, the angle FOG=angle DCF+angle CFO.
Step 6: because OC=OF (they are all radius of circles), angle DCF=angle CFO.

Step 7: therefore the angle $\text{FOG} = 2 * \text{angle DCF}$.
 Step 8: so the angle $\text{EOD} = 3 * \text{angle DCF}$.
 Step 9: Given the angle $\text{DCF} = 20.0$, the angle $\text{EOD} = 60.0$.
 The answer is: Angle EOD measures 60.0 degrees.
 [Answer]: Step 8

Process Judging - Original Problem

[Question]: In the circle with center O, diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF, and the measure of angle DCF is 20 degrees. Determine the measurement of angle EOD in degrees.
 [Solution]:
 Step 1: OE and OF are the radius of the circle, so $\text{OE} = \text{OF}$.
 Step 2: G is the midpoint of EF, so $\text{EG} = \text{FG}$.
 Step 3: Because triangle OGE and triangle OGF are congruent triangles.
 Step 4: so the angle EOD is equal to the angle FOG.
 Step 5: because the angle FOG is the outer angle of the triangle COF, the angle $\text{FOG} = \text{angle DCF} + \text{angle CFO}$.
 Step 6: because $\text{OC} = \text{OF}$ (they are all radius of circles), angle $\text{DCF} = 2 * \text{angle CFO}$.
 Step 7: therefore the angle $\text{FOG} = 1.5 * \text{angle DCF}$.
 Step 8: so the angle $\text{EOD} = 1.5 * \text{angle DCF}$.
 Step 9: Given the angle $\text{DCF} = 20.0$, the angle $\text{EOD} = 30.0$.
 The answer is: Angle EOD measures 30.0 degrees.
 [Answer]: Step 6

Process Judging - Problem Understanding

[Question]: In the figure of circle O, the diameter CD intersects the midpoint G of the chord EF. The length of the chord EF is 7.5 cm, which is irrelevant to our angle measurements. The angle $\angle \text{DCF}$ is given to be 20.0 degrees. We need to calculate the angle $\angle \text{EOD}$. What is the measure of this angle in degrees?
 [Solution]:
 Step 1: OE and OF are the radius of the circle, so $\text{OE} = \text{OF}$.
 Step 2: G is the midpoint of EF, so $\text{EG} = \text{FG}$.
 Step 3: Because triangle OGE and triangle OGF are congruent triangles.
 Step 4: so the angle EOD is equal to the angle FOG.
 Step 5: because the angle FOG is the outer angle of the triangle COF, the angle $\text{FOG} = \text{angle DCF} + \text{angle CFO}$.
 Step 6: because $\text{OC} = \text{OF}$ (they are all radius of circles), angle $\text{DCF} = \text{angle CFO}$.
 Step 7: therefore the angle $\text{FOG} = \text{angle DCF}$.
 Step 8: so the angle $\text{EOD} = \text{angle DCF}$.
 Step 9: Given the angle $\text{DCF} = 20.0$, the angle $\text{EOD} = 20.0$.
 The answer is: Angle EOD measures 20.0 degrees.
 [Answer]: Step 7

Process Judging - Irrelevant Disturbance

[Question]: As shown in the figure, the diameter CD of $\odot O$ crosses the midpoint G of chord EF, $\angle \text{DCF} = x$, $\angle \text{EOD}$ is equal to 40° . What is the value of unknown variable x?
 [Solution]:
 Step 1: OE and OF are the radius of the circle, so $\text{OE} = \text{OF}$.
 Step 2: G is the midpoint of EF, so $\text{EG} = \text{FG}$.
 Step 3: Because triangle OGE and triangle OGF are congruent triangles.
 Step 4: so the angle EOD is equal to the angle FOG.
 Step 5: because the angle FOG is the outer angle of the triangle COF, the angle $\text{FOG} = \text{angle DCF} + \text{angle CFO}$.
 Step 6: because $\text{OC} = \text{OF}$ (they are all radius of circles), angle $\text{DCF} = \text{angle CFO}$.
 Step 7: therefore the angle $\text{FOG} = 4 * \text{angle DCF}$.

Step 8: so the angle $EOD = 4 * \text{angle } DCF$.
Step 9: Given the angle $EOD=40.0$, the angle $DCF = x = 10.0$.
The answer is $x = 10$ degrees.
[Answer]: Step 7

Process Judging - Scenario Understanding