

# GoLongRL: Capability-Oriented Long Context Reinforcement Learning with Multitask Alignment

Minxuan Lv<sup>\*,1</sup> Tiehua Mei<sup>\*,1</sup> Tanlong Du<sup>\*,1</sup> Junmin Chen<sup>1</sup> Zhenpeng Su<sup>†,2</sup>  
 Ziyang Chen<sup>2</sup> Ziqi Wang<sup>1</sup> Zhennan Wu<sup>1</sup> Ruotong Pan<sup>1</sup> Jian Liang<sup>1</sup> Ruiming Tang<sup>†,1</sup> Han Li<sup>†,1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup> Kuaishou Technology <sup>2</sup> University of Chinese Academy of Sciences  
<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>†</sup>Corresponding author

We present GoLongRL, a fully open-source, capability-oriented post-training recipe for long-context reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards (RLVR). Existing long-context RL methods often treat data construction as a matter of designing increasingly complex retrieval paths, leading to homogeneous task coverage and reward formulations that inadequately reflect practical long-context requirements. Our work offers two contributions. (1) Capability-oriented data construction with full open release. We openly release a dataset of 23K RLVR samples, the complete construction pipeline, and all training code. Guided by a taxonomy of long-context capabilities, the dataset spans 9 task types, each paired with its natural evaluation metric. It comprises curated open-source samples from established corpora and synthetic samples whose QA pairs are generated from real source documents such as books, academic papers, and multi-turn dialogues. Under the same vanilla GRPO setup, our dataset alone outperforms the closed-source QwenLong-L1.5 dataset. Moreover, our Qwen3-30B-A3B model trained on this data delivers long-context performance comparable to DeepSeek-R1-0528 and Qwen3-235B-A22B-Thinking-2507, suggesting that broader coverage and greater reward diversity substantially benefit long-context capability improvement. (2) TMN-Reweight for heterogeneous multitask optimization. To address optimization challenges from heterogeneous rewards, we propose TMN-Reweight, which combines task-level mean normalization for cross-task reward scale alignment with difficulty-adaptive weighting for more reliable advantage estimation. TMN-Reweight further improves average performance over vanilla GRPO, with general capabilities preserved or improved across reported evaluations. All resources, including the dataset and training code, are publicly available at <https://github.com/xiaoxuanNLP/GoLongRL>.




Figure 1 | Overall performance comparison on long-context benchmarks.

## 1. Introduction

As large language models (LLMs) are increasingly deployed in practical domains, long-context reasoning has emerged as an important capability for advanced AI systems (Achiam et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024). Tasks such as multi-document analysis, deep research, retrieval-augmented generation (RAG), and agentic workflows often require coherent understanding over tens or hundreds of thousands of tokens (Bai et al., 2024). Although current LLM foundations have rapidly expanded their context windows through pretraining and mid-training (DeepSeek-AI, 2025; Yang et al., 2025; Chu et al., 2026), effective use of long contexts during post-training remains a significant bottleneck. Recent studies suggest that reinforcement learning (RL) can further improve how effectively these extended contexts are utilized (Guo et al., 2025; Chen et al., 2026a; Wang et al., 2026).

Existing RL-based long-context methods share a common limitation in both data design and optimization. On the data side, training data is frequently constructed around complex retrieval paths, including UUID chain tracking, chunk-based QA, and similar patterns. While such datasets provide useful supervision, they tend to produce narrow task coverage, artificial difficulty structures, and overly uniform reward design. Important capabilities such as summarization, ranking, aggregation, and structured reasoning consequently receive limited direct supervision. On the algorithm side, standard GRPO can introduce two optimization issues when applied to heterogeneous tasks. Per-prompt normalization may distort advantage estimates across prompts of varying difficulty, and reward metrics such as EM, F1, NDCG, and ROUGE-L exhibit different variance profiles, causing high-variance tasks to contribute disproportionate gradients.

We address these challenges through a capability-oriented long-context RL framework. On the data side, inspired by the task taxonomy of LongBench Pro (Chen et al., 2026b), we define 9 task types that cover core capabilities for long-context understanding and construct 23K RLVR samples across these tasks. Each task is paired with its natural evaluation metric as the reward function, rather than being collapsed into a single indicator. The dataset draws from two complementary pools, with roughly 14K curated open-source samples adapted from established long-context corpora with existing annotations, and roughly 9K synthetic samples whose QA pairs are generated from real source documents including books, academic papers, and multi-turn dialogues. The entire dataset is produced through a four-phase pipeline (Section 3.4) that covers source collection, task-oriented filtering, sample construction with multi-stage quality control, and iterative refinement guided by benchmark diagnostics. On the algorithm side, we propose TMN-Reweight, short for Task-level Mean Normalization with difficulty-adaptive Reweighting. Task-level normalization replaces the per-prompt  $\sigma_u$  with a task-level root mean square standard deviation, reducing cross-task scale differences without erasing individual prompt difficulty. Difficulty-adaptive weighting then uses a smoothed pass rate to emphasize informative hard positive samples while reducing redundant signals from easy cases.

Under the same GRPO setting, training on our capability-oriented dataset improves the long-context average from 53.0 to 62.2 on Qwen3-4B-Thinking and from 60.1 to 69.8 on Qwen3-30B-A3B, outperforming QwenLong-L1.5 trained with GRPO at both scales. Extensive ablation studies on the 4B model further show that TMN-Reweight raises the average to 63.0, surpassing QwenLong-L1.5. General capabilities remain stable or improve on the reported evaluations, including MMLU-Pro, AIME24/25, and GPQA. Our contributions can be summarized as follows.

1. **Data.** A capability-oriented long-context RLVR dataset of 23K samples across 9 task types with heterogeneous reward functions. Vanilla GRPO trained on our data outperforms QwenLong-L1.5 trained with GRPO at both the 4B and 30B scales, suggesting data coverage and reward diversity are primary bottlenecks in long-context RL.
2. **Algorithm.** TMN-Reweight jointly mitigates cross-task reward scale inconsistency and difficulty-

induced advantage bias, yielding consistent gains over vanilla GRPO at both scales.

3. **Generalization.** Long-context RL with capability-oriented data preserves or improves general reasoning and memory capabilities, including transfer to agentic memory and long-term dialogue memory benchmarks not seen during training.

## 2. Related Work

**Long-Context RL Training.** Recent work has demonstrated that reinforcement learning can improve long-context understanding beyond what supervised fine-tuning alone achieves. LoongRL (Wang et al., 2026) composes short multi-hop QA pairs into long-context tasks through KeyChain, inducing reasoning patterns that transfer from 16K training to 128K evaluation. LongRLVR (Chen et al., 2026a) identifies exponential gradient attenuation caused by sparse final-answer rewards and proposes dense context evidence rewards to mitigate it. QwenLong-L1.5 (Shen et al., 2025) reports strong results through atomic-fact-based data synthesis, task-balanced RL with task-specific advantage estimation, and a memory-augmented architecture for ultra-long contexts. Despite their progress, these approaches focus on retrieval path injection, with task types largely restricted to QA variants and rewards often reduced to binary EM or accuracy signals. Capabilities such as summarization, ranking, aggregation, and structured reasoning therefore receive less explicit supervision. Our work addresses this gap with a capability-oriented dataset spanning 9 reward types, as described in Section 3.

**GRPO Variants for Multitask RL.** RLVR avoids the need to train reward models for long-context evaluation because rule-based reward functions such as EM, F1, and NDCG provide objective signals independent of the model being evaluated. GRPO (Shao et al., 2024) has become a common algorithm in this setting, estimating advantages as  $A_i^u = (r_i - \mu_u) / \sigma_u$ . This formulation, however, introduces biases that several variants seek to mitigate.

*Difficulty bias and its corrections.* Dr. GRPO (Liu et al., 2025) observes that dividing by the per-prompt standard deviation  $\sigma_u$  can inflate advantages for both easy and hard prompts while suppressing medium-difficulty samples. It removes  $\sigma_u$  to concentrate gradients on more informative examples. F-GRPO (Plyusov et al., 2026) applies Focal-style downweighting to easy prompts (Lin et al., 2020; Su et al., 2024), but it estimates difficulty directly from raw rewards, which becomes less reliable under heterogeneous reward metrics. HA-DW (Yang et al., 2026) introduces history-aware adaptive weighting with finite-sample advantage bias analysis, although its historical mean is computed across tasks and may therefore conflate task difficulty with cross-task reward scale. These methods are helpful in single-task settings, but they do not fully address the interaction between difficulty bias and heterogeneous multitask rewards.

*Cross-task scale normalization.* QwenLong-L1.5 adopts task-specific normalization, which normalizes advantages using the reward standard deviation within each task type and thereby reduces cross-task scale differences.

*Orthogonal improvements.* DAPO (Yu et al., 2026) introduces asymmetric clipping for exploration, GPPO (Su et al., 2026a; b) propose gradient-preserving clipping, and ASPO (Wang et al., 2025a) corrects importance sampling ratio mismatches for positive-advantage tokens. These methods primarily target policy optimization mechanics rather than the advantage estimation problem studied here.

**Token-Level Importance Weighting for Long-Context Training.** A complementary line of work investigates how to weight individual tokens during long-sequence training. These studies observe that uniform-weight objectives can be suboptimal for long contexts and propose solutions including

context-aware denoising objectives (Tang et al., 2026), revised perplexity formulations for long-range utilization (Fang et al., 2025), and token-level loss weights that prioritize informative tokens (Helm et al., 2025). While these methods primarily operate in supervised settings, their insight that position- and content-dependent weighting can sharpen long-context learning signals is conceptually aligned with the difficulty-adaptive reweighting we apply at the response level in RL. Combining token-level weighting with RLVR remains a promising future direction.

### 3. Data for Capability-Oriented Long-Context RLVR

Effective long-context data construction should start from the question of what capabilities long-context understanding requires, rather than from how to inject length into a prompt. Our data construction follows a capability-oriented framework, starting from the capabilities required by long-context models and designing tasks and rewards aligned with each. This section describes the design principles (Section 3.1), dataset composition (Section 3.2), data sources (Section 3.3), construction pipeline (Section 3.4), and data validity experiments (Section 3.5).

#### 3.1. Design Principles

Our data construction is guided by three principles.

**Capability orientation.** Rather than extending context length through additional retrieval hops or distractor density, we identify 9 core capabilities that long-context models should develop and define one task for each (Table 1). The taxonomy is inspired by the capability dimensions proposed by LongBench Pro (Chen et al., 2026b). Mapping data to these tasks helps the training process exercise a broad and balanced set of capabilities rather than repeatedly optimizing a single retrieval pattern.

**Reward alignment with task semantics.** Different long-context tasks carry different evaluation semantics, and collapsing them into a single reward metric can distort the training signal. Ranking tasks, for example, produce graded relevance judgments naturally measured by NDCG; forcing them into binary Exact Match would discard the partial-order structure of the output. We therefore assign each task its natural evaluation metric as the reward function, preserving more information in each reward signal and providing task-appropriate feedback during RL training.

**Real document priority.** Template-based synthesis can generate data efficiently but may introduce exploitable regularities. When multiple short documents are concatenated and questions target only a subset, models may learn to exploit paragraph boundaries or formatting cues rather than developing genuine cross-document comprehension. We therefore prioritize real documents, including books, academic papers, legal filings, and financial reports, whose information distribution, narrative structure, and linguistic variety provide a more natural source of difficulty. When annotated data in certain domains is scarce, we synthesize question-answer pairs from these real documents rather than generating the documents themselves, ensuring that the training signal remains grounded in authentic text.

#### 3.2. Overview of the Dataset

The dataset contains **22,965** samples covering 9 tasks, with context lengths ranging from 0.1K to 256K tokens. Figure 2 visualizes the joint distribution of tasks and context lengths, showing broad coverage across both axes. Table 1 provides the full breakdown.

The task distribution is intentionally non-uniform. T1, T2, T3, and T4 constitute more than 90% of the samples and form the training backbone because they cover fundamental long-context capabilities




Figure 2 | Dataset distribution visualizations. The nine tasks T1 through T9 cover a broad range of context lengths rather than clustering within a narrow band. Most samples fall in the 4K to 256K range where long-context reasoning is most needed, while shorter and longer segments remain represented.

Table 1 | Composition of the capability-oriented long-context RLVR dataset. Each task is paired with its natural evaluation metric as the reward function.

Task	Reward Type	Samples	Ratio	Reward Function	Core Capability
T1	EM	7,908	34.4%	Exact match	Precise long-range information retrieval
T2	Accuracy	6,808	29.6%	Multiple-choice accuracy	Evidence-grounded comprehension and reasoning
T3	F1	3,478	15.1%	Token F1	High-recall exhaustive retrieval and verification
T4	<code>math_verify</code>	3,054	13.3%	Math verification	Numerical extraction and quantitative reasoning
T5	IoU	937	4.1%	IoU-based structured match	Multi-table structured extraction
T6	SubEM	360	1.6%	Substring match	Fragment-level structured matching and induction
T7	NDCG	120	0.5%	Ranking quality	Dimension-quantified retrieval and graded ranking
T8	Pairwise	180	0.8%	Pairwise comparison	Sequence reconstruction and ordering
T9	Summary	120	0.5%	ROUGE-L	Long document summarization
<b>Total</b>		<b>22,965</b>	<b>100%</b>		

and benefit from abundant real-document sources. T6, T7, T8, and T9 together account for less than 4% of the dataset because high-quality source material that naturally supports these formats is relatively scarce. We prioritize data quality over volume for these tasks, since retaining the natural reward form for each task contributes to complete capability coverage even at smaller scale.

To further illustrate the semantic diversity of the dataset, Figure 3 presents a UMAP projection of all training samples, colored by task and reward type. Samples from different tasks form well-separated clusters, confirming that the 9 reward types correspond to genuinely distinct semantic regions.

### 3.3. Data Sources

The dataset draws from two complementary pools, with roughly 14K curated open-source samples adapted from existing long-context corpora with available annotations and roughly 9K synthetic samples whose QA pairs are generated from real source documents. Table 2 maps each source to its

UMAP Projection of Training Data by Reward Type (n = 22,965)




Figure 3 | UMAP projection of 22,965 training samples. Different tasks occupy distinct regions in the embedding space, reflecting the semantic diversity of the capability-oriented dataset.

Table 2 | Mapping from data sources to tasks and reward types. Sample counts and capability descriptions are provided in Table 1.

Origin	Source	Task	Reward
Synthetic	Evidence integration QA from Gutenberg (Lahiri, 2014), arXiv CC0 (M8than, 2024), and PMC (National Library of Medicine, 2003)	T2	Accuracy
	Rule induction reasoning with multiple choice questions	T2	Accuracy
	Dialogue memory and tracking from BEAM (Tavakoli et al., 2026) and Oolong (Bertsch et al., 2025)	T2	Accuracy
	Needle in a haystack samples	T1	EM
Open source	CLongEval (Qiu et al., 2024) from novels, news, tables, and related sources	T1	EM
	Filtered WikiHop (Welbl et al., 2018)	T1	EM
	Gaokao Chinese (Zhang et al., 2024), LexSum (Shen et al., 2022), and LongBench Pro (Chen et al., 2026b)	T2	Accuracy
	LongBench Pro (Chen et al., 2026b) and CAIL2018 (Xiao et al., 2018)	T3	F1
	Financial QA (Chen et al., 2021)	T4	math_verify
	MultiTableQA (Wang et al., 2025b)	T5	IoU
	LongBench Pro clustering, consistency, and rule induction subsets	T6	SubEM
	LongBench Pro ranking subset	T7	NDCG
	LongBench Pro ordering and frequency analysis subsets	T8	Pairwise
LongBench Pro summarization subset	T9	Summary	

task and reward type.

### 3.3.1. Synthetic Data

Among the 9 tasks, T2 is the primary target for large-scale synthesis because its multiple-choice format enables both reliable automatic generation and automatic verification, and its accuracy-based reward tends to reduce hallucinated labels during generation. Tasks with more complex reward formats, such as token-level F1, structured IoU, and ranking-based NDCG, are substantially harder to verify automatically during synthesis and are therefore covered through the open-source track (Section 3.3.2). In all cases, the source documents are real-world texts; what is generated is the question-answer pair, not the context itself. To capture diverse reasoning patterns within T2, we construct three categories of T2 samples.

- First, evidence integration QA, requires the model to locate and synthesize evidence from multiple scattered passages in long documents. Source texts are real documents drawn from Project Gutenberg books, arXiv CC0 academic papers, and PMC Open Access biomedical articles (Table 2); a synthesis model generates questions and answers from these documents. All




Figure 4 | Overview of our four-phase Capability-Oriented RLVR Dataset construction pipeline.

synthetic samples, including those from the other two T2 categories described below, undergo the multi-stage quality control detailed in Section 3.4.

- Second, rule induction reasoning, asks the model to infer an underlying rule from a small number of examples embedded in task-irrelevant natural language contexts and then apply the induced rule to a new case.
- Third, dialogue memory and tracking, uses multi-turn dialogues with more than 50 turns and 30K tokens. Questions target information stated by a specific speaker in an earlier turn.

We additionally synthesize approximately 4K needle-in-a-haystack samples for T1 with an exact match reward; like T2, the binary nature of T1’s reward makes automatic verification straightforward. These T1 samples serve as a calibration anchor that helps the model retain basic long-range retrieval ability during training.

### 3.3.2. Open-Source Data

The remaining roughly 14K samples are curated from established corpora and mapped to the task and reward function that best matches their capability semantics (Table 2). The data covers domains such as legal case law, financial filings, literary fiction, and multi-turn dialogues, providing domain and format diversity that complements the synthetic portion. Unlike the synthetic track, this curated track starts from existing long-context samples with human-verified labels. These samples undergo compatibility filtering and reward format standardization to ensure RLVR compatibility, as detailed in Section 3.4.

## 3.4. Data Construction Pipeline

The entire dataset, spanning both the open-source and synthetic tracks, is produced through a unified four-phase pipeline illustrated in Figure 4.

**P1 Source corpus collection.** Guided by the 9-task capability taxonomy (Section 3.1), this

phase collects two categories of source corpora through careful manual curation. The first consists of annotated open-source datasets such as CLongEval, WikiHop, LongBench Pro, and FinancialQA (Table 2), which provide long-context QA annotations for the open-source track. The second consists of unannotated real-world documents for the synthetic track, including Project Gutenberg books, arXiv CCO papers, PMC Open Access articles, and multi-turn dialogues from BEAM and Oolong. Corpora are selected to maximize diversity in domain, document structure, and length distribution across the target tasks.

**P2 Task-oriented filtering and assignment.** This phase determines the task assignment for every sample or document by applying task-specific selection criteria. For open-source datasets, we select subsets whose evaluation semantics align with a particular task. For example, CLongEval samples that require pinpointing a single factual span are assigned to T1, while CAIL2018 samples that require aggregating multiple legal provisions are assigned to T3. For unannotated documents, filtering operates at the document level based on structural properties required by each task. The dialogue memory subcategory of T2, for instance, retains only multi-turn conversations containing speaker-specific, traceable statements and excludes dialogues with fewer than 50 turns or total length below 30K tokens. At the end of this phase, every retained sample or document has been assigned to exactly one task.

**P3 Sample construction.** This phase converts filtered materials from P2 into training-ready RLVR samples through two parallel tracks.

*Open-source track.* Samples from established corpora already carry human-verified annotations, but these are not always directly compatible with the RLVR reward format. Construction proceeds in two steps. Compatibility filtering first examines whether each sample’s annotation can be transformed into a reward-computable answer for its assigned task, discarding incompatible samples. For T1, which uses exact match, we retain only samples whose reference answers are short spans, because longer answers introduce matching ambiguity. Reward format standardization then converts the remaining annotations into the format expected by each task’s reward function. T4 numerical reasoning samples, for example, have their answers reformulated as expressions parsable by `math_verify`, and T7 ranking samples have their annotations restructured as ordered lists evaluable by NDCG.

*Synthetic track.* Filtered real documents are converted into question-answer pairs through three steps. First, documents are tokenized and assigned to length bins so that the appropriate synthesis model can be selected for each bin. We use DeepSeek V3.2 (DeepSeek-AI, 2025) for sequences within its context window and Gemini-2.5-Pro (Comanici et al., 2025) for longer samples. Second, the synthesis model generates candidate questions and answers from a task-specific prompt, following a three-step procedure in which the model identifies the source language, constructs questions with task-specific constraints including plausible distractors and at least four options, and performs a self-check for task compliance, answer accuracy, and absence of ambiguity (Appendix B.1). Third, each generated sample undergoes two stages of quality filtering. In the first stage, QA-pair verification by Gemini-2.5-Pro reviews the full source document to confirm that the question is well-defined, the designated answer is unambiguously supported, distractors are plausible but clearly incorrect, and no hallucinated content is present (Appendix B.2); samples that fail any check are discarded. In the second stage, multi-stage verification validates answer-label correctness by evaluating each sample with models of different capability levels. Because the synthetic data covers only T1 and T2, both of which use binary rewards (EM and multiple-choice Accuracy yield  $r_i \in \{0, 1\}$ ), the pass rate is simply the fraction of rollouts that answer correctly. In Stage 1, each sample is evaluated by Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507 with  $G=8$  rollouts. Samples with pass rate above 0.75 are labeled *easy*, those between 0.5 and 0.75 are labeled *medium*, and those below 0.5 are labeled *unsolved*. Unsolved samples are forwarded to Stage 2, where Qwen3-30B-A3B with  $G=8$  rollouts reclassifies them as

Table 3 | Data effectiveness validation across model scales. Bold marks the best result within each scale and underlining marks the second best. In “Flagship Reasoning Models” and “Lightweight Reasoning Models”, bold indicates the best performance within each respective group.

Scale	Model	Avg.	DocMath	LBV2	Frames	MRCR	CorpusQA	LBV1-QA
<i>Flagship Reasoning Models</i>								
	GPT-5 †	<b>74.74</b>	<b>67.62</b>	62.82	<b>84.59</b>	77.29	<b>81.56</b>	<b>73.70</b>
	Gemini-2.5-Pro †	72.40	62.38	<b>65.72</b>	74.51	<b>79.92</b>	80.62	71.28
	Qwen3-Max-Thinking-Preview †	69.43	64.12	57.89	77.93	71.24	74.69	70.71
	DeepSeek-R1-0528 †	68.67	63.44	59.48	76.86	64.88	77.50	69.90
	Qwen3-235B-A22B-Thinking-2507 †	68.45	65.75	57.46	75.12	66.17	75.31	70.90
<i>Lightweight Reasoning Models</i>								
	Gemini-2.5-Flash-Thinking †	68.73	64.75	56.77	65.78	78.84	<b>79.38</b>	66.86
	GPT-OSS-120B †	58.55	61.25	47.01	72.69	39.68	64.38	66.30
	GPT-5-Nano †	57.06	63.88	43.74	73.54	43.88	50.31	67.10
	Qwen3.5-4B	68.81	65.87	45.92	70.87	96.09	70.52	63.60
	Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	<b>74.91</b>	<b>68.87</b>	<b>59.44</b>	<b>74.88</b>	<b>97.37</b>	78.72	<b>70.20</b>
<i>Qwen3 Series Models</i>								
4B	QwenLong-L1.5 (w. GRPO) †	56.1	<u>61.3</u>	44.3	<u>67.1</u>	40.9	58.8	64.1
	QwenLong-L1.5 (w. AEPO) †	<u>59.4</u>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>47.9</b>	<b>67.4</b>	<u>47.9</u>	<u>64.7</u>	<u>65.8</u>
	Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507	53.0	61.0	40.2	64.4	38.4	49.9	64.0
	<b>GoLongRL-4B (w. GRPO)‡</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<u>45.5</u>	66.6	<b>67.5</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>65.9</b>
30B	QwenLong-L1.5 (w. GRPO) †	67.2	65.1	<b>55.3</b>	<u>71.4</u>	66.9	<u>76.9</u>	<u>67.9</u>
	QwenLong-L1.5 (w. AEPO)	<b>71.2</b>	<b>66.4</b>	<u>55.2</u>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>82.5</b>	<b>80.9</b>	<u>67.7</u>
	Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking-2507	60.1	63.3	48.7	70.2	41.6	70.5	66.5
	<b>GoLongRL-30B-A3B (w. GRPO)</b>	<u>69.8</u>	<u>65.3</u>	55.1	<b>74.5</b>	<u>81.6</u>	73.6	<b>68.7</b>

† Flagship, lightweight, and QwenLong results reported from Shen et al. (2025); Qwen3.5 and all other results evaluated under our unified protocol.

‡ Trained on a randomly sampled 8K subset of the full dataset. See Section 3.5 for details.

*medium* (pass rate above 0.75), *hard* (pass rate between 0.25 and 0.75), or *quality-insufficient* (pass rate below 0.25). Samples labeled quality-insufficient are discarded, as their consistently low pass rates under both model scales suggest label noise rather than genuine difficulty. Across the full training set evaluated by the 4B model, approximately 31% of samples achieve a perfect pass rate, 58% fall in the intermediate range, and 11% are never solved, yielding an approximate easy-to-medium-to-hard ratio of 3:6:1.

**P4 Iterative refinement.** After P3, samples from both tracks are merged into a unified dataset. We refine the dataset through multiple version iterations. In each iteration, we first apply 13-gram overlap filtering between training queries and all benchmark queries, discarding any training sample that shares a 13-gram sub-string with an evaluation query to prevent data contamination. We then train a model on the filtered dataset and evaluate it on downstream benchmarks to diagnose weak capability dimensions. When a task exhibits stagnant improvement despite sufficient sample volume, we inspect the corresponding training samples for systematic issues such as reward hacking, answer ambiguity, or exploitable formatting shortcuts, and remove the offending samples. When a capability dimension shows limited gains due to insufficient training signal, we repeat P1 through P3 to supplement the dataset with additional samples from newly identified corpora or freshly synthesized QA pairs. This cycle is repeated until benchmark performance and data quality stabilize. The complete set of generation prompts is provided in Appendix B, and the verification prompt is provided in Appendix B.2.

Table 4 | Dataset iteration. Each version is trained on an 8K randomly sampled subset from its data pool with vanilla GRPO at the 4B scale.

Version	Size	Avg.	DocMath	LBV2	Frames	MRCR	CorpusQA	LBV1-QA
V1	9,630	52.8	59.8	42.5	62.1	38.8	50.2	63.6
V2	17,729	55.0	60.0	43.7	64.4	40.7	57.8	63.5
V3*	22,965	<b>62.2</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>45.5</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>65.9</b>

\* V3 corresponds to the final dataset reported in the GoLongRL-4B row of Table 3.

### 3.5. Data Validity Verification

To evaluate the independent effect of the capability-oriented data scheme, we conduct validation experiments at two model scales while fixing the algorithm to vanilla GRPO, thereby decoupling the data contribution from algorithmic changes. The model configurations, hyperparameters, and evaluation protocols follow Section 5. Because long-context RLVR is computationally expensive, the 4B model is trained on a randomly sampled 8,000-example subset of the full dataset, enabling efficient iteration and ablation. For consistency, all later 4B-scale experiments use the same subset. The 30B model is trained on the full dataset to evaluate scalability. As the 30B MoE architecture introduces additional optimization variables unrelated to advantage estimation, the algorithmic ablation is conducted separately in the more controlled 4B dense setting (Section 5).

Table 3 provides evidence for the independent contribution of the capability-oriented dataset. Both comparison groups use GRPO, so performance differences can be attributed primarily to data construction. At the 4B scale, GRPO trained on our dataset reaches an average of 62.2, exceeding GRPO on QwenLong-L1.5 data by 6.1 points. At the 30B scale, the advantage remains positive (69.8 vs. 67.2). Notably, vanilla GRPO trained on our data already approaches QwenLong-L1.5 with its specialized AEPO algorithm (62.2 vs. 59.4 at 4B and 69.8 vs. 71.2 at 30B), suggesting that data construction and algorithm design are complementary drivers of long-context RL performance. These results suggest that capability-oriented multitask coverage and heterogeneous reward design provide richer training signals than approaches that focus primarily on retrieval-based tasks with a single reward format. As a post-training recipe orthogonal to base model improvements, GoLongRL can be applied to stronger backbones, suggesting room for further gains.

Table 4 records the training results at three key dataset versions during the P4 iterative refinement process (Section 3.4). After training on the initial version V1 (9.6K pool), single-document comprehension and basic retrieval metrics were already close to their final levels, but cross-document reasoning (CorpusQA 50.2) and long-range context memory (MRCR 38.8) lagged noticeably behind, pointing to uneven task coverage. We returned to the P1 through P3 pipeline to broaden task-type coverage, producing V2 (17.7K pool). CorpusQA improved to 57.8 (+7.6), yet MRCR stalled at 40.7, suggesting that this capability dimension responds weakly to general data expansion. Following this diagnosis, we supplemented V2 with targeted multi-hop reasoning and context-memory samples, yielding the final version V3 (23.0K pool). MRCR jumped from 40.7 to 67.5 (+26.8) and all remaining metrics improved, bringing the average to 62.2. Notably, V2 to V3 added only 5.2K samples yet produced an average gain of +7.2, compared with +2.2 from the 8.1K-sample expansion of V1 to V2, indicating that diagnosis-driven supplementation achieves higher data efficiency than undifferentiated expansion. This precise diagnosis and targeted repair is made possible by the capability-oriented task taxonomy (Section 3.1), which provides actionable evaluation dimensions for each iteration.

## 4. TMN-Reweight for Multitask Long-Context RL

The capability-oriented dataset described in Section 3 employs 9 reward functions with different numerical scales and variance profiles. Training on this mixture with standard GRPO can give rise to two optimization issues. This section first reviews GRPO and its variants in Section 4.1, then analyzes the two issues in Section 4.2, introduces TMN-Reweight in Section 4.3, and compares it with existing approaches in Section 4.4.

### 4.1. Preliminaries for GRPO and Its Variants

We use Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) (Shao et al., 2024) as the base RL algorithm. Unlike PPO (Schulman et al., 2017), which requires a separate value network, GRPO estimates advantages by normalizing rewards within a sampled group of responses, eliminating the value network and reducing the cost of long-context training.

**GRPO objective.** For each prompt  $u$ , which contains a context  $c$  and a question  $q$ , GRPO samples a group of  $G$  candidate responses  $\{o_i\}_{i=1}^G$  from the current policy  $\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}$ , collects their rewards  $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^G$ , and computes the response advantage through group-level z-score normalization.

$$A_i^u = \frac{r_i - \mu_u}{\sigma_u + \delta}, \quad \mu_u = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G r_j, \quad \sigma_u = \sqrt{\frac{1}{G-1} \sum_{j=1}^G (r_j - \mu_u)^2} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\mu_u$  and  $\sigma_u$  denote the mean and standard deviation of rewards within the group, and  $\delta$  is a small constant for numerical stability. The policy is then updated by maximizing the clipped surrogate objective.

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{GRPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{D}, \{o_i\}_{i=1}^G \sim \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\cdot|u)} \left[ \frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G \frac{1}{|o_i|} \sum_{t=1}^{|o_i|} \min(\rho_{i,t}(\theta) A_i^u, \text{clip}(\rho_{i,t}(\theta), 1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon) A_i^u) \right] \quad (2)$$

The importance sampling ratio is  $\rho_{i,t}(\theta) = \pi_{\theta}(o_{i,t} | u, o_{i,<t}) / \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(o_{i,t} | u, o_{i,<t})$  for token  $t$  in response  $i$ . The clipping range  $\varepsilon$  stabilizes the update by limiting large policy shifts. Following recent practice, we omit the KL divergence penalty term  $\beta \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{\theta} || \pi_{\text{ref}})$  because the model distribution is expected to move away from the initial policy during long-context RL.

**Dr. GRPO.** Dr. GRPO (Liu et al., 2025) identifies two biases in standard GRPO. First, division by the per-prompt standard deviation  $\sigma_u$  in Eq. 1 creates question-level difficulty bias. Prompts where all rollouts receive similar rewards, whether mostly correct or mostly incorrect, can have small  $\sigma_u$  and therefore inflated normalized advantages. Second, averaging the sample loss by response length  $|o_i|$  in Eq. 2 creates response length bias and can underweight longer responses. Dr. GRPO mitigates these issues by removing  $\sigma_u$  from advantage computation and replacing per-sample length normalization with a global constant  $L$ , typically the maximum completion length.

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{Dr.GRPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G \frac{1}{L} \sum_{t=1}^{|o_i|} \min(\rho_{i,t} A_i^u, \text{clip}(\rho_{i,t}, 1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon) A_i^u) \right] \quad (3)$$

where  $A_i^u = r_i - \mu_u$ . This formulation concentrates more gradient weight on medium-difficulty prompts and provides more consistent per-token learning signals across response lengths.

**Multitask training objective.** In our setting, the training data spans  $K$  task types  $\{\mathcal{T}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ , each associated with its own reward function  $r^{(k)}$ , including EM, Accuracy, F1, and NDCG. We sample

prompts uniformly from the full dataset, so each task’s effective weight is proportional to its share of the training data (Table 1). The overall training objective is

$$\mathcal{J}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{k \sim \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})} \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k, \{o_i\} \sim \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\cdot|u)} \left[ \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^G |o_j|} \sum_{i=1}^G \sum_{t=1}^{|o_i|} \mathcal{L}_{\text{clip}}(\rho_{i,t}, \tilde{A}_i^{(k)}) \right] \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$  is the task sampling distribution proportional to each task’s sample proportion,  $\tilde{A}_i^{(k)}$  is the modified advantage for response  $i$  under task type  $k$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{clip}}$  is the standard clipped surrogate loss. We normalize the per-token loss by the total number of tokens across all responses in the group rather than by individual response length, providing more uniform per-token learning signals across varying completion lengths. The central challenge is to compute  $\tilde{A}_i^{(k)}$  so that heterogeneous rewards produce comparable gradient magnitudes across tasks while preserving useful within-task difficulty information.

## 4.2. Problem Analysis

Although GRPO and Dr. GRPO are effective in single-task RL settings, their advantage estimation strategies can interact poorly with heterogeneous multitask long-context training.

**Defect 1. Difficulty-induced advantage bias.** Dividing by the per-prompt standard deviation  $\sigma_u$  amplifies advantages for both hard and easy prompts, while compressing advantages for medium-difficulty prompts whose rollouts exhibit greater outcome diversity. Medium-difficulty prompts are often the most informative because the model can sometimes solve them but does not yet do so reliably. Dr. GRPO addresses this issue by removing  $\sigma_u$ , which reduces the advantage to the raw deviation  $r_i - \mu_u$ . While this is a reasonable correction in single-task settings, in heterogeneous multitask training it exposes a second issue.

**Defect 2. Cross-task reward scale inconsistency.** Different tasks in our dataset use different evaluation metrics, including EM, F1, NDCG, and ROUGE-L. These metrics produce reward distributions with different scales and variance profiles. Once  $\sigma_u$  is removed, tasks with higher reward variance can generate disproportionately large gradients and dominate optimization, while tasks with lower reward variance may receive weaker learning signals. In our dataset, for instance, F1-based retrieval tasks have reward distributions that differ substantially from multiple-choice Accuracy (binary-valued) tasks, and mixing them without normalization can distort the optimization trajectory.

These two defects call for different interventions. Defect 1 motivates removing per-prompt normalization to avoid over-amplifying prompts at extreme difficulty levels. Defect 2 motivates some form of normalization to align cross-task reward scales. Existing methods typically target only one side of this tension, and addressing one defect in isolation can exacerbate the other.

## 4.3. TMN-Reweight

TMN-Reweight decouples scale normalization from difficulty correction through two transformations that define  $\tilde{A}_i^{(k)}$  in Eq. 4.

**Step 1. Task-level Mean Normalization.** Instead of normalizing by the per-prompt standard deviation  $\sigma_u$ , which conflates scale correction with difficulty amplification, we normalize by a task-level aggregated standard deviation. Concretely, we first compute the within-group standard deviation  $\sigma_u$  independently for each prompt  $u$ , then aggregate these per-prompt values across all prompts in the




Figure 5 | Normalised mean absolute advantage per task under three advantage estimation methods. For each method, per-task values are divided by the method-specific cross-task mean, so ideal uniformity corresponds to values near 1.0. The shaded band marks the  $\pm 15\%$  convergence region. The coefficient of variation quantifies cross-task disparity, where lower values indicate more uniform gradient magnitudes.

same task via root mean square

$$\hat{A}_i^u = \frac{r_i - \mu_u}{\sigma_{\text{task}(i)} + \delta}, \quad \text{where } \sigma_{\text{task}(i)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{|U_{\text{task}}|} \sum_{u \in U_{\text{task}}} \sigma_u^2} \quad (5)$$

Here,  $\sigma_{\text{task}(i)}$  is the root mean square of per-prompt standard deviations within the task of prompt  $i$ . This aggregation is theoretically motivated by a gradient norm analysis (Appendix A), which shows that the per-task gradient magnitude scales with  $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k} [\sigma_u^2]}$ , of which  $\sigma_{\text{task}(i)}$  is the empirical estimate. Because the denominator is shared across prompts in the same task, this operation reduces cross-task scale differences while preserving relative advantage magnitudes within each task. In contrast to Dr. GRPO, which removes normalization entirely, TMN replaces per-prompt normalization with per-task normalization and leaves within-task difficulty structure available for the second step.

Figure 5 provides quantitative support. We compute the mean absolute advantage per task under GRPO, Dr. GRPO, and TMN using a single inference pass, then normalize each method by its cross-task mean to isolate scale uniformity. Dr. GRPO yields a cross-task coefficient of variation of 0.54, as removing the denominator allows high-variance tasks to dominate. GRPO reduces this to 0.34 through per-prompt normalization, but cross-task disparity persists because  $\sigma_u$  corrects within-prompt rather than between-task scale. TMN further reduces the coefficient of variation to 0.18, placing all nine tasks within a narrow band around unity.

**Step 2. Difficulty-adaptive reweighting.** After TMN reduces cross-task scale discrepancies, the remaining issue is difficulty bias within each task. We estimate prompt difficulty with a smoothed pass rate and apply exponential weighting, following the intuition from HA-DW (Yang et al., 2026) that finite-sample advantage estimates can underestimate hard prompts.

A central design choice is how to estimate prompt difficulty. The naive estimate  $\hat{p}_u = \frac{1}{G} \sum_i \mathbf{1}[r_i > 0]$  from  $G$  rollouts exhibits high variance. With  $G=8$ , a hard prompt may have pass rate 0 in one batch and 0.125 in another. A batch-level pass rate across all prompts, on the other hand, discards prompt-level granularity. We address this by smoothing the per-prompt mean reward with a task-level baseline.

$$\tilde{\mu}_u = \alpha \cdot \mu_u + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \mu_{\text{task}}, \quad \hat{p} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^G \mathbf{1}[r_i > \tilde{\mu}_u]}{G} \quad (6)$$

Here,  $\mu_{\text{task}}$  is the average reward over prompts from the same task type within the current batch. The interpolation coefficient  $\alpha$  controls the balance between prompt-level sensitivity and task-level stability. Values near 1 preserve prompt-level granularity, while values near 0 borrow more strength from the task-level estimate. The smoothing is performed strictly within task boundaries to avoid cross-task contamination.

The difficulty weight is computed as

$$w = \exp(0.5 - \hat{p}) \quad (7)$$

When  $\hat{p} < 0.5$ , the prompt is relatively hard and  $w > 1$ , which amplifies rare positive samples representing successful exploration on difficult problems. When  $\hat{p} > 0.5$ , the prompt is relatively easy and  $w < 1$ , which reduces the optimization signal for problems the model already solves reliably.

**Four-quadrant gradient reallocation.** Applying  $w$  symmetrically to all trajectories introduces two concerns. For hard prompts, scaling up the dominant negative samples can create large opposing gradients and destabilize optimization; DeepSeek-V3.2 reports a related failure mode in its Off-Policy Sequence Masking analysis where divergent negative sequences mislead the update. For easy prompts, repeatedly reinforcing correct responses can concentrate probability mass and contribute to entropy collapse.

We address both concerns by applying  $w$  asymmetrically according to the sign of the TMN advantage  $\hat{A}_i^u$ . A sample is considered positive when  $\hat{A}_i^u > 0$ , meaning its raw reward exceeds the group mean  $\mu_u$ , rather than the smoothed threshold  $\tilde{\mu}_u$  used for pass rate estimation. These two thresholds serve distinct roles. The advantage sign determines gradient direction and should preserve standard group-relative semantics, reinforcing responses that exceed the policy’s current expected performance. Replacing  $\mu_u$  with  $\tilde{\mu}_u$  would weaken within-group contrast, particularly on easy prompts where the task-level component could shift the threshold below  $\mu_u$  and cause nearly all trajectories to receive positive advantage. The smoothed threshold  $\tilde{\mu}_u$  provides a stabilized difficulty estimate that reduces variance from small group sizes, but this statistical benefit should not alter gradient direction.

$$\tilde{A}_i = \begin{cases} \hat{A}_i^u \cdot w & \text{if } \hat{A}_i^u > 0 \\ \hat{A}_i^u \cdot \frac{1}{w} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

This rule creates four gradient regimes. For hard prompts ( $w > 1$ ), positive advantages are amplified to reinforce rare successful rollouts, while negative advantages are scaled down by  $1/w$  to reduce destabilizing gradients, acting as a softer alternative to masking. For easy prompts ( $w < 1$ ), positive advantages are attenuated to slow probability concentration on already-solved outputs, while negative advantages are amplified by  $1/w$  to increase learning from unexpected failures.

ASPO (Wang et al., 2025a) also treats positive and negative advantages asymmetrically, but through a different mechanism. ASPO modifies token-level importance sampling ratios for positive-advantage tokens to correct weight mismatch inside the clipping objective. TMN-Reweight does not modify the importance sampling ratio. Instead, it applies a prompt-level difficulty weight asymmetrically by scaling positive and negative advantages by  $w$  and  $1/w$ , respectively.

Combining the two steps, TMN-Reweight is designed to mitigate both issues identified in Section 4.2. Task-level normalization reduces cross-task reward scale discrepancies, while difficulty-adaptive reweighting adjusts the learning signal according to prompt difficulty.

#### 4.4. Comparison with Existing Approaches

We compare TMN-Reweight with existing GRPO variants along the two axes identified in Section 4.2. GRPO does not directly address either issue. Dr. GRPO removes  $\sigma_{it}$  to reduce difficulty bias but can allow high-variance tasks to dominate in multitask settings. F-GRPO applies Focal-style downweighting to easy prompts but estimates difficulty from raw rewards, which is less reliable across heterogeneous metrics. HA-DW introduces history-aware adaptive weighting but computes its historical mean across tasks, potentially conflating difficulty with cross-task reward scale. QwenLong-L1.5 normalizes advantages by task-level reward standard deviation, addressing cross-task scale but without explicit difficulty correction. Each method targets at most one of the two issues, and the correction may introduce sensitivity along the other axis.

TMN-Reweight combines task-level normalization for cross-task scale alignment with difficulty-adaptive four-quadrant reweighting for difficulty bias correction. The empirical results in Section 5 suggest that these two components are complementary.

## 5. Experiments

### 5.1. Setup

**Training setup.** The full training dataset consists of 23k instances. To balance computational cost and enable efficient ablation, all experiments on Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507 use a randomly sampled subset of 8k instances; the full dataset is used for Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking-2507. All methods on the 8k subset are trained under identical conditions. We use the `verl` framework in a strictly on-policy setting with a batch size of 128, a group size of 16, and a learning rate of  $2e-6$  with 5 warmup steps. For rollout generation, temperature and top-p are both set to 1.0 to promote exploration. We additionally adopt IcePop (Team et al., 2025) to mitigate the mismatch between training and inference in long-context settings.

**Evaluation.** We evaluate on a diverse set of long-context benchmarks, following the evaluation protocol of QwenLong-L1.5 for fair comparison (detailed scoring criteria in Appendix C). The six benchmarks are **LongBench-V2** (Bai et al., 2025) for general long-context comprehension, **MRCR** (Vodrahalli et al., 2024) for retrieval under long contexts, **Frames** (Krishna et al., 2025) for multi-hop reasoning, **LongBench** (Bai et al., 2024) with five subsets (2WikiMultihopQA (Ho et al., 2020), HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), MuSiQue (Trivedi et al., 2022), NarrativeQA (Kočíský et al., 2018), and Qasper (Dasigi et al., 2021)), **DocMath** (Zhao et al., 2024) for numerical reasoning over documents, and **CorpusQA** (Lu et al., 2026) for corpus-level multi-document reasoning.

To verify that long-context RL training does not degrade general capabilities, we further evaluate on standard reasoning and memory benchmarks, including MMLU-Pro (Wang et al., 2024), AIME24/25 (Mathematical Association of America, 2025), GPQA-Diamond (Rein et al., 2023), the BFCL-V4 memory subset (Patil et al., 2025) for agentic memory, and LongMemEval (Wu et al., 2024) for dialogue memory.

**Compared Methods.** We compare standard GRPO with our proposed TMN-Reweight. All methods share the same training configuration except for the advantage estimation strategy, ensuring a fair comparison. Detailed training hyperparameters are provided in Appendix D.

### 5.2. Main Results

The main results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5 | Long-context benchmark results and component ablation. Rows +GRPO and +TMN-Reweight share the same capability-oriented training data and differ only in the advantage estimation method, isolating the algorithmic contribution.

Model	Avg.	DocMath	LBV2	Frames	MRCR	CorpusQA	LBV1-QA
QwenLong-L1.5-4B <sup>†</sup>	59.4	<b>62.5</b>	<b>47.9</b>	<b>67.4</b>	47.9	64.7	65.8
Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507	53.0	61.0	40.2	64.4	38.4	49.9	64.0
<b>GoLongRL-4B</b> ( <i>w. GRPO</i> )	<u>62.2</u>	<b>62.5</b>	45.5	66.6	<b>67.5</b>	<u>65.1</u>	<b>65.9</b>
<b>GoLongRL-4B</b> ( <i>w. TMN-Reweight</i> )	<b>63.0</b>	<u>62.3</u>	<u>47.1</u>	<b>67.4</b>	<u>65.5</u>	<b>69.6</b>	<b>65.9</b>

<sup>†</sup> Results reported directly from (Shen et al., 2025), as the 4B model has not been publicly released. All other results are evaluated under our unified evaluation protocol.

Compared with the vanilla GRPO baseline, TMN-Reweight improves the average score from 62.2 to 63.0, with gains concentrated on aggregation- and reasoning-intensive benchmarks such as CorpusQA (+4.5) and LBV2 (+1.6). On retrieval-oriented tasks such as MRCR, vanilla GRPO achieves the higher score (67.5 vs. 65.5), suggesting that the reweighting mechanism is more beneficial when tasks require coordinating multiple reasoning capabilities rather than optimizing a single dominant behavior.

From a per-task perspective, different methods exhibit distinct strength profiles. The vanilla GRPO baseline achieves the highest score on MRCR (67.5), indicating that direct RL optimization is highly effective for retrieval-oriented tasks. QwenLong-L1.5, while competitive on DocMath, LBV2, and Frames, scores only 47.9 on MRCR, revealing a notable weakness in long-context retrieval. In contrast, TMN-Reweight achieves the best or second-best result on five out of six sub-tasks, demonstrating a more balanced capability profile. In particular, on CorpusQA, TMN-Reweight achieves the highest score of 69.6, outperforming the GRPO baseline by 4.5 points and QwenLong-L1.5 by 4.9 points, indicating that the proposed reweighting mechanism is especially effective for tasks requiring corpus-level information aggregation.

These results suggest that the core advantage of TMN-Reweight lies not in maximizing performance on any single task, but in providing more stable and informative training signals that improve robustness and generalization across a diverse set of long-context reasoning tasks (Su et al., 2025).

### 5.3. Ablation study

All TMN-Reweight ablations are conducted at the 4B scale, where the dense architecture provides a controlled environment for attributing performance differences to specific algorithmic modifications. The 30B MoE model introduces confounding factors such as train-inference inconsistency in expert routing, which requires dedicated stabilization mechanisms like R3 (Ma et al., 2025). We therefore validate TMN-Reweight in the 4B setting and leave MoE-specific integration to future work. The data contribution is evaluated separately at both scales in Section 3.5.

We conduct ablation experiments to analyze the effectiveness of TMN-Reweight and the effect of its key hyperparameter.

**Component ablation.** Table 5 also serves as a component ablation, since the +GRPO and +TMN-Reweight rows share identical training data and differ only in advantage estimation. The 0.8-point average gap (62.2 vs. 63.0) indicates that TMN-Reweight provides a modest but consistent gain over vanilla GRPO. The larger driver is the data itself, as vanilla GRPO on our data already outperforms QwenLong-L1.5 with GRPO by 6.1 points (Section 3.5). The algorithmic contribution of TMN-Reweight is most pronounced on aggregation-intensive benchmarks, with CorpusQA improving by +4.5 points

Table 6 | Effect of  $\alpha$  in difficulty-adaptive reweighting. Best results per column are **bolded**, second best are underlined.

$\alpha$	Avg.	DocMath	LBV2	Frames	MRCR	CorpusQA	LBV1-QA
0.0	61.3	61.9	45.8	<b>68.7</b>	64.5	60.2	<b>66.5</b>
0.5	<u>62.9</u>	<b>63.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	67.4	<u>64.9</u>	<u>67.8</u>	<u>66.2</u>
0.8	<b>63.0</b>	<u>62.4</u>	<u>47.1</u>	67.4	<b>65.5</b>	<b>69.6</b>	65.9
1.0	61.5	62.4	44.9	66.8	65.4	65.7	63.8

Table 7 | Results on general reasoning, agentic memory, and dialogue memory benchmarks.

Benchmark	Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507		QwenLong	Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking-2507	
	Base	GoLongRL (w. TMN-Reweight)	L1.5-30B	Base	GoLongRL (w. GRPO)
<i>General Reasoning</i>					
MMLU-Pro	73.6	74.3 (+0.7)	81.1	80.2	81.0 (+0.8)
AIME24	82.6	84.2 (+1.6)	89.8	90.5	91.3 (+0.8)
AIME25	80.2	80.8 (+0.6)	87.9	85.1	86.9 (+1.8)
GPQA-Diamond	65.4	67.7 (+2.3)	72.6	70.1	72.3 (+2.2)
<i>Agentic Memory</i>					
Memory-KV	12.9	11.6 (-1.3)	<b>16.1</b>	15.5	<b>16.1 (+0.6)</b>
Memory-Vec	15.5	20.0 (+4.5)	21.3	18.7	<b>21.9 (+3.2)</b>
Memory-Rec_Sum	36.8	46.5 (+9.7)	<b>36.1</b>	31.0	35.5 (+4.5)
<i>Dialogue Memory</i>					
LongMemEval	47.6	61.2 (+13.6)	72.2	61.6	<b>75.2 (+13.6)</b>

and LBV2 by +1.6 points, while retrieval-oriented tasks such as MRCR slightly favor vanilla GRPO. The pronounced CorpusQA improvement is consistent with the design intent of TMN-Reweight, which targets settings where heterogeneous reward signals must be jointly balanced.

**Effect of  $\alpha$ .** We further investigate the effect of the hyperparameter  $\alpha$  in Difficulty-adaptive Reweighting. This parameter controls the trade-off between prompt-level and task-level difficulty estimation. Larger  $\alpha$  relies more on prompt-level statistics but may introduce higher variance, while smaller  $\alpha$  leads to more stable estimates at the cost of reduced granularity. To study this trade-off, we vary  $\alpha$  while keeping other settings fixed.

Results are shown in Table 6. The best average performance is achieved at  $\alpha = 0.8$ , outperforming both extremes of  $\alpha = 1.0$  (pure prompt-level, 61.5) and  $\alpha = 0.0$  (pure task-level, 61.3). Prompt-level estimation alone introduces high variance with small group sizes, while task-level estimation alone loses prompt-specific difficulty information. The intermediate value  $\alpha = 0.8$  retains most of the prompt-level granularity while borrowing sufficient stability from the task-level baseline, and is used as the default in all other experiments.

#### 5.4. Analysis

**General Capability Retention** To evaluate the generalization of skills acquired through long-context post-training, we conduct evaluations on both **Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507** and **Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking-2507** across three dimensions: general reasoning, agentic memory, and dialogue memory (Table 7).

In terms of general reasoning, TMN-Reweight yields improvements on all four benchmarks at

Table 8 | Ablation results on long-context benchmarks (128K+). Best results per section are **bolded**.

Models	MRCR		CorpusQA
	128K–512K	512K–1M	1M
<i>Qwen3-4B</i>			
Qwen3-4B-Thinking-2507	11.16	1.37	<b>5.78</b>
GoLongRL (w. GRPO)	<b>23.43</b>	<b>4.87</b>	5.47
GoLongRL (w. TMN-Reweight)	21.85	3.87	4.56
<i>Qwen3-30B-A3B</i>			
Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking-2507	24.91	3.69	6.38
GoLongRL (w. GRPO)	<b>37.52</b>	<b>9.14</b>	<b>9.12</b>

both scales. The 4B model gains on MMLU-Pro (+0.7), AIME24 (+1.6), AIME25 (+0.6), and GPQA-Diamond (+2.3), with a similar trend at 30B. These results suggest that information integration skills learned during long-context training transfer effectively to standard reasoning tasks.

For agentic memory, both models show overall improvements, with notable gains on Memory-Vec and Memory-Rec\_Sum, indicating that long-context RL training transfers to semantic retrieval and state-tracking tasks. The 4B model shows a marginal decline on Memory-KV (−1.3), while the 30B model improves consistently across all three subtasks.

For dialogue memory, LongMemEval evaluates a model’s ability to maintain state and recall information across extended conversations. Both the 4B and 30B models achieve substantial improvements of +13.6, demonstrating significant gains in long-range dependency handling.

In summary, long-context training with TMN-Reweight preserves general reasoning capabilities while achieving substantial improvements on information integration and long-range context tasks at both scales.

**Length Extrapolation Performance.** We evaluate the extrapolation capability of GoLongRL on long-sequence MRCR and CorpusQA tasks (Table 8). Although the model was trained with a context length of 160K, its long-context capability generalizes effectively to longer evaluation sequences.

On the 4B model, GoLongRL (GRPO) achieves gains of +12.27 on MRCR 128K–512K and +3.50 on 512K–1M, with TMN-Reweight showing a similar trend. The 30B model shows even larger gains, improving by +12.61 on MRCR 128K–512K, +5.45 on MRCR 512K–1M, and +2.74 on CorpusQA 1M. These results suggest that information integration skills learned during 160K training extrapolate to much longer sequences, consistently across model scales.

## 6. Conclusion and Future Work

We present a capability-oriented long-context RL framework that mitigates two limitations of existing approaches, namely narrow data coverage and unstable multitask optimization under heterogeneous rewards. The dataset contains 23K samples across 9 task types, combining curated open-source samples with synthetic samples whose QA pairs are generated from real documents. Both tracks are produced through a four-phase construction pipeline with multi-stage quality control and iterative refinement. TMN-Reweight combines task-level reward scale normalization with difficulty-adaptive reweighting, yielding improved average performance at the 4B scale. On Qwen3-4B-Thinking, the capability-oriented dataset with vanilla GRPO raises the long-context benchmark average from 53.0 to 62.2, and TMN-Reweight further improves it to 63.0, surpassing QwenLong-L1.5. General capability

evaluations suggest that these gains do not come at the cost of reasoning or memory degradation. The dataset, data pipeline, and training code are open-sourced.

**Future work.** The effectiveness of difficulty reweighting may vary across model scales, with clearer gains observed at 4B and less settled evidence at larger scales. This motivates further study of scale-dependent optimization dynamics. The remaining CorpusQA gap suggests that targeted data supplementation for multi-document reasoning may be beneficial. Additionally, combining the context-aware token weighting method (Section 2) with RLVR for more fine-grained training would be a promising research direction.

## References

- National Library of Medicine (2003). *PMC Open Access Subset*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/tools/openftlist/>.
- Lahiri, S. (2014). “Complexity of Word Collocation Networks: A Preliminary Structural Analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the Student Research Workshop at the 14th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 96–105.
- Schulman, J., F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov (2017). *Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms*. arXiv: [1707.06347](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347).
- Kočiský, T., J. Schwarz, P. Blunsom, C. Dyer, K. M. Hermann, G. Melis, and E. Grefenstette (2018). “The narrativeqa reading comprehension challenge”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6.
- Welbl, J., P. Stenetorp, and S. Riedel (2018). “Constructing Datasets for Multi-hop Reading Comprehension Across Documents”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6, pp. 287–302.
- Xiao, C., H. Zhong, Z. Guo, C. Tu, Z. Liu, M. Sun, Y. Feng, X. Han, Z. Hu, H. Wang, and J. Xu (2018). *CAIL2018: A Large-Scale Legal Dataset for Judgment Prediction*. arXiv: [1807.02478](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.02478).
- Yang, Z., P. Qi, S. Zhang, Y. Bengio, W. Cohen, R. Salakhutdinov, and C. D. Manning (2018). “HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*.
- Ho, X., A.-K. Duong Nguyen, S. Sugawara, and A. Aizawa (Dec. 2020). “Constructing A Multi-hop QA Dataset for Comprehensive Evaluation of Reasoning Steps”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Lin, T.-Y., P. Goyal, R. Girshick, K. He, and P. Dollár (2020). “Focal Loss for Dense Object Detection”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 42.2, pp. 318–327.
- Chen, Z., W. Chen, C. Smiley, S. Shah, I. Borova, D. Langdon, R. Moussa, M. Beane, T.-H. Huang, B. Routledge, and W. Y. Wang (2021). “FinQA: A Dataset of Numerical Reasoning over Financial Data”. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 3697–3711.
- Dasigi, P., K. Lo, I. Beltagy, A. Cohan, N. A. Smith, and M. Gardner (2021). “A dataset of information-seeking questions and answers anchored in research papers”. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Shen, Z., K. Lo, L. Yu, N. Dahlberg, M. Schlanger, and D. Downey (2022). “Multi-LexSum: Real-world Summaries of Civil Rights Lawsuits at Multiple Granularities”. In: *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Trivedi, H., N. Balasubramanian, T. Khot, and A. Sabharwal (2022). “MuSiQue: Multihop Questions via Single-hop Question Composition”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10.

- Achiam, J., S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, et al. (2023). “GPT-4 technical report”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Rein, D., B. L. Hou, A. C. Stickland, J. Petty, R. Y. Pang, J. Dirani, J. Michael, and S. R. Bowman (2023). “GPQA: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12022*.
- Bai, Y., X. Lv, J. Zhang, H. Lyu, J. Tang, Z. Huang, Z. Du, X. Liu, A. Zeng, L. Hou, et al. (2024). “Longbench: A bilingual, multitask benchmark for long context understanding”. In: *Proceedings of the 62nd annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: Long papers)*, pp. 3119–3137.
- Liu, N. F., K. Lin, J. Hewitt, A. Paranjape, M. Bevilacqua, F. Petroni, and P. Liang (2024). “Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts”. In: *Transactions of the association for computational linguistics* 12, pp. 157–173.
- M8than, r. (2024). *arXiv-CC0-v0.5*.
- Qiu, Z., J. Li, S. Huang, X. Jiao, W. Zhong, and I. King (2024). “CLongEval: A Chinese Benchmark for Evaluating Long-Context Large Language Models”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shao, Z., P. Wang, Q. Zhu, R. Xu, J. Song, X. Bi, H. Zhang, M. Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and D. Guo (2024). *DeepSeekMath: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models*. arXiv: [2402.03300](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03300).
- Su, Z., X. Wu, X. Bai, Z. Lin, H. Chen, G. Ding, W. Zhou, and S. Hu (2024). “MiLe Loss: a New Loss for Mitigating the Bias of Learning Difficulties in Generative Language Models”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vodrahalli, K., S. Ontanon, N. Tripuraneni, K. Xu, S. Jain, R. Shivanna, J. Hui, N. Dikkala, M. Kazemi, B. Fatemi, et al. (2024). “Michelangelo: Long context evaluations beyond haystacks via latent structure queries”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12640*.
- Wang, Y., X. Ma, G. Zhang, Y. Ni, A. Chandra, S. Guo, W. Ren, A. Arulraj, X. He, Z. Jiang, et al. (2024). “MMLU-PRO: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37, pp. 95266–95290.
- Wu, D., H. Wang, W. Yu, Y. Zhang, K.-W. Chang, and D. Yu (2024). “Longmemeval: Benchmarking chat assistants on long-term interactive memory”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10813*.
- Zhang, X., C. Li, Y. Zong, Z. Ying, L. He, and X. Qiu (2024). *Evaluating the Performance of Large Language Models on GAOKAO Benchmark*. arXiv: [2305.12474](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.12474).
- Zhao, Y., Y. Long, H. Liu, R. Kamoi, L. Nan, L. Chen, Y. Liu, X. Tang, R. Zhang, and A. Cohan (2024). “DocMath-eval: Evaluating math reasoning capabilities of LLMs in understanding long and specialized documents”. In: *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 16103–16120.
- Bai, Y., S. Tu, J. Zhang, H. Peng, X. Wang, X. Lv, S. Cao, J. Xu, L. Hou, Y. Dong, et al. (2025). “Longbench v2: Towards deeper understanding and reasoning on realistic long-context multitasks”. In: *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 3639–3664.
- Bertsch, A., A. Pratapa, T. Mitamura, G. Neubig, and M. R. Gormley (2025). *Oolong: Evaluating Long Context Reasoning and Aggregation Capabilities*. arXiv: [2511.02817](https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.02817).
- Comanici, G., E. Bieber, M. Schaeckermann, I. Pasupat, N. Sachdeva, et al. (2025). *Gemini 2.5: Pushing the Frontier with Advanced Reasoning, Multimodality, Long Context, and Next Generation Agentic Capabilities*. arXiv: [2507.06261](https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.06261).
- DeepSeek-AI (2025). *DeepSeek-V3.2: Pushing the Frontier of Open Large Language Models*. arXiv: [2512.02556](https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.02556).
- Fang, L., Y. Wang, Z. Liu, C. Zhang, S. Jegelka, J. Gao, B. Ding, and Y. Wang (2025). “What is Wrong with Perplexity for Long-context Language Modeling?” In: *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Guo, D., D. Yang, H. Zhang, J. Song, P. Wang, et al. (Sept. 2025). “DeepSeek-R1 incentivizes reasoning in LLMs through reinforcement learning”. In: *Nature* 645.8081, pp. 633–638. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: [10.1038/s41586-025-09422-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-09422-z).
- Helm, F., N. Daheim, and I. Gurevych (2025). “Token Weighting for Long-Range Language Modeling”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2025*.
- Krishna, S., K. Krishna, A. Mohananeey, S. Schwarcz, A. Stambler, S. Upadhyay, and M. Faruqui (2025). “Fact, fetch, and reason: A unified evaluation of retrieval-augmented generation”. In: *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 4745–4759.
- Liu, Z., C. Chen, W. Li, P. Qi, T. Pang, C. Du, W. S. Lee, and M. Lin (2025). *Understanding R1-Zero-Like Training: A Critical Perspective*. arXiv: [2503.20783](https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.20783).
- Ma, W., H. Zhang, L. Zhao, Y. Song, Y. Wang, Z. Sui, and F. Luo (2025). *Stabilizing MoE Reinforcement Learning by Aligning Training and Inference Routers*. arXiv: [2510.11370](https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.11370).
- Mathematical Association of America (2025). *American Invitational Mathematics Examination (AIME)*. <https://maa.org/maa-invitational-competitions/>.
- Patil, S. G., H. Mao, F. Yan, C. C.-J. Ji, V. Suresh, I. Stoica, and J. E. Gonzalez (2025). “The berkeley function calling leaderboard (bfcl): From tool use to agentic evaluation of large language models”. In: *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Shen, W., Z. Yang, C. Li, Z. Lu, M. Peng, H. Sun, Y. Shi, S. Liao, S. Lai, B. Zhang, D. Liu, F. Huang, J. Zhou, and M. Yan (2025). *QwenLong-L1.5: Post-Training Recipe for Long-Context Reasoning and Memory Management*. arXiv: [2512.12967](https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.12967).
- Su, Z., L. Pan, M. Lv, T. Mei, Z. Lin, Y. Li, W. Hu, R. Tang, K. Gai, and G. Zhou (2025). “Entropy Ratio Clipping as a Soft Global Constraint for Stable Reinforcement Learning”. In: *CoRR abs/2512.05591*. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2512.05591](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2512.05591). arXiv: [2512.05591](https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.05591). URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2512.05591>.
- Team, L., A. Shen, B. Li, B. Hu, B. Jing, C. Chen, C. Huang, C. Zhang, C. Yang, C. Lin, et al. (2025). “Every step evolves: Scaling reinforcement learning for trillion-scale thinking model”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18855*.
- Wang, J., R. Liu, L. Lin, W. Hu, X. Li, F. Zhang, G. Zhou, and K. Gai (2025a). *ASPO: Asymmetric Importance Sampling Policy Optimization*. arXiv: [2510.06062](https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.06062).
- Wang, X., M. Costa, J. Kovaceva, S. Wang, and F. C. Pereira (2025b). “Plugging Schema Graph into Multi-Table QA: A Human-Guided Framework for Reducing LLM Reliance”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*. Suzhou, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 5829–5842.
- Yang, A., A. Li, B. Yang, B. Zhang, B. Hui, et al. (2025). *Qwen3 Technical Report*. arXiv: [2505.09388](https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388).
- Chen, G., M. Q. Shieh, and L. Bing (2026a). “LongRLVR: Long-Context Reinforcement Learning Requires Verifiable Context Rewards”. In: *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Chen, Z., X. Wu, J. Jia, C. Gao, Q. Fu, D. Zhang, and S. Hu (2026b). *LongBench Pro: A More Realistic and Comprehensive Bilingual Long-Context Evaluation Benchmark*. arXiv: [2601.02872](https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.02872).
- Chu, C., G. Zhou, G. Zhang, H. Li, H. Peng, H. Cheng, J. Liang, J. Cao, K. Gai, L. Zhou, et al. (2026). “Kwai Summary Attention Technical Report”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.24432*.
- Lu, Z., C. Li, Y. Shi, W. Shen, M. Yan, and F. Huang (2026). “CorpusQA: A 10 Million Token Benchmark for Corpus-Level Analysis and Reasoning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.14952*.
- Plyusov, D., A. Gorbatoevski, B. Shaposhnikov, V. Sini, A. Malakhov, and D. Gavrilo (2026). *F-GRPO: Don’t Let Your Policy Learn the Obvious and Forget the Rare*. arXiv: [2602.06717](https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.06717).
- Su, Z., L. Pan, X. Bai, D. Liu, G. Dong, J. Huang, M. Lv, W. Hu, F. Zhang, K. Gai, and G. Zhou (2026a). *Klear-Reasoner: Advancing Reasoning Capability via Gradient-Preserving Clipping Policy Optimization*. arXiv: [2508.07629](https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.07629).

- Su, Z., L. Pan, M. Lv, Y. Li, W. Hu, F. Zhang, K. Gai, and G. Zhou (2026b). *CE-GPPO: Coordinating Entropy via Gradient-Preserving Clipping Policy Optimization in Reinforcement Learning*. arXiv: 2509.20712 [cs.LG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.20712>.
- Tang, Z., B. Ji, J. Li, L. Wu, H. Gui, and M. Zhang (2026). “Revisiting Long-context Modeling from Context Denoising Perspective”. In: *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tavakoli, M., A. Salemi, C. Ye, M. Abdalla, H. Zamani, and J. R. Mitchell (2026). “Beyond a Million Tokens: Benchmarking and Enhancing Long-Term Memory in LLMs”. In: *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Wang, S., G. Zhang, L. L. Zhang, N. Shang, F. Yang, D. Chen, and M. Yang (2026). “LoongRL: Reinforcement Learning for Advanced Reasoning over Long Contexts”. In: *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yang, F., Z. Chen, X. Wang, X. Lu, J. Chai, G. Yin, W. Lin, S. Ma, F. Zhuang, D. Wang, Y. Yang, J. Li, and Y. Ban (2026). *Your Group-Relative Advantage Is Biased*. arXiv: 2601.08521.
- Yu, Q., Z. Zhang, R. Zhu, Y. Yuan, X. Zuo, et al. (2026). “DAPO: An Open-Source LLM Reinforcement Learning System at Scale”. In: *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

## A. Gradient Analysis and Theoretical Motivation for TMN

This appendix provides a gradient-based derivation that motivates the task-level normalization in TMN (Section 4.3). The analysis starts from the REINFORCE-style policy gradient used by Dr. GRPO and shows that the per-task gradient magnitude is governed by the expected within-prompt reward variance. Equalizing these magnitudes across tasks leads naturally to the  $\sigma_{\text{task}}$  denominator introduced in the main text.

### A.1. Per-Prompt Gradient Norm Bound

Consider a GRPO variant that removes the per-prompt standard deviation, as in Dr. GRPO. The policy gradient takes the REINFORCE form

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J} = \mathbb{E}_{u,o} \left[ (r(u,o) - \mu_u) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(o | u) \right] \quad (9)$$

where  $u$  denotes the prompt,  $o$  the sampled response,  $r(u,o)$  the reward, and  $\mu_u = \mathbb{E}_o[r(u,o)]$  the expected reward under prompt  $u$ . For a single prompt  $u$ , the per-prompt gradient is

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J}_u = \mathbb{E}_o \left[ (r(u,o) - \mu_u) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(o | u) \right] \quad (10)$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality applied inside the expectation,

$$\|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J}_u\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_o \left[ (r(u,o) - \mu_u)^2 \|\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(o | u)\|^2 \right] \quad (11)$$

Assuming that the log-probability gradient norm  $\|\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(o | u)\|^2$  varies modestly compared with the reward deviation  $(r - \mu_u)^2$ , the dominant factor controlling the per-prompt gradient magnitude is the within-prompt reward variance

$$\text{Var}(r | u) = \mathbb{E}_o \left[ (r(u,o) - \mu_u)^2 \right] = \sigma_u^2 \quad (12)$$

This quantity is exactly the square of the per-prompt standard deviation  $\sigma_u$  defined in Eq. 1 of the main text.

## A.2. Per-Task Gradient Magnitude

Now consider  $K$  task types  $\{\mathcal{T}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ , each with its own reward function  $r^{(k)}$ . The overall gradient decomposes as

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J} = \mathbb{E}_{k \sim \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})} \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k, o} \left[ (r^{(k)}(u, o) - \mu_u) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(o | u) \right] \quad (13)$$

The gradient contribution from task  $k$  is

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J}_k = \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k, o} \left[ (r^{(k)}(u, o) - \mu_u) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(o | u) \right] \quad (14)$$

Extending the per-prompt analysis, the magnitude of  $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J}_k$  is governed by the expected within-prompt reward variance across prompts in task  $k$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k} [\sigma_u^2] = \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k} [\text{Var}(r^{(k)} | u)] \quad (15)$$

Tasks whose reward functions produce higher variance, such as continuous-valued F1 or NDCG metrics, will contribute larger gradient norms than tasks with lower-variance rewards, such as EM or multiple-choice Accuracy (both binary-valued). Without explicit normalization, the former can dominate the joint optimization.

## A.3. Deriving the Normalization Coefficient

To equalize gradient magnitudes across tasks, we introduce a per-task scaling coefficient  $\alpha_k$  that normalizes the advantage by the expected gradient scale. Setting the target to unit gradient magnitude yields

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k} [\sigma_u^2] + \delta}} \quad (16)$$

The empirical estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k} [\sigma_u^2]$  over a batch containing  $|U_{\text{task}}|$  prompts from task  $k$  is

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\sigma_u^2] = \frac{1}{|U_{\text{task}}|} \sum_{u \in U_{\text{task}}} \sigma_u^2 \quad (17)$$

Taking the square root recovers  $\sigma_{\text{task}(i)}$  as defined in Eq. 5 of the main text,

$$\sigma_{\text{task}(i)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{|U_{\text{task}}|} \sum_{u \in U_{\text{task}}} \sigma_u^2} \quad (18)$$

This establishes that the TMN denominator is the natural normalization constant for equalizing per-task gradient contributions under the variance-based gradient bound in Eq. 11.

The derivation above provides the theoretical basis for the  $\sigma_{\text{task}(i)}$  formula in Eq. 5 of Section 4.3. **The per-task gradient magnitude is governed by  $\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{T}_k} [\sigma_u^2]$ , which is the expected within-prompt reward variance, not by  $\text{Var}_{u,o}(r^{(k)})$ , which is the total variance obtained by pooling all reward samples across prompts.** These two quantities differ because the pooled variance conflates within-prompt variation (which drives gradient magnitude) with between-prompt variation in mean reward (which reflects difficulty differences rather than scale differences). Computing  $\sigma_{\text{task}(i)}$  as the root mean square of per-prompt  $\sigma_u$  values estimates precisely the former, yielding a normalization constant that equalizes gradient scales without distorting the difficulty structure that TMN-Reweight subsequently exploits in its second step.

#### A.4. Structural Relationship to GRPO

The task-level coefficient  $\alpha_k$  in Eq. 16 bears a notable structural resemblance to the per-prompt normalization used by standard GRPO. In GRPO, the advantage for each response is divided by  $\sigma_u$ , which is equivalent to applying a prompt-level coefficient

$$\eta_u = \frac{1}{\sigma_u + \delta} \quad (19)$$

Both  $\alpha_k$  and  $\eta_u$  normalize by a standard deviation to balance reward scales, and both can be viewed as instances of the same variance-based principle. The critical difference lies in the granularity at which normalization is applied. GRPO applies  $\eta_u$  at the prompt level, which addresses cross-task scale differences but simultaneously distorts within-task difficulty structure, because prompts with small  $\sigma_u$  (easy or hard) receive inflated advantages. TMN applies  $\alpha_k$  at the task level, which addresses cross-task scale differences through a shared denominator while preserving relative advantage magnitudes within each task, leaving the difficulty structure intact for subsequent reweighting.

This analysis clarifies the empirical observation in Figure 5. In single-task settings with a uniform reward function, removing  $\sigma_u$  entirely (as in Dr. GRPO) often improves performance because the per-prompt normalization introduces difficulty bias without providing useful scale correction. In our multitask setting, however, removing  $\sigma_u$  exposes the gradient to uncorrected cross-task scale differences, which can degrade performance. TMN resolves this tension by retaining normalization at the task level, where it serves the useful function of scale alignment, while removing it at the prompt level (within each task), where it would distort difficulty signals. The result is a method that inherits the scale-balancing property of GRPO across tasks and the unbiased advantage estimation of REINFORCE within each task.

## B. Data Generation Prompts

This appendix documents the prompts used to generate training samples in the capability-oriented dataset described in Section 3. Each prompt is organized under the corresponding task in our 9-task taxonomy. Within each task, subtask prompts specify the context requirement (Full or Partial), the evaluation metric, and the expected output format. All prompts follow a unified structure: a primary task definition establishes the capability being assessed, while secondary task definitions specify the concrete subtask, its scope, and the answer format.

The sample generation pipeline feeds each prompt together with a long source document into the synthesis model. The model then produces candidate questions and reference answers, which are subsequently parsed, validated through QA-pair verification by Gemini-2.5-Pro, and quality-calibrated through multi-stage verification as described in Section 3.4.

### B.1. Shared Generation Instruction

All task-specific prompts are wrapped inside the following shared instruction template, which guides the synthesis model through language identification, question construction, identifier design, and self-checking.

#### Shared Sample Generation Instruction

You are a professional question-design specialist with capabilities in textual deconstruction, deep reading, and cross-domain item construction.

Task: Given an input long context and its task category (primary task + secondary task), create three questions that fulfill the task requirements, including answers, design rationale, and detailed solution process.

Procedure:

1. Language Identification

Determine the language of the input long text. All subsequent content must fully use the same language.

2. Question Construction

- Generate three questions satisfying the secondary task specifications.
- Questions must meet the evaluation goals of the primary task, the required I/O format, and the secondary task definition.
- The three questions must exhibit clear differentiation, avoiding repeated formats or duplicate assessment points.
- Identifier Rules: Use naturally occurring unique elements (titles, section names, entities) as identifiers. If insufficient, construct identifiers using only letters and numbers.
- For multiple-choice questions: include plausible distractors, at least four options, and a text-verifiable correct option.
- Provide design rationale and solution with evidence for every question.

3. Self-Check

Verify task compliance, answer accuracy, absence of ambiguity, and language consistency. Regenerate if any criterion fails.

Input:

[Long Context]: {Long\_Context}  
 [Primary Task]: {Primary\_Task}  
 [Secondary Task]: {Secondary\_Task}

## B.2. QA-Pair Verification Prompt

After QA generation, each sample undergoes QA-pair verification. The following prompt is sent to Gemini-2.5-Pro together with the full source document and the generated QA pair. Samples that receive a REJECT verdict are discarded before multi-stage verification.

### QA-Pair Verification Prompt

You are a rigorous quality assessor for long-context question-answer pairs. Given a source document and a generated QA sample (question, answer options, the designated correct answer, and the solution rationale), perform all of the following checks.

1. Answer Uniqueness

Verify that the correct answer is uniquely and unambiguously supported by the source document. The answer must be derivable from the text without requiring external knowledge or subjective interpretation. If the document could support more than one option, flag the sample.

2. Distractor Quality

Confirm that each distractor (incorrect option) is plausible given the topic but clearly wrong according to the source document. Flag any distractor that is trivially distinguishable, or that could also be considered correct under a reasonable reading.

3. Hallucination Detection

Check whether the question, the answer, or the rationale contains any claim not grounded in the source document. Flag fabricated entities, events, numbers, or causal relationships.

4. Task Compliance

Verify that the question targets the intended reasoning capability (e.g., cross-passage evidence integration, rule induction, or speaker tracking in dialogue) and that the answer format matches the task specification.

5. Language and Format Consistency

Confirm that the question and all options are in the same language as the source document and that the output follows the required structured format.

Output format:  
 Verdict -- PASS or REJECT  
 If REJECT, specify which check(s) failed and provide a brief explanation for each failure.

Input:  
 [Source Document]: {Source\_Document}  
 [Question]: {Question}  
 [Options]: {Options}  
 [Correct Answer]: {Correct\_Answer}  
 [Solution Rationale]: {Solution\_Rationale}

### B.3. T1: Precise Long-Range Information Retrieval

T1 evaluates a model’s ability to locate and extract specific information across long documents. The reward function is Exact Match (EM). Training data for this task primarily consists of needle-in-a-haystack samples and curated open-source retrieval instances, which do not require task-specific generation prompts beyond the shared instruction above.

### B.4. T2: Evidence-Grounded Comprehension and Reasoning

T2 assesses the model’s ability to answer fact-based and reasoning questions grounded in textual evidence. The reward function is multiple-choice Accuracy. This task encompasses multi-hop integration QA, single-hop fact QA, dialogue memory tracking, and related comprehension patterns. Below we present the subtask prompts.

#### B.4.1. T2-a: Multi-Document Integration QA

Answer questions that require synthesizing information from multiple scattered passages across the full document.

##### T2-a: Multi-Document Integration QA

Primary Task: Evidence-Grounded QA  
 Answer fact/reasoning questions based on evidence.

Secondary Task: Multi-Doc Integration QA  
 Use multi-hop information across documents to answer questions.  
 Context Requirement: Full  
 Metric: Accuracy

Output format:  
 Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the answer option letter (A/B/C/D), without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 C

#### B.4.2. T2-b: Single-Hop Fact QA

Answer questions that can be resolved from a localized paragraph without cross-document reasoning.

##### T2-b: Single-Hop Fact QA

Primary Task: Evidence-Grounded QA  
 Answer fact/reasoning questions based on evidence.

Secondary Task: Single-Hop Fact QA  
 Answer questions based on local paragraphs.  
 Context Requirement: Partial  
 Metric: Accuracy

Output format:  
 Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the answer option letter (A/B/C/D), without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 A

### B.4.3. T2-c: Long-Range Entity and Commitment Tracking

Track entity states and commitments across extended dialogue or narrative context.

#### T2-c: Long-Range Entity and Commitment Tracking

Primary Task: Dialogue Memory and Long-Horizon Tracking  
 Track and respond to dialogue history.

Secondary Task: Long-Range Entity and Commitment Tracking  
 Track entity states across the global context.  
 Context Requirement: Full  
 Metric: Accuracy

Output format:  
 Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output A/B/C/D/E, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 B

### B.4.4. T2-d: Short-Range Reference Resolution

Resolve references and query local states within a bounded dialogue or narrative segment.

#### T2-d: Short-Range Reference Resolution

Primary Task: Dialogue Memory and Long-Horizon Tracking  
 Track and respond to dialogue history.

Secondary Task: Short-Range Reference Resolution  
 Resolve references and states in local context.  
 Context Requirement: Partial  
 Metric: Accuracy

Output format:  
 Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the answer option letter (A/B/C/D), without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 B

## B.5. T3: High-Recall Exhaustive Retrieval and Verification

T3 targets the model's ability to exhaustively retrieve, verify, and align information with high recall. The reward function is token-level F1. This task aggregates subtasks involving citation alignment, subset identification, compliance checking, and version diff analysis.

**B.5.1. T3-a: Full-Sentence Citation Alignment**

Identify all source locations that support a given summary sentence.

**T3-a: Full-Sentence Citation Alignment**

Primary Task: Attribution and Citation Alignment  
Bind correct sources to generated text by identifying citation locations.

Secondary Task: Full-Sentence Citation Alignment  
Citation alignment for all sentences.  
Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: F1

Instruction:  
You will be provided with a summary sentence. Identify the original Part number(s) from the provided text that fully support this sentence.

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the cited content (format as "Part xx") line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
Part 1  
Part 12  
Part 15

**B.5.2. T3-b: Key-Statement Citation Alignment**

Identify source locations for a specified sentence within a multi-sentence summary.

**T3-b: Key-Statement Citation Alignment**

Primary Task: Attribution and Citation Alignment  
Bind correct sources to generated text by identifying citation locations.

Secondary Task: Key-Statement Citation Alignment  
Citation alignment for specified sentences.  
Context Requirement: Partial  
Metric: F1

Instruction:  
You will see a generated multi-sentence summary. Identify and cite the original source location for the specified sentence only, using paragraph identifiers from the source text.

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the paragraph identifier(s) line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
S1  
S2

**B.5.3. T3-c: Targeted Subset Identification**

Identify instances belonging to a specified category within a collection.

**T3-c: Targeted Subset Identification**

Primary Task: Aggregation and Clustering  
Cluster and output statistics, examples, or sorted results.

Secondary Task: Targeted Subset Cluster Identification

Return instances matching a query category.  
 Context Requirement: Partial  
 Metric: F1

Output format:

Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the IDs that meet the conditions line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 A22V1MD93T2FW9  
 ACJT8MUCOLRF0  
 A38NELQT98S4H8

#### ***B.5.4. T3-d: Global Conflict and Inconsistency Localization***

Detect and locate contradictory or inconsistent content across the full text.

##### **T3-d: Global Conflict and Inconsistency Localization**

Primary Task: Consistency and Compliance Checking  
 Detect and locate contradictions, violations, or conflicts in documents.

Secondary Task: Global Conflict and Inconsistency Localization  
 Locate contradictory segments in the full text.  
 Context Requirement: Full  
 Metric: F1

Output format:

Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output all inconsistent article pairs line by line in the format "A[id] B[id]", without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 A1 B2  
 A2 B3

#### ***B.5.5. T3-e: Targeted Rule Violation Detection***

Identify content that violates specific rules or conditions within a designated scope.

##### **T3-e: Targeted Rule Violation Detection**

Primary Task: Consistency and Compliance Checking  
 Detect and locate contradictions, violations, or conflicts in documents.

Secondary Task: Targeted Rule or Condition Violation Detection  
 Locate content that violates specific rules.  
 Context Requirement: Partial  
 Metric: F1

Output format:

Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output all violated term IDs line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 5  
 6

#### ***B.5.6. T3-f: Comprehensive Error and Anomaly Sweep***

Locate all errors or anomalies (e.g., misspellings) across the full document.

**T3-f: Comprehensive Error and Anomaly Sweep**

Primary Task: Consistency and Compliance Checking  
 Detect and locate contradictions, violations, or conflicts in documents.

Secondary Task: Comprehensive Error and Anomaly Sweep  
 Locate errors (e.g., spelling) in the full text.  
 Context Requirement: Full  
 Metric: F1

Output format:  
 Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output all identified errors line by line, without any additional content.

```
[Answer]
beleive
freind
tomorrow
```

**B.5.7. T3-g: Dependency-Aware Multi-Version Impact Analysis**

Track dependency changes across multiple versions of a document or codebase.

**T3-g: Multi-Version Impact Analysis**

Primary Task: Version and Code Diff Analysis  
 Compare changes in different text/code versions.

Secondary Task: Dependency-Aware Multi-Version Impact Analysis  
 Track dependency changes across versions.  
 Context Requirement: Full  
 Metric: F1

Instruction:  
 Identify all methods/elements that changed status between versions. Use the signature as the identifier in the format "MethodName(ParameterTypes)".

Output format:  
 Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the identifiers line by line, without any additional content.

```
[Answer]
MethodA(java.lang.String)
MethodB()
MethodC(int, java.lang.String)
```

**B.5.8. T3-h: Localized Interface Change Detection**

Detect local differences between two versions of an interface or resource model.

**T3-h: Localized Interface Change Detection**

Primary Task: Version and Code Diff Analysis  
 Compare changes in different text/code versions.

Secondary Task: Localized Interface Change Detection  
 Detect local version differences.  
 Context Requirement: Partial  
 Metric: F1

Instruction:  
 Identify fields that were renamed, removed, or refactored between versions. Use the format "Model : [Field Name]".

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output fields line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
Lesson Model: key  
Lesson Model: seq length

## B.6. T4: Numerical Extraction and Quantitative Reasoning

T4 evaluates the model's ability to perform numerical calculations within structured text such as financial tables and reports. The reward function uses `math_verify`. Subtask prompts cover both multi-source consistency verification and single-source targeted aggregation.

### B.6.1. T4-a: Multi-Source Consistency Verification

Verify numerical consistency across multiple structured sources using a given formula.

#### T4-a: Multi-Source Consistency Verification

Primary Task: Structured and Numeric Reasoning  
Numerical calculations in structured text.

Secondary Task: Structured Multi-Source Consistency Verification  
Numerical computation across multiple sources.  
Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: `math_verify`

Instruction:  
Given multiple tables, use the provided formula to determine whether the computed values are consistent across sources. If consistent, return "No Error". If inconsistent, return the corresponding record IDs.

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output "No Error" or the corresponding IDs line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
No Error

### B.6.2. T4-b: Single-Source Targeted Aggregation

Perform targeted computations within a single structured source.

#### T4-b: Single-Source Targeted Aggregation

Primary Task: Structured and Numeric Reasoning  
Numerical calculations in structured text.

Secondary Task: Single-Source Targeted Aggregation  
Query computation in a single source.  
Context Requirement: Partial  
Metric: `math_verify`

Instruction:  
According to the specified table, calculate the requested quantities (e.g., percentage changes).

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the computed values line by line, without any additional content.

```
[Answer]
5.5%
-2.2%
```

### B.6.3. T4-c: Procedural State Tracking

Track entity state evolution across a long procedural narrative.

#### T4-c: Procedural State Tracking

Primary Task: Structured and Numeric Reasoning  
Numerical calculations in structured text.

Secondary Task: Long-Context Procedural State Tracking  
Track entity state evolution across the full context.  
Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: math\_verify

Output format:

Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output tracked states line by line, without any additional content.

```
[Answer]
state_1
state_2
```

### B.7. T5: Multi-Table Structured Extraction

T5 evaluates the model’s ability to extract and integrate information from multiple structured tables. The reward function uses IoU-based Structured Match, which deserializes both the predicted JSON and the reference JSON into structured objects and computes the Intersection-over-Union of their attributes. Deserialization eliminates the effect of attribute ordering, so the comparison is based solely on structural and value-level overlap. Training data for this task is curated from open-source multi-table QA corpora and does not require additional generation prompts beyond the shared instruction.

#### T5: Multi-Table Structured Extraction

Primary Task: Structured Table Reasoning  
Perform multi-table querying, aggregation, filtering, and relational reasoning.

Secondary Task: Long-Context Multi-Table Integration  
Integrate information distributed across multiple tables within the full context.  
Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: IoU-based Structured Match

Instruction:

You are given multiple tables and a question. Carefully read all tables before reasoning. When combining tables, explicitly identify the join keys and referenced columns. If aggregation, filtering, or sorting is required, reason step by step before producing the answer.

Output format:

Output the final answer strictly between `<answer>` and `</answer>` tags. The answer must be a valid JSON object: `{"columns": ["col1", ...], "data": [{"val1", ...}, ...]}`

If the answer cannot be inferred from the provided tables, output: `<answer>{"columns": [], "data": []}</answer>`

```
[Answer]
formatted output
```

## B.8. T6: Fragment-Level Structured Matching and Induction

T6 assesses the model’s ability to perform clustering, rule induction, and structured matching at the fragment level. The reward function is Substring Exact Match (SubEM). This task covers large-scale document clustering, rule induction from examples, and related pattern recognition subtasks.

### B.8.1. T6-a: Large-Scale Document Clustering

Cluster documents by a specified criterion and report category proportions.

#### T6-a: Large-Scale Document Clustering

Primary Task: Aggregation and Clustering  
Cluster and output statistics, examples, or sorted results.

Secondary Task: Large-Scale Document Clustering  
Return all category proportions.  
Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: SubEM

Instruction:  
Cluster the given documents by the specified criterion into the required number of clusters.

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the clusters in the format "ClusterName Proportion%" (rounded to two decimal places) line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
Cluster\_A 25.00%  
Cluster\_B 25.00%  
Cluster\_C 50.00%

### B.8.2. T6-b: Large-Scale In-Context Rule Induction

Induce formatting or transformation rules from global context examples and apply them to new input.

#### T6-b: In-Context Rule Induction

Primary Task: Rule Induction and In-Context Learning  
Summarize rules and make decisions on new samples.

Secondary Task: Large-Scale In-Context Rule Induction  
Induce rules from the global context.  
Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: SubEM

Instruction:  
Based on the conventions demonstrated in the provided text, apply the induced rules to reformat or transform the given input snippet.

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the fully formatted result, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
formatted output

### B.8.3. T6-c: Targeted Example-Based Rule Induction

Induce rules from targeted examples and apply them to a new case for decision-making.

**T6-c: Targeted Rule Induction**

Primary Task: Rule Induction and In-Context Learning  
Summarize rules and make decisions on new samples.

Secondary Task: Targeted Example-Based Rule Induction  
Induce rules from the targeted examples.

Context Requirement: Partial  
Metric: SubEM

**Instruction:**

Based on the case examples in the specified section, answer the given question by applying the induced rule. The answer must be a fixed value.

**Output format:**

Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the answer, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
support

**B.9. T7: Dimension-Quantified Retrieval and Graded Ranking**

T7 evaluates the model's ability to retrieve content and rank results by relevance or a quantified dimension. The reward function is NDCG.

**B.9.1. T7-a: Global Cohesive Retrieval**

Retrieve all qualifying items from the full text and output them in the specified order.

**T7-a: Global Cohesive Retrieval**

Primary Task: Retrieval and Ranking  
Retrieve content and rank most relevant first.

Secondary Task: Global Cohesive Retrieval  
Retrieve from the full text and reorganize.

Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: NDCG@k

**Instruction:**

Retrieve all items that meet the specified condition and output their IDs in the required sorted order.

**Output format:**

Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output IDs line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
A2AV7Q95QGPT00  
A3NMORAYSL6PA8  
A1C9C1Q0QB94RT

**B.9.2. T7-b: Key-Snippet Retrieval**

Locate and rank target fragments within a specified subset of the document.

**T7-b: Key-Snippet Retrieval**

Primary Task: Retrieval and Ranking  
Retrieve content and rank most relevant first.

Secondary Task: Key-Snippet Retrieval  
 Locate target fragment in a specified paragraph subset.  
 Context Requirement: Partial  
 Metric: NDCG@k

Instruction:  
 From the specified subset, retrieve items matching the given category and sort them by the requested criterion.

Output format:  
 Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the sorted IDs line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 ID1  
 ID2  
 ID3

## B.10. T8: Sequence Reconstruction and Ordering

T8 evaluates the model's ability to restore temporal, logical, or frequency-based orderings. The reward function is Pairwise Accuracy.

### B.10.1. T8-a: Global Timeline Reconstruction

Sort shuffled segments of the full text into their correct chronological order.

#### T8-a: Global Timeline Reconstruction

Primary Task: Sequencing and Structure Reconstruction  
 Restore timeline or logical order.

Secondary Task: Global Timeline Reconstruction  
 Sort unordered events across the whole text.  
 Context Requirement: Full  
 Metric: Pairwise Accuracy

Instruction:  
 The text is divided into multiple parts in shuffled order. Sort these parts in the correct chronological sequence.

Output format:  
 Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the correct sequence of part identifiers line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
 Part 5  
 Part 1  
 Part 9  
 Part 3

### B.10.2. T8-b: Local Causal Chain Sorting

Reorder content within a specific paragraph according to causal or logical structure.

#### T8-b: Local Causal Chain Sorting

Primary Task: Sequencing and Structure Reconstruction  
 Restore timeline or logical order.

Secondary Task: Local Causal Chain Sorting  
 Sort content in a specific paragraph.

Context Requirement: Partial  
Metric: Pairwise Accuracy

Instruction:  
The specified paragraph is out of order. Reorder it according to the original text and options.

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the sorted option letters line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
A  
B  
C  
D  
E

### B.10.3. T8-c: Global Frequency Analysis

Count and sort terms by their frequency of occurrence across the full text.

#### T8-c: Global Frequency Analysis

Primary Task: Aggregation and Clustering  
Cluster and output statistics, examples, or sorted results.

Secondary Task: Global Frequency Analysis  
Count and sort global word frequency.  
Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: Pairwise Accuracy

Instruction:  
Sort the given terms in descending order by their frequency of appearance in the text.

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the sorted terms line by line, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
would  
this  
that  
went  
have

## B.11. T9: Long Document Summarization

T9 evaluates the model's ability to generate abstractive summaries under specified constraints. The reward function is ROUGE-L.

### B.11.1. T9-a: Global-Coverage Constrained Summary

Summarize the full document under a specified word limit.

#### T9-a: Global-Coverage Constrained Summary

Primary Task: Summarization and Synthesis  
Generate abstract summary under given constraints.

Secondary Task: Global-Coverage Constrained Summary  
Generate summary of the full text.

Context Requirement: Full  
Metric: ROUGE-L

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the summary, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
your summary

### B.11.2. T9-b: Query-Focused Summary

Summarize a specific subtopic or section within the document.

#### T9-b: Query-Focused Summary

Primary Task: Summarization and Synthesis  
Generate abstract summary under given constraints.

Secondary Task: Query-Focused Summary  
Generate summary of a specific subtopic.  
Context Requirement: Partial  
Metric: ROUGE-L

Output format:  
Output the "[Answer]" identifier first, then output the summary, without any additional content.

[Answer]  
your summary

## C. Evaluation Alignment with QwenLong-L1.5

To ensure a fair comparison with QwenLong-L1.5, we verify that our evaluation pipeline faithfully reproduces the results reported in the original paper. Tables 9, 10, and 11 present the published scores with  $\Delta = \text{ours} - \text{published}$  shown as a subscript next to each value. Deviations within a small margin are shown in gray; larger deviations are highlighted in orange. Across most benchmarks, the deviations are small, confirming that our evaluation protocol is well-aligned with that of QwenLong-L1.5.

Table 9 | Evaluation protocol alignment against the QwenLong-L1.5 paper. Each cell reports the published score with  $\Delta = \text{ours} - \text{published}$  as a subscript.

Model	DocMath	LBV2	Frames	MRCR	CorpusQA	LBV1-QA
	<i>(published score, <math>\Delta = \text{ours} - \text{published}</math>)</i>					
Qwen3-4B-Thinking	59.0 <sub>+2.0</sub>	41.4 <sub>-1.2</sub>	62.9 <sub>+1.5</sub>	39.9 <sub>-1.5</sub>	49.9 <sub>±0.0</sub>	64.3 <sub>-0.3</sub>
Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking	62.3 <sub>+1.0</sub>	49.1 <sub>-0.4</sub>	70.3 <sub>-0.1</sub>	51.3 <sub>-9.7</sub>	71.6 <sub>-1.1</sub>	67.1 <sub>-0.6</sub>
QwenLong-L1.5-30B-A3B	66.3 <sub>+0.1</sub>	55.3 <sub>-0.1</sub>	74.8 <sub>-0.3</sub>	83.0 <sub>-0.5</sub>	81.3 <sub>-0.4</sub>	70.4 <sub>-2.7</sub>

## D. Training Hyperparameters

Table 12 summarizes the key hyperparameters used in our RL training. All configurations are shared across the two model scales.

Table 10 | Evaluation protocol alignment on general reasoning benchmarks. Each cell reports the published score with  $\Delta = \text{ours} - \text{published}$  as a subscript.

<b>Model</b>	<b>MMLU-Pro</b>	<b>AIME24</b>	<b>AIME25</b>	<b>GPQA</b>
	<i>(published score, <math>\Delta = \text{ours} - \text{published}</math>)</i>			
Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking	81.0 <sub>-0.8</sub>	90.3 <sub>+0.2</sub>	82.8 <sub>+2.3</sub>	75.9 <sub>-5.8</sub>
QwenLong-L1.5-30B-A3B	81.3 <sub>-0.2</sub>	90.0 <sub>-0.2</sub>	86.5 <sub>+1.4</sub>	76.8 <sub>-4.2</sub>

Table 11 | Evaluation protocol alignment on agentic and dialogue memory benchmarks. Each cell reports the published score with  $\Delta = \text{ours} - \text{published}$  as a subscript.

<b>Model</b>	<b>Memory-KV</b>	<b>Memory-Vec</b>	<b>Mem-Rec_Sum</b>	<b>LongMemEval</b>
	<i>(published score, <math>\Delta = \text{ours} - \text{published}</math>)</i>			
Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking	11.0 <sub>+4.5</sub>	16.1 <sub>+2.6</sub>	41.9 <sub>-10.9</sub>	60.8 <sub><math>\pm 0.0</math></sub>
QwenLong-L1.5-30B-A3B	16.8 <sub>-0.7</sub>	16.8 <sub>+4.5</sub>	40.0 <sub>-3.9</sub>	76.4 <sub>-4.2</sub>

Table 12 | Training hyperparameters for GoLongRL.

<b>Hyperparameter</b>	<b>Value</b>
<i>Data</i>	
Max prompt length	160K
Max response length	16K
Responses per prompt	16
<i>Optimization</i>	
Learning rate	2e-6
LR warmup steps	5
Weight decay	0.1
Gradient clipping	1.0
PPO epochs	1
Total epochs	10
Train prompt batch size	128
Loss aggregation	token-mean
<i>Clipping</i>	
Clip ratio (low)	0.2
Clip ratio (high)	0.28
Clip ratio $c$	3.0
<i>Importance Sampling</i>	
IS level	token
IS clipping mode	clip
IS threshold (upper)	5.0
IS threshold (lower)	0.5
IS veto threshold	1e-4
<i>TMN-Reweight</i>	
Difficulty reweighting	enabled
Smoothing $\alpha$	0.8