

QVAC Genesis III: A Large-Scale, High-Quality Open Synthetic STEM Corpus for Efficient Language Model Pre-Training

Davide Vitabile, N. Ranjan, Akshay Nambiar, Kamal K. Gupta, Amril Nazir
Tether Data, S.A. de C.V. d.b.a. Tether AI Research

 <https://huggingface.co/datasets/qvac/GenesisIII>

 <https://github.com/tether-ai-research/qvac-genesis-III>

Abstract

High-quality pre-training data is a critical bottleneck for educational and STEM-specific language models targeting edge AI and on-device deployment where token budgets are tightly constrained. While major organizations train ever-larger models on private corpora, the open ecosystem lacks STEM-focused synthetic datasets that deliver high per-token learning value efficiently for small models. To address this gap, we introduce QVAC Genesis III, a 191.43B-token, STEM-focused multi-domain synthetic corpus covering 19 domains across several difficulty levels and different educational styles. QVAC Genesis III is built via a dual generation strategy that performs targeted teacher distillation using a weak edge-scale student model as signal: the student’s *failures* are converted into corrective explanations, while its *successes* are expanded into contrastive option-level reasoning over all answer choices. We further introduce an *LLM-as-a-parser* evaluation protocol that extracts final answers from free-form outputs and tracks both accuracy and answer validity. To validate the effectiveness of our QVAC Genesis III data, we conduct controlled from-scratch ablations with 1.7B-parameter models, showing that models trained with QVAC Genesis III consistently outperform both models trained with the open-source synthetic corpus Cosmopedia-v2 and the publicly released Cosmo-1B model across ARC, GPQA Diamond, and MMLU STEM benchmarks, achieving up to +28.57% on ARC-E and +21.35% on ARC-C, while reaching a Valid Answer Rate of up to 99.45%.

1 Introduction

Educational and STEM-specific (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) language models are essential because they push large language models (LLMs) beyond basic text generation toward precise reasoning and complex problem solving. Incorporating STEM-focused data directly improves factual accuracy and logical robustness. Yet, despite this need, high-quality STEM pre-training data remains scarce in the open ecosystem. The primary source, large-scale web crawls, is underrepresented in STEM domains and lacks rigorous correctness verification and multi-domain categorization, making it unreliable for education and professional settings that require factual precision and disciplined reasoning. Moreover, major organizations maintain carefully curated STEM corpora that are not publicly released, further widening the gap between well-resourced labs that train models at massive scale and academic or smaller teams aiming to build efficient models for practical deployment. For customized models that must remain computationally feasible on modest compute infrastructure during training, pre-training under tightly constrained token budgets is critical because each training token must deliver maximum learning value (Hoffmann et al., 2022). There is also a growing need to run these models on edge devices (smartphones, laptops and embedded systems) with limited internet connectivity and on privacy-sensitive on-premise servers that must operate in offline mode. This has created

strong demand for small, efficient models in the 1–2B parameter range that can operate under strict memory, latency, and energy constraints.

Synthetic data has emerged as a key strategy to close this gap. Microsoft’s Phi series demonstrated that large-scale synthetic datasets can train competitive small models (Li et al., 2023), and HuggingFace’s Cosmopedia provided the first open replication of this approach (Ben Allal et al., 2024). However, existing open synthetic corpora remain insufficiently STEM-focused and lack the *token efficiency* needed for reasoning-intensive pre-training at edge scale. When parameter counts and token budgets are both constrained, the *structure* and *quality* of training data matter far more than sheer volume.

A further inefficiency is that current pipelines systematically discard the learning signal embedded in model failures. Incorrect answers are typically filtered out to avoid contaminating the corpus, but this also removes examples that expose conceptual gaps and misconceptions, high-value supervision that could improve robustness and reasoning, especially for small models that cannot afford to waste capacity on redundant content.

We address these limitations with **QVAC Genesis III**, a **191.43B-token**, STEM-focused, multi-domain educational synthetic corpus spanning **19 domains** and **three difficulty levels** (high-school, college, and professional). QVAC Genesis III is built via a *dual generation strategy* (Figure 1) that performs *targeted teacher distillation* from a capable reasoning model into edge-scale student models: the student’s *failures* and *successes* are both converted into structured, high-value training content:

1. **Failure Analysis (FA) pipeline.** When the student produces an incorrect answer, we trigger a teacher-driven procedure that diagnoses the likely misconception and generates a targeted corrective explanation, turning each failure into a focused teaching moment.
2. **Option-Level (OL) reasoning pipeline.** When the student succeeds, the teacher expands the instance into detailed *option-level reasoning* over *all* answer choices: explaining why the correct option holds and why each distractor fails, yielding richer supervision than single-trace solutions.

Together, these pipelines ensure that no student signal is wasted: failures become corrective lessons, and successes become comprehensive reasoning demonstrations. Content is rendered in four complementary styles (educational textbook, web articles, question-answering, and conversational dialogue) to maximize diversity. We further introduce an *LLM-as-a-parser* evaluation protocol (Figure 2) that extracts final answers from full model-generated output and reports both accuracy and a *Valid Answer Rate (VAR)*, decoupling formatting reliability from domain knowledge and enabling fairer comparisons.

In controlled from-scratch ablations with 1.7B-parameter models, QVAC Genesis III yields large gains over Cosmopedia-v2 baselines and the publicly released Cosmo-1B model (HuggingFace SmolModels Team, 2024) across ARC, GPQA, and MMLU STEM benchmarks, while the OL split achieves a near-perfect VAR of 99.45% (Section 5). These results demonstrate that token-efficient, structurally rich synthetic data can substantially improve edge-scale model capabilities even under fixed compute budgets.

2 Related work

Synthetic data for LLM pre-training. Scaling laws (Hoffmann et al., 2022) established that data quality and quantity jointly determine LLM performance, motivating efforts to generate high-quality synthetic corpora. Microsoft’s Phi series was among the first to show that billions of synthetic tokens can train small models competitive with much larger systems trained on organic data (Li et al., 2023), a finding especially relevant for edge-scale deployment where model size is constrained. Phi-4 extended this direction by incorporating multi-agent prompting, self-revision workflows, and instruction reversal, showing that synthetic-data quality, not merely volume, drives reasoning gains, and that student models can even surpass their teachers (Abdin et al., 2024). HuggingFace’s Cosmopedia provided the first large-scale *open* replication of the Phi-style data recipe (Ben Allal et al., 2024), while

concurrent work on web-corpus curation, including FineWeb (Penedo et al., 2024) and Ultra-FineWeb (Wang et al., 2025), developed quality classifiers for selecting high-value seed passages from large crawls. Despite these advances, existing open synthetic datasets remain limited in STEM coverage and are not optimized for the token efficiency demanded by edge-scale models, where every token in a tightly bounded pre-training budget must carry maximal learning signal.

Knowledge distillation and learning from model errors. Knowledge distillation (Hinton et al., 2015) transfers capabilities from a large teacher to a smaller student, typically by training on teacher-generated outputs. In the LLM setting, Orca (Mukherjee et al., 2023) showed that progressive learning from detailed explanation traces produced by GPT-4 substantially improves small-model reasoning. More recently, Burns et al. (2024) studied weak-to-strong generalization, finding that strong models can be elicited even from imperfect supervision. However, these approaches uniformly *filter out* incorrect teacher or student outputs; the learning signal embedded in failures, misconceptions, reasoning errors, formatting ambiguities, is systematically discarded. Our Failure Analysis pipeline reverses this convention: rather than removing incorrect student responses, we use them as prompts for the teacher to generate targeted corrective explanations, converting each error into a focused teaching moment. Complementary to our approach, recent work on active synthetic data generation (Kessler et al., 2025) shows that iteratively curating data based on student performance outperforms static generation, though it focuses on fine-tuning rather than pre-training at scale.

Contrastive and option-level reasoning. Standard synthetic question-answering datasets retain only the correct solution trace, leaving the model to infer implicitly why alternative answers fail. Contrastive explanations, which explicitly articulate why distractors are incorrect, have been shown to improve generalization in smaller-scale educational settings (Talmor et al., 2020). Our Option-Level Reasoning pipeline scales this principle to pre-training: for every correctly answered MCQ, the teacher generates exhaustive per-option justifications covering both the correct choice and each distractor, yielding richer supervision than single-trace solutions.

LLM-based evaluation of multiple-choice benchmarks. Multiple-choice evaluation of LLMs has traditionally relied on log-likelihood scoring over answer tokens. More recent frameworks such as OpenCompass (OpenCompass Contributors, 2023) support *LLM-as-a-judge* protocols, where a separate model rates or grades open-ended outputs, following the paradigm introduced by Zheng et al. (2023). However, judging assesses *quality* of a response, which is distinct from reliably *extracting* a final committed answer from free-form text that may contain reasoning, hedging, or self-corrections. We extend OpenCompass with an *LLM-as-a-parser* framework: rather than rating response quality, the parser is instructed solely to recover the model’s final option choice, or to abstain when no unambiguous answer can be identified. This yields two decoupled metrics: standard accuracy and the Valid Answer Rate (VAR), which quantifies answer extractability independently of domain knowledge, a distinction invisible to both likelihood-based and judge-based evaluation.

3 Methodology

We construct QVAC Genesis III via a dual-method synthetic data pipeline that converts each generated multiple-choice question (MCQ) into pedagogically structured text (Figure 1). The pipeline consists of (i) seed acquisition and quality filtering, (ii) MCQ generation, (iii) model answering with answer extraction, and (iv) branching into either Failure Analysis (FA) or Option-Level (OL) Reasoning depending on whether the extracted answer matches the gold label. All prompt templates used for MCQ generation, answering, answer extraction, and FA/OL rendering are provided in Appendix F.




Figure 1: Overview of the dual-method synthetic data generation pipeline. Seed passages are quality-filtered, converted into MCQs, answered by a student model, and parsed via LLM-as-a-parser extraction. Correct answers are routed to Option-Level (OL) Reasoning; incorrect or non-extractable answers are routed to Failure Analysis (FA). Details in Section 3.

3.1 Seed acquisition and quality filtering

Seed acquisition. We source seed passages from FineFineWeb, a large-scale web corpus organized into coarse domains (M-A-P et al., 2024). We map each FineFineWeb domain to a set of curriculum-aligned generation subdomains used downstream (the full mapping is provided in Appendix A); for example, FineFineWeb biology seeds are used to generate items for college_biology and high_school_biology. We continue sampling candidates until we obtain approximately 500k high-quality seeds after filtering.

Quality filtering. Raw web text contains boilerplate, low-information content, and other noise that can degrade downstream synthetic data quality. We therefore apply the Ultra-FineWeb classifier (Wang et al., 2025), a FastText-style binary classifier for quality discrimination, to each sampled passage and retain all instances classified as positive. The resulting positive set constitutes the seed pool used for MCQ generation.

3.2 MCQ generation and format validation

MCQ generation. Given a filtered seed for a target domain and difficulty level, we generate self-contained MCQs using QwQ-32B (Qwen Team, 2025) as the generator model. We selected QwQ-32B as generator and teacher model because, at 32B parameters, it can be deployed with high throughput while delivering competitive reasoning performance, making it a practical choice for large-scale synthetic data generation without requiring prohibitive infrastructure. Each generated item consists of a question, four mutually exclusive answer options (A–D), and a gold label indicating the correct choice. We enforce output constraints through a structured prompt template that requires exactly four options, a fixed CSV-like schema, and an even distribution of correct labels across A/B/C/D to prevent positional bias.

Post-processing and rejection. Despite prompt constraints, a fraction of generations violate formatting requirements (e.g., wrong number of fields or invalid label). We apply a lightweight Python post-processing script that validates each generated row and retains only correctly formatted instances. Approximately 15% of raw generations are rejected by this validation step.

3.3 Answering model and answer extraction

Student generation. To obtain success/failure signals at scale, we require a student model representative of the edge-scale models that QVAC Genesis III targets. Our analysis indicates that 1–2B parameter models offer the best trade-off between accuracy and memory footprint / throughput for on-device deployment. We evaluated four pretrained base models in this range, Llama-3.2-1B, Gemma-3-1B, SmolLM2-1.7B, and Qwen3-1.7B-Base, and selected **Qwen3-1.7B-Base** (Yang et al., 2025) as the data-generation student because it achieved the strongest baseline performance across our target STEM benchmarks (Appendix D). Each generated MCQ is presented to this pretrained student, which produces a free-form response. This data-generation role is distinct from the controlled pretraining experiments in Section 5.1, whose checkpoints are initialized from random weights.

Answer extraction via model-based parsing. Student outputs frequently contain reasoning, hedging, or inconsistent formatting. Rather than relying on heuristic string parsing, we use CompassJugder-2-32B (Zhang et al., 2025), a model fine-tuned specifically for judging and parsing tasks, as an *extractor* (see also Figure 2) that reads the student’s full response and identifies the final option it selected. Despite its name, the model does not judge correctness: it only extracts the committed answer, which is subsequently compared with the gold label. The extractor returns a single option label (A–D) when a clear final answer can be identified, or abstains when the response is ambiguous or contains conflicting conclusions (corresponding to NOANS and MULTI in the evaluation protocol of Section 4). The same extraction procedure is applied uniformly across all domains and difficulty levels.

Branching policy. If the extracted answer matches the gold label, we treat the instance as a *success* and route it to the Option-Level pipeline; otherwise (including cases where no unambiguous answer can be extracted), we treat it as a *failure* and route it to Failure Analysis, since non-extractable responses provide useful signal about response clarity and reasoning failures.

3.4 Failure Analysis (FA)

Failure Analysis transforms incorrect or non-extractable student answers into corrective instructional content. For each failed instance, the teacher model (QwQ-32B (Qwen Team, 2025)) receives the original question with all options, the student’s full response, and the gold answer, and generates a pedagogical explanation that satisfies three requirements. First, **failure diagnosis**: the text explains why the student’s response plausibly led to an incorrect or ambiguous choice and pinpoints the specific reasoning error, misconception, or formatting issue. Second, **correction**: the text provides a coherent solution that leads to the correct answer. Third, **self-containedness**: the full problem statement (question and all options) is embedded in the output so that the resulting document can be used as standalone training text without external context. Outputs are generated in four complementary styles, educational textbook, web article, question-answer tutoring, and conversational dialogue, to maximize diversity in the resulting corpus.

3.5 Option-Level reasoning (OL)

Option-Level Reasoning converts correctly answered questions into contrastive, option-by-option explanations. While success cases are often retained only as a question-answer pair, OL produces richer supervision by explicitly analyzing *every* answer choice. For each successful instance, the teacher model (QwQ-32B (Qwen Team, 2025)) receives the question, all options, and the gold answer, and generates an explanation satisfying four

requirements. First, **justification of the correct option**: the text provides a clear argument establishing why the correct choice holds, with step-by-step reasoning. Second, **refutation of distractors**: for every incorrect option, the text states a specific reason it fails (e.g., violated assumption, incorrect definition, wrong sign, or missing condition). Third, **deterministic coverage**: all options are addressed explicitly, leaving no choice unanalyzed, which reduces underspecification. Fourth, **self-containedness**: the full problem statement (question and all options) is included so the output serves as standalone training text. As with FA, outputs are generated in four styles (textbook, web article, Q&A, dialogue).

Corpus scale. The final corpus comprises two splits, OL (correct answers) and FA (incorrect/non-extractable answers), totalling **191.43B** tokens across **159.6M** documents (Table 1; per-domain breakdowns in Appendix B).

Split	Tokens	Documents
Option-Level (OL)	108.67B	92,538,646
Failures (FA)	82.76B	67,107,907
Total	191.43B	159,646,553

Table 1: Overall corpus scale by split.

3.6 Deduplication and decontamination

Deduplication. We run MinHash near-deduplication over the full 159.6M-document corpus using 60-gram signatures. Out of 47,927 flagged duplicate pairs, only **1,729** unique documents are identified as near-duplicates ($<0.002\%$ of the corpus), confirming that the synthetic generation pipeline produces highly diverse content with negligible redundancy.

Decontamination. We scan the corpus against all evaluation benchmarks using **Decon** (AllenAI), a token-level n -gram overlap detector. A document is marked as contaminated when answer overlap $\geq 60\%$ with meaningful term matches or passage overlap $\geq 40\%$. QVAC Genesis III contains only **17** verified contaminated documents across 159.6M (vs. 313 for Cosmopedia-v2 over 39.1M documents), all from the FA split where a small number of GSM8K and MMLU questions were echoed verbatim in model outputs during generation. The OL split has **zero** verified contamination. An initial 190 SQuAD matches were manually inspected and confirmed as false positives. Critically, test-set leakage is negligible: GSM8K test 0%, MMLU test 0.005% (3 of 56,168), ensuring that all reported benchmark scores are trustworthy. Full contamination statistics are provided in Table 8 (Appendix).

4 Evaluation protocol

We build our evaluation on **OpenCompass** (OpenCompass Contributors, 2023), modified to support a generation-first, answer-extraction workflow (Figure 2). Rather than relying on log-likelihood scoring (which, while convenient, does not evaluate the model’s realized generation and can be confounded by response-formatting issues, self-corrections, or ambiguous conclusions), we (i) generate a full free-form answer, (ii) *parse* the text to extract a single final option, and (iii) score correctness against the gold label. This protocol also exposes whether the model produces an unambiguous decision, which we quantify via the *Valid Answer Rate* (VAR).

4.1 LLM-as-a-parser framework

Given an MCQ item $x = (q, \{o_i\}_{i=1}^m, y)$, the evaluated model produces a free-form response $r = A(x)$ (prompt in Appendix F.2). A *separate* extractor LLM then parses r to recover the model’s final committed choice; it is instructed *not* to solve the question or assess correctness (prompt in Appendix F.3). We use CompassJugder-2-32B (Zhang et al., 2025), a model fine-tuned for judging and parsing tasks, as extractor under deterministic decoding (temperature 0). Correctness is determined only afterward by comparing the extracted option with the benchmark gold label. The extractor returns

$$\hat{y} = J(r) \in \{1, \dots, m\} \cup \{\text{NOANS}, \text{MULTI}\},$$




Figure 2: LLM-as-a-parser evaluation framework. The evaluated model generates a free-form prediction; a separate extractor LLM recovers the final committed option or abstains (NOANS/MULTI), enabling decoupled reporting of Accuracy and VAR. Details in Section 4.

where NOANS indicates that no unambiguous final option can be extracted from r , and MULTI indicates that r contains multiple conflicting final answers.

4.2 Metrics: accuracy and extractability

Based on $\hat{y}$, we report two complementary metrics.

Valid Answer Rate (VAR). VAR measures the fraction of responses that contain an unambiguous, extractable final choice:

$$\text{VAR} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{I}[\hat{y}_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}] = 1 - \text{NoAnsRate} - \text{MultiRate}. \quad (1)$$

Here $\text{NoAnsRate} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \mathbb{I}[\hat{y}_j = \text{NOANS}]$ and $\text{MultiRate} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \mathbb{I}[\hat{y}_j = \text{MULTI}]$. VAR isolates answer extractability (decisiveness and formatting reliability) from domain knowledge. Appendix D reports both failure rates separately and verifies that the main VAR conclusion is robust to two independent extractor models.

Accuracy. We report standard multiple-choice accuracy over all examples, treating non-extractable or conflicting outputs as incorrect: $\text{Acc} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{I}[\hat{y}_j = y_j]$. Together, VAR and accuracy separate “can the model commit to a single option” from “is that option correct”, a distinction invisible to likelihood-based evaluation.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental setup

Experimental design. All models in our primary controlled comparisons use the Qwen3-1.7B architecture with identical hyperparameters and are trained from random initialization, rather than initialized from Qwen3-1.7B-Base, so that observed differences are attributable solely to data. We consider two settings:

1. **Individual split ablation.** Separate models on the FA split (1 ep, $\approx 82.8\text{B}$ tokens), the OL split (1 ep, $\approx 108.7\text{B}$ tokens), and Cosmopedia-v2 (4 ep, $\approx 109.7\text{B}$ tokens).
2. **Combined corpus vs. baselines.** QVAC Genesis III combined (1 ep, 191.43B tokens) vs. (a) Cosmopedia-v2 (7 ep, $\approx 192.4\text{B}$ tokens), providing a token-budget-matched comparison, and (b) **Cosmo-1B** (HuggingFace SmolModels Team, 2024), a 1.8B model pre-trained on 180B tokens of Cosmopedia augmented with code, mathematics, and instruction-following data.

We additionally evaluate a same-stage checkpoint near one epoch of Cosmopedia-v2 and repeat the OL comparison with three non-Qwen backbones; full results are provided in Appendix D.

Training framework and hyperparameters. All models are trained using **Megatron-Core** (Shoeybi et al., 2019) with **Megatron-Bridge** converting HuggingFace model definitions into Megatron-compatible format. Training uses Flash Attention 2, BF16 mixed precision, and sequence packing with end-of-document (<EOD>) attention-mask resets to prevent cross-document attention leakage. Each domain is loaded as a separate dataset with proportional-weights sampling so that each domain’s contribution scales with its token count. All training is single-stage with no curriculum schedule; models are initialised from random weights. The full hardware and parallelism configuration is in Table 6 (Appendix). The full hyperparameter table including per-run wall-clock times and GPU-hours is provided in Table 7 (Appendix).

Benchmarks. We evaluate on STEM-aligned benchmarks that match the training distribution: **ARC-Easy/Challenge** (ARC-E/ARC-C) (Clark et al., 2018) for science reasoning; **GPQA Diamond** (Rein et al., 2024) for graduate-level science QA; and **MMLU STEM subsets** (Hendrycks et al., 2021), covering the 19 STEM domains aligned with the QVAC Genesis III curriculum (Appendix A). We restrict MMLU to its STEM subdomains because the corpus does not cover non-STEM areas; evaluating on unrelated domains would conflate absence of training signal with data quality. All benchmarks use the generation-first LLM-as-a-parser protocol (Section 4), reporting both accuracy and VAR.

5.2 Individual split ablation (from scratch)

We isolate each pipeline component by training separate models on the FA split (1 epoch, 82.76B tokens), the OL split (1 epoch, 108.67B tokens), and Cosmopedia-v2 (4 epochs, $\approx$ 109.7B tokens). Token budgets are closely matched for OL and Cosmopedia-v2; the FA run is $\sim$ 25% smaller by design. Differences therefore primarily reflect data quality rather than scale.

Table 2(a) reports results. The OL split delivers the largest gains: **+26.81** on ARC-E, **+15.25** on ARC-C, and **+10.11** on GPQA Diamond over Cosmopedia-v2. FA also outperforms Cosmopedia-v2 on all three benchmarks (+9.18 ARC-E, +2.03 ARC-C, +3.54 GPQA), indicating that learning from model errors provides meaningful signal even in isolation. On MMLU STEM, OL achieves **30.26%** accuracy ($\approx$ +10 over Cosmopedia-v2) and a VAR of **99.45%**, demonstrating that the contrastive option-level format improves both domain knowledge and the model’s ability to produce unambiguous outputs.

The additional controls support the same conclusion (Appendix D). At the closest same-stage checkpoint ($\approx$ 25B Cosmopedia-v2 tokens), FA and OL improve MMLU by 13.65 and 20.80 points, respectively, over Cosmopedia-v2; OL also improves ARC-C/ARC-E by 15.93/16.94 points. Across Llama-3.2-1B, SmoLLM2-1.7B, and Gemma3-1B, QVAC-OL outperforms the corresponding Cosmopedia-v2 run on every reported benchmark, indicating that the gain is not specific to the Qwen architecture.

5.3 Combined corpus vs. baselines

We now evaluate the full QVAC Genesis III corpus (FA+OL combined, 1 epoch, 191.43B tokens) against the two baselines described in Section 5.1: a token-budget-matched Cosmopedia-v2 run (7 epochs, $\approx$ 192.4B tokens) and the publicly released Cosmo-1B (HuggingFace SmolModels Team, 2024).

Table 2(b) reports results (per-domain breakdown in Table 3). Against the token-matched Cosmopedia-v2 baseline, QVAC Genesis III Combined achieves **+28.57** on ARC-E, **+21.35** on ARC-C, and **+15.03** on MMLU STEM, with a VAR improvement of **+29.58** points (92.06% vs. 62.48%). Notably, the 7-epoch Cosmopedia-v2 model shows lower accuracy and degraded VAR compared to its 4-epoch counterpart, suggesting that repeated passes over the same $\approx$ 27.5B unique tokens cause overfitting that harms both knowledge and answer quality.

Against Cosmo-1B, QVAC Genesis III Combined outperforms by **+23.81** on ARC-E, **+18.98** on ARC-C, **+3.02** on GPQA Diamond, and **+4.77** on MMLU STEM, while maintaining comparable VAR (92.06% vs. 92.51%). Cosmo-1B is not a controlled Cosmopedia-v2-only

Model / Training data	Science reasoning			MMLU STEM (19 dom.)	
	ARC-E	ARC-C	GPQA	Acc	VAR
<i>(a) Individual split ablation</i>					
Cosmopedia-v2 (4 ep)	20.63	21.02	17.67	20.39	72.71
QVAC Genesis III – FA	29.81	23.05	21.21	23.29	78.14
QVAC Genesis III – OL	47.44	36.27	27.78	30.26	99.45
Δ (OL vs. Cosmo-v2 4 ep)	+26.81	+15.25	+10.11	+9.87	+26.74
<i>(b) Combined corpus vs. baselines</i>					
Cosmopedia-v2 (7 ep)	23.28	21.36	20.20	15.16	62.48
Cosmo-1B	28.04	23.73	19.70	25.42	92.51
QVAC Genesis III Combined (FA+OL)	51.85	42.71	22.72	30.19	92.06
Δ (vs. Cosmo-v2 7 ep)	+28.57	+21.35	+2.52	+15.03	+29.58
Δ (vs. Cosmo-1B)	+23.81	+18.98	+3.02	+4.77	−0.45

Table 2: Main results. *Panel (a)*: individual split ablation, all models 1.7B parameters, trained from scratch (FA: 1 ep / 82.76B tokens; OL: 1 ep / 108.67B tokens; Cosmopedia-v2: 4 ep / $\approx$ 109.7B tokens). *Panel (b)*: combined corpus vs. baselines, QVAC Genesis III Combined (1 ep / 191.43B tokens) vs. token-matched Cosmopedia-v2 (7 ep / $\approx$ 192.4B tokens) and Cosmo-1B. All values are accuracy (%) or VAR (%).

baseline: it benefits from additional code, mathematics, instruction-following, and chat-formatted data, whereas our QVAC checkpoints are trained from scratch using pretraining data only.

5.4 Analysis and per-domain breakdown

Table 3 provides the full per-domain breakdown. Three patterns stand out. First, OL is the stronger standalone split overall and outperforms FA in 18 of 19 domains, plausibly because it analyzes every answer option and is generated from easier, correctly answered questions. FA instead targets harder student failures and provides corrective signal; it is strongest relative to OL in Professional Medicine (28.7% vs. 19.9%). These signals can still complement one another: on High School Geography, Combined reaches 35.4%, versus 31.8% for OL and 25.8% for FA. Second, when the splits are combined, QVAC Genesis III outperforms Cosmo-1B on 12 of 19 domains, with the largest margins in biological and natural sciences (College Bio +18.7, HS Bio +16.1); Cosmo-1B retains an edge primarily in formally structured domains (Econometrics, CS, Physics) where its code and math augmentation provides additional signal. Third, VAR patterns reveal that data structure directly affects output quality: OL achieves 100% VAR on 15 of 19 domains, while Cosmopedia-v2 VAR degrades from 72.71% (4 epochs) to 62.48% (7 epochs), indicating that data diversity, not repetition, is key to maintaining answer extractability.

6 Conclusion

We presented QVAC Genesis III, a 191.43B-token STEM-focused synthetic corpus that converts both model failures and successes into structured educational content through targeted teacher distillation, designed to maximize token efficiency for edge-scale language models. Our key contributions are: (i) **QVAC Genesis III**, a multi-domain corpus spanning 19 curriculum-aligned domains and three difficulty levels; (ii) **Failure Analysis**, a teacher-distilled procedure that transforms incorrect student responses into targeted corrective explanations; (iii) **Option-Level Reasoning**, a contrastive generation strategy that produces exhaustive per-option justifications; and (iv) an **LLM-as-a-parser evaluation framework** that decouples answer validity from domain knowledge via the Valid Answer Rate metric. To validate the effectiveness of our contributions, we conducted experiments with 1.7B-parameter models and demonstrated that our QVAC Genesis III data substantially outperforms both Cosmopedia-v2 baselines and the Cosmo-1B model across all evaluated

Domain	Individual split ablation						Combined vs. baselines					
	Cosmo-v2 (4 ep)		QVAC-FA		QVAC-OL		Cosmo-v2 (7 ep)		Cosmo-1B		QVAC Comb.	
	Acc	VAR	Acc	VAR	Acc	VAR	Acc	VAR	Acc	VAR	Acc	VAR
Astronomy	25.7	70.4	21.7	73.7	34.9	100.0	17.1	78.3	24.3	88.2	39.5	93.4
Elec. Eng.	22.1	80.7	28.3	77.2	35.9	100.0	21.4	71.7	31.0	95.2	27.6	93.8
HS Geography	20.2	80.3	25.8	73.7	31.8	100.0	21.2	77.3	27.8	91.9	35.4	93.9
College Bio.	21.5	72.2	23.6	66.7	30.6	100.0	18.8	63.9	18.1	88.9	36.8	93.8
HS Biology	21.6	71.6	17.7	73.2	35.8	100.0	21.6	69.4	23.6	91.3	39.7	94.5
College Med.	17.3	65.3	23.1	78.0	34.7	100.0	15.6	68.2	24.9	91.9	31.2	94.2
Prof. Med.	27.2	79.8	28.7	94.5	19.9	100.0	14.7	71.0	17.3	91.2	25.0	96.0
College Maths	22.0	56.0	17.0	71.0	27.0	94.0	12.0	47.0	25.0	99.0	24.0	84.0
HS Mathematics	16.7	74.8	25.6	90.4	28.2	100.0	12.2	50.7	24.8	92.6	25.2	85.9
College Physics	12.8	74.5	23.5	90.2	24.5	100.0	15.7	63.7	30.4	94.1	28.4	96.1
HS Physics	17.2	74.2	21.2	70.9	29.8	100.0	19.2	63.6	30.5	96.0	28.5	95.4
Concept. Physics	22.6	76.6	26.8	82.6	33.6	100.0	17.4	66.0	28.1	93.6	34.0	94.9
College Chem.	29.0	76.0	25.0	77.0	26.0	100.0	5.0	53.0	18.0	88.0	31.0	94.0
HS Chemistry	12.3	65.5	15.8	74.4	33.0	99.5	15.8	59.6	27.1	92.6	29.6	96.1
College CS	10.0	56.0	23.0	80.0	31.0	99.0	10.0	54.0	30.0	96.0	25.0	90.0
HS Comp. Sci.	16.0	61.0	25.0	79.0	36.0	100.0	13.0	63.0	32.0	92.0	30.0	83.0
Machine Learning	18.8	66.1	24.1	71.4	30.4	99.1	14.3	53.6	18.8	93.8	31.3	80.4
HS Statistics	16.2	61.6	13.9	71.3	24.1	100.0	12.5	61.6	20.8	91.2	27.8	97.7
Econometrics	20.2	56.1	17.5	65.8	24.6	100.0	10.5	51.8	30.7	90.4	23.7	92.1
Average	20.4	72.7	23.3	78.1	30.3	99.5	15.2	62.5	25.4	92.5	30.2	92.1

Table 3: Per-domain MMLU STEM results across all settings. *Left*: individual split ablation (Cosmopedia-v2 4 ep; FA 1 ep; OL 1 ep). *Right*: combined corpus vs. baselines (Cosmopedia-v2 7 ep; Cosmo-1B; QVAC Combined). All values in %.

STEM benchmarks, with the OL split achieving near-perfect answer extractability (99.45% VAR). Human domain-expert assessment of factual correctness, pedagogical usefulness, and hallucinations in the generated explanations remains important future work. To support future research, we will release the QVAC Genesis III corpus under CC-BY-NC-4.0 and the FA, OL, and Combined pretrained models under Apache-2.0, offering a comprehensive foundation for building efficient education and STEM small models targeting edge and on-device deployment.

References

- Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J. Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Weishung Liu, Caio C. T. Mendes, Anh Nguyen, Eric Price, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Xin Wang, Rachel Ward, Yue Wu, Dingli Yu, Cyril Zhang, and Yi Zhang. Phi-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08905*, 2024.
- Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, and Daniel van Strien. Cosmopedia: how to create large-scale synthetic data for pre-training large language models. <https://huggingface.co/blog/cosmopedia>, March 2024.
- Collin Burns, Pavel Izmailov, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Bowen Baker, Leo Gao, Leopold Aschenbrenner, Yining Chen, Adrien Ecoffet, Manas Joglekar, Jan Leike, Ilya Sutskever, and Jeffrey Wu. Weak-to-strong generalization: Eliciting strong capabilities with weak supervision. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 4971–5012. PMLR, 2024.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try ARC, the AI2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.

- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 30016–30030, 2022.
- HuggingFace SmolModels Team. Cosmo-1b. <https://huggingface.co/HuggingFaceTB/cosmo-1b>, 2024.
- Samuel Kessler, Menglin Xia, Daniel Madrigal Diaz, Dongge Han, Helia Hashemi, Saravan Rajmohan, Victor Rühle, and Jordan T. Ash. Towards active synthetic data generation for finetuning language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.00884*, 2025.
- Yuanzhi Li, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Allie Del Giorno, Suriya Gunasekar, and Yin Tat Lee. Textbooks are all you need II: phi-1.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05463*, 2023.
- M-A-P, Ge Zhang, Xinrun Du, Zhimiao Yu, Zili Wang, Zekun Wang, et al. FineFineWeb: A comprehensive study on fine-grained domain web corpus. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/m-a-p/FineFineWeb>, 2024.
- Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of GPT-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707*, 2023.
- OpenCompass Contributors. OpenCompass: A universal evaluation platform for foundation models. <https://github.com/open-compass/opencompass>, 2023.
- Guilherme Penedo, Hynek Kydlíček, Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Leandro von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. The FineWeb datasets: Decanting the web for the finest text data at scale. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, 2024.
- Qwen Team. QwQ-32B: Embracing the power of reinforcement learning. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwq-32b/>, 2025.
- David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R. Bowman. GPQA: A graduate-level Google-proof Q&A benchmark. In *Proceedings of the First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024.
- Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-LM: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053*, 2019.
- Alon Talmor, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, Yoav Goldberg, and Jonathan Berant. Leap-Of-Thought: Teaching pre-trained models to systematically reason over implicit knowledge. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 20227–20237, 2020.
- Yudong Wang, Zixuan Fu, Jie Cai, Peijun Tang, Hongya Lyu, Yewei Fang, Zhi Zheng, Jie Zhou, Guoyang Zeng, Chaojun Xiao, Xu Han, and Zhiyuan Liu. Ultra-FineWeb: Efficient data filtering and verification for high-quality LLM training data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.05427*, 2025.
- An Yang et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025.
- Taolin Zhang, Maosong Cao, Alexander Lam, Songyang Zhang, and Kai Chen. Compassjudge-2: Towards generalist judge model via verifiable rewards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09104*, 2025.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P. Xing, et al. Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-bench and chatbot arena. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, 2023.

A Domain mapping

Table 4 shows the mapping from FineFineWeb source domains to the curriculum-aligned generation subdomains used in QVAC Genesis III.

FineFineWeb domain	QVAC Genesis III domain
astronomy	astronomy
biology	college_biology high_school_biology
chemistry	college_chemistry high_school_chemistry
computer science	college_computer_science high_school_computer_science machine_learning
geography	high_school_geography
physics	college_physics high_school_physics conceptual_physics
statistics	high_school_statistics econometrics
electronic science	electrical_engineering
medical	college_medicine professional_medicine
mathematics	college_maths high_school_maths

Table 4: Mapping from FineFineWeb domains to curriculum-aligned generation subdomains used in QVAC Genesis III.

B Per-domain corpus scale

Table 5 reports the token and document counts for each domain in both the OL and FA splits.

Domain	Option-Level (OL)		Failure Analysis (FA)	
	Tokens	Docs	Tokens	Docs
College Medicine	13.37B	11.6M	6.22B	5.2M
HS Biology	11.12B	9.9M	4.51B	3.8M
College Biology	8.69B	7.6M	3.93B	3.3M
College Maths	7.44B	5.8M	7.58B	5.7M
Machine Learning	5.50B	4.6M	3.82B	3.1M
HS Statistics	5.31B	4.4M	4.16B	3.3M
HS Mathematics	5.29B	4.2M	4.04B	3.2M
HS Chemistry	5.18B	4.5M	4.02B	3.3M
College Chemistry	4.93B	4.2M	4.82B	3.9M
HS Geography	4.76B	4.3M	4.57B	4.0M
Econometrics	4.73B	3.8M	4.43B	3.4M
Astronomy	4.62B	4.0M	4.47B	3.7M
College Physics	4.49B	3.6M	5.16B	4.0M
College CS	4.45B	3.8M	4.68B	3.9M
HS Comp. Science	4.40B	3.9M	4.01B	3.4M
Elec. Engineering	4.37B	3.7M	4.74B	3.9M
Prof. Medicine	3.89B	3.3M	1.87B	1.5M
HS Physics	3.25B	2.7M	2.85B	2.2M
Conceptual Physics	2.90B	2.5M	2.88B	2.3M
Total	108.67B	92.5M	82.76B	67.1M

Table 5: Per-domain corpus scale for Option-Level (OL) and Failure Analysis (FA) splits.

C Training configuration and contamination details

Training runs on 64 NVIDIA H100 (80 GB) GPUs across 8 nodes connected via InfiniBand with GPU Direct RDMA, using Tensor Parallelism (TP = 2) over NVLink, Data Parallelism (DP = 32) across nodes, and no Pipeline Parallelism (PP = 1).

All runs use AdamW ($\beta_1=0.9$, $\beta_2=0.95$, $\epsilon=10^{-5}$) with cosine learning-rate decay from 2×10^{-4} to 2×10^{-5} , 10% warmup, a global batch size of 2,048 sequences ($\approx 8.4\text{M}$ tokens/step), and BF16 precision. Total training time ranges from ~ 13.5 h (FA) to ~ 31.5 h (Combined) on $64 \times \text{H100}$, with the matched-budget Cosmopedia-v2 baseline taking ~ 29.8 h.

Setting	Value
Hardware	$64 \times \text{H100 (80 GB)}$, 8 nodes
Tensor Parallelism (TP)	2
Pipeline Parallelism (PP)	1
Data Parallelism (DP)	32
Interconnect	InfiniBand + GPU Direct RDMA

Table 6: Hardware and parallelism configuration.

Hyperparameter	Value
Architecture	Qwen3-1.7B (random init)
Sequence length	4,096 tokens
Optimizer	AdamW ($\beta_1=0.9$, $\beta_2=0.95$, $\epsilon=10^{-5}$)
Global batch size	2,048 sequences ($\approx 8.4\text{M}$ tokens/step)
Micro batch size	4 per GPU
Gradient accumulation	16 steps
Learning rate	$2 \times 10^{-4} \rightarrow 2 \times 10^{-5}$ (cosine decay)
Warmup	10% of total steps
Weight decay	0.01
Gradient clipping	1.0
Precision	BF16
<i>Training duration</i>	
FA (Failures only)	1 epoch ($\approx 82.8\text{B}$ tokens)
OL (Option Level only)	1 epoch ($\approx 108.7\text{B}$ tokens)
Combined (FA+OL)	1 epoch (191.43B tokens)
Cosmopedia-v2 (indiv. ablation)	4 epochs ($\approx 109.7\text{B}$ tokens)
Cosmopedia-v2 (7 ep, matched budget)	7 epochs ($\approx 192.4\text{B}$ tokens)
<i>Wall-clock time ($64 \times H100$)</i>	
FA (Failures only)	13 h 29 min
OL (Option Level only)	17 h 45 min
Combined (FA+OL)	31 h 31 min
Cosmopedia-v2 (indiv. ablation)	~ 17 h
Cosmopedia-v2 (7 ep, matched budget)	~ 29.8 h
<i>GPU-hours ($64 \times H100$)</i>	
FA (Failures only)	~ 864
OL (Option Level only)	$\sim 1,136$
Combined (FA+OL)	$\sim 2,017$
Cosmopedia-v2 (indiv. ablation)	$\sim 1,088$
Cosmopedia-v2 (7 ep, matched budget)	$\sim 1,907$

Table 7: Training hyperparameters (identical across all runs).

	QVAC Genesis III	Cosmopedia-v2
Total documents	159.6M	39.1M
Verified contamination	17	313
GSM8K test leaked	0%	0%
MMLU test leaked	0.005%	0.002%
GSM8K train leaked	0.19%	3.52%

Table 8: Benchmark contamination: QVAC Genesis III vs. Cosmopedia-v2.

D Additional experiments and robustness

This section reports additional controls covering weak-student selection, a same-stage Cosmopedia-v2 comparison, transfer to non-Qwen architectures, parser sensitivity, and the separate parser failure rates underlying VAR.

D.1 Weak-student model selection

We selected the pretrained Qwen3-1.7B-Base model as the weak student used during data generation based on the controlled STEM evaluation in Table 9, rather than on a model-family or leaderboard preference. This pretrained data-generation student is distinct from the randomly initialized checkpoints used in the controlled pretraining experiments.

D.2 Same-stage comparison

Table 10 compares the closest available checkpoints at iter_0003000, corresponding to approximately 25B tokens for Cosmopedia-v2. Both QVAC splits substantially outperform

Base model	MMLU avg	MMLU VAR	ARC-C	ARC-E	GPQA
Qwen3-1.7B-Base	58.04	98.97	80.34	88.71	30.81
SmolLM2-1.7B	41.11	95.81	58.64	77.60	23.74
Llama-3.2-1B	29.96	96.94	32.54	48.15	23.74
Gemma-3-1B-pt	14.52	55.88	12.88	19.05	15.15

Table 9: Pretrained base-model comparison used to select the weak student for synthetic-data generation. All values are percentages under the same evaluation setup.

Cosmopedia-v2 at the same training stage. Relative to Cosmopedia-v2, FA improves MMLU by 13.65 points and OL by 20.80 points; OL also improves ARC-C, ARC-E, and GPQA Diamond by 15.93, 16.94, and 8.08 points, respectively.

Model / training data	MMLU avg	MMLU VAR	ARC-C	ARC-E	GPQA
Cosmopedia-v2	8.98	37.59	13.90	15.34	12.63
QVAC Genesis III FA	22.63	85.17	25.08	30.69	20.71
QVAC Genesis III Combined	22.91	80.63	23.05	27.34	18.18
QVAC Genesis III OL	29.78	98.21	29.83	32.28	20.71

Table 10: Same-stage comparison at iter_0003000. All values are percentages.

D.3 Transfer across model architectures

To test whether the OL benefit is specific to Qwen, we repeated the Cosmopedia-v2 4-epoch and QVAC-OL comparison with Llama-3.2-1B, SmolLM2-1.7B, and Gemma3-1B, using the same evaluation protocol. As shown in Table 11, QVAC-OL improves every reported metric for all three non-Qwen backbones. This transfer check is limited to OL, the strongest individual split.

Backbone	Training data	MMLU avg	MMLU VAR	ARC-C	ARC-E	GPQA
Qwen3-1.7B	Cosmopedia-v2 (4 ep)	20.39	72.71	21.02	20.63	17.67
	QVAC-OL	30.26	99.45	36.27	47.44	27.78
Llama-3.2-1B	Cosmopedia-v2 (4 ep)	14.42	51.65	20.00	21.69	18.18
	QVAC-OL	26.83	97.83	24.41	30.34	24.24
SmolLM2-1.7B	Cosmopedia-v2 (4 ep)	21.24	69.85	22.37	21.52	11.11
	QVAC-OL	34.36	99.78	32.54	41.98	26.26
Gemma3-1B	Cosmopedia-v2 (4 ep)	20.48	81.83	25.76	26.98	18.69
	QVAC-OL	34.71	99.66	48.81	62.96	24.75

Table 11: Architecture-transfer results. Each QVAC-OL run is compared with the Cosmopedia-v2 4-epoch run using the same backbone and evaluation protocol. All values are percentages.

D.4 Parser robustness and failure modes

We re-evaluated the saved predictions from two representative endpoints with GPT-OSS-20B and GPT-OSS-120B as independent extractors. Table 12 shows that QVAC-OL’s VAR advantage remains 24.28–36.97 points across all three extractors. The extractor only recovers the model’s committed option; accuracy is computed afterward against the benchmark gold label.

Table 13 separates the two failure modes in Equation 1. QVAC-OL has a 0.06% conflicting-answer rate, compared with 6.60% and 16.90% for the 4- and 7-epoch Cosmopedia-v2 baselines.

Model	MMLU accuracy / VAR		
	CompassJudger	GPT-OSS-20B	GPT-OSS-120B
Cosmopedia-v2 (7 ep)	15.16 / 62.48	16.00 / 73.85	16.27 / 72.50
QVAC Genesis III OL	30.26 / 99.45	29.71 / 98.13	30.23 / 99.31

Table 12: Sensitivity to the answer-extraction model. Each cell reports MMLU accuracy / VAR (%).

Model	MMLU NoAns	MMLU Multi	MMLU VAR
QVAC OL	0.49	0.06	99.45
QVAC Combined	6.80	1.14	92.06
QVAC FA	15.69	6.25	78.14
Cosmopedia-v2 (4 ep)	20.69	6.60	72.71
Cosmopedia-v2 (7 ep)	20.62	16.90	62.48

Table 13: No-answer (NOANS), conflicting-answer (MULTI), and valid-answer rates on MMLU. All values are percentages.

E Representative synthetic-data traces

The following compact examples trace one failure and one success from source seed to the resulting training document. [...] marks truncated text.

E.1 Failure Analysis example

1. Source seed (verbatim excerpt)

The full moon on 23rd July 2021 { Friday, might seem uncanny orange, especially to those who reside under smoky skies prevailing from the burning wildfire between summers.
[...]
Moreover, NASA also revealed that this full moon is named Buck Moon after taking into account the Old Maine Farmer’s Almanac 1930s publication about the full moon.

2. Generated MCQ

What is the traditional name for July's full moon in some cultures?
A) Harvest Moon
B) Strawberry Moon
C) Wolf Moon
D) Buck Moon
Gold answer: D

3. Weak-student response (verbatim excerpt)

A
[...]
Question: What is the traditional name for July's full moon in some cultures?

- A. A) Harvest Moon
- B. B) Strawberry Moon
- C. C) Wolf Moon
- D. D) Buck Moon

Answer: A

4. Parser output (verbatim excerpt)

Extraction Reasoning: The candidate explicitly states "Answer: A" directly after restating the original question about July's full moon, indicating their final choice.

Extracted Candidate's Answer: A

The extracted answer A differs from the gold answer D, so this record is routed to Failure Analysis.

5. Generated FA document (verbatim excerpt)

```
# Understanding Lunar Naming Traditions and
Problem-Solving Strategies

## Problem Statement
**Question:** What is the traditional name for July's
full moon in some cultures?
**Options:**
A) Harvest Moon
B) Strawberry Moon
C) Wolf Moon
D) Buck Moon

**Proposed Solution:** A (Harvest Moon)
**Correct Answer:** D (Buck Moon)

[...]

## Analysis of the Proposed Solution: Why "Harvest Moon"
(A) Is Incorrect

### Key Errors in the Proposed Answer
The proposed solution incorrectly identifies July's full
moon as the **Harvest Moon**. This mistake likely arises
from two common misconceptions:
1. **Confusion with Autumn Timing:** The Harvest Moon
occurs in late summer/early autumn, not mid-summer
(July).
2. **Overemphasis on "Harvest":** The term "harvest" is
strongly linked to agricultural labor, which peaks in
autumn, not July in temperate regions.

[...]

**Final Answer**
\boxed{D}
```

E.2 Option-Level example

1. Source seed (verbatim excerpt)

Previous abstract Next abstract
Session 46 - Supernova Remnants.
Display session, Tuesday, January 14
We present an analysis of the X-ray data collected during an observation of the supernova remnant (SNR) MSH 11-62 by the Advanced Satellite for Cosmology and Astrophysics (ASCA\). We show that MSH 11-62 is a composite remnant whose X-ray emission comes from two distinct contributions: a nonthermal, synchrotron emission, dominating the total flux above 2 keV, and localized to a region of radius $3''$ (consistent with a point source) and a thermal component, extended up to a radius of $\sim 5''$ and detected only at energies below 2 keV.
[...]

2. Generated MCQ

What type of X-ray emission is typically associated with synchrotron radiation in supernova remnants?
A. Thermal bremsstrahlung
B. Nonthermal synchrotron
C. Blackbody radiation
D. Gamma-ray bursts
Gold answer: B

3. Weak-student response (verbatim excerpt)

B. Nonthermal synchrotron

The correct answer is B. Nonthermal synchrotron.

Explanation:

Synchrotron radiation is a type of electromagnetic radiation produced when charged particles, such as electrons, are accelerated to high energies in a magnetic field. In the context of supernova remnants, synchrotron radiation is typically associated with nonthermal emission, which means it is produced by non-thermal processes such as the acceleration of particles in a magnetic field.

[...]

4. Parser output (verbatim excerpt)

Extraction Reasoning: The candidate explicitly states "The correct answer is B. Nonthermal synchrotron" and begins their response with "B. Nonthermal synchrotron," indicating a clear final choice without any corrections or conflicting statements.

Extracted Candidate's Answer: B

The extracted answer B matches the gold answer, so this record is routed to Option-Level Reasoning.

5. Generated OL document (verbatim excerpt)

User: Hey, I've got this question here about X-ray emissions in supernova remnants. The options are A. Thermal bremsstrahlung, B. Nonthermal synchrotron, C. Blackbody radiation, and D. Gamma-ray bursts. I'm a bit stuck|could you walk me through it?

Assistant: Of course! Let's start with the question:
What type of X-ray emission is typically associated with synchrotron radiation in supernova remnants?
Hmm, okay. First, why is this question important?

[...]

User: Oh right, synchrotron radiation happens when charged particles, like electrons, accelerate in magnetic fields. I think it's nonthermal because it's not from hot gas but from high-energy particles. But how does that connect to supernova remnants?

Assistant: Nice! Supernova remnants (SNRs) are filled with superheated gas and strong magnetic fields. When shock waves from the supernova blast outward, they energize electrons to nearly light-speed. These electrons spiral around magnetic field lines, emitting synchrotron radiation. Now, the question is about the *type* of X-ray emission linked to this process.

[...]

User: That's super helpful. So the answer is definitely B?

Assistant: Yes! \boxed{B}

[...]

F Prompt templates

This appendix documents the prompt templates used in our synthetic data pipeline. Placeholders are denoted with double braces (e.g., `{{level}}`) and are populated at runtime. Unless otherwise stated, templates are applied independently per MCQ instance.

F.1 Scaling QA template (MCQ generation)

We generate MCQs from seed passages using a scaling QA template that enforces (i) self-contained questions, (ii) exactly four answer options, and (iii) an even distribution of correct choices across A/B/C/D.

Scaling QA template

You are a `{{level}}` `{{domain}}` tutor. I will give you a context passage. IGNORE the details of the passage. Use it only as inspiration for topics, but DO NOT refer to the passage, book, text, or

"discussed/mentioned" material in your questions.

Context:
`{{output}}`

Generate EXACTLY 4 independent, self-contained questions suitable for `{{level}}` level `{{domain}}`.

Output rules (MUST be followed strictly):

- Output EXACTLY 4 samples.
- Each row = ONE question in the following format:
`"<question>","<choiceA>","<choiceB>","<choiceC>","<choiceD>","<correct_choice_letter>"`
- Each row MUST end with a newline (line break).
- Do NOT join multiple questions into one line.
- Do NOT output any extra text, headers, or blank lines.

Field definitions:

- `<question>` = a fully self-contained `{{level}}`-level `{{domain}}` problem. It must NOT reference any passage, book, figure, table, or "as discussed" or "as mentioned" style wording. Include all necessary values, constants, or definitions directly inside the question.
- `<choiceA>` ... `<choiceD>` = four mutually exclusive, plausible answer choices.
- `<correct_choice_letter>` = exactly one of A, B, C, D.

Question variety:

- Use a mix of imperative (e.g., "Calculate..."), interrogative, completion/fill-in, and true/false style.
- Do NOT start all questions with the same word.
- Include realistic values/constants when needed (e.g., $g = 9.8 \text{ m/s}^2$).
- Use standard SI units and symbols.

Hard constraints:

- Generate exactly 4 questions (4 samples).
- Correct answers must be evenly distributed: one A, one B, one C, one D.
- Randomize placement of correct answers; no clustering.
- Each row must contain exactly 6 comma-separated values.
- Do NOT add quotes around the entire block; only around individual fields.

Output ONLY the 4 samples in the required format, nothing else.

F.2 MCQ answering template (student model prompting)

The answering model receives a plain MCQ prompt with a constrained answer field.

MCQ answering template

Question: `{{question}}`

- A. `{{option_a}}`
- B. `{{option_b}}`
- C. `{{option_c}}`
- D. `{{option_d}}`

Answer:

E.3 LLM-as-a-parser answer extraction template

We use an answer-extraction prompt to map free-form model outputs to a discrete option label, or to abstain when the response is ambiguous.

LLM-as-a-parser answer extraction template

```
MMLU_ANSWER_EXTRACTOR_TEMPLATE = """
```

```
You are an expert answer extractor. Your ONLY job is to
extract the final answer from the candidate's response.
```

```
CRITICAL INSTRUCTIONS - READ CAREFULLY:
```

- DO NOT solve the question yourself
- DO NOT generate a new answer
- DO NOT think about what the correct answer should be
- DO NOT evaluate whether the candidate's answer is right or wrong
- ONLY extract what the candidate actually wrote as their final answer

```
Your task is purely extraction, not generation or evaluation.
```

```
Here are the extraction guidelines for MMLU multiple choice questions:
```

1. Look for the candidate's final answer in their response.
 - This should be one of: A, B, C, or D
 - Look for explicit statements like "ANSWER: A", "The answer is B", "Final answer: C"
 - Look for \boxed{A} format (extract what's inside the braces)
 - Look for standalone letters A, B, C, or D in their conclusion
 - The final choice they settle on in their reasoning
2. If the candidate's response contains multiple different answers:
 - If they state one answer but then correct/fix themselves, extract the corrected/final answer they provided
 - If they state multiple different answers without choosing one or correcting themselves, return "MULTIPLE_ANSWERS"
3. If you cannot clearly identify a single letter choice (A, B, C, or D) in the response, return "NO_ANSWER"
4. If the candidate generates new questions:
 - DO NOT extract the answer from the new generated questions
 - ONLY extract the answer from the original question

```
RESPONSE FORMAT:
```

```
First, provide a brief explanation of why you are
extracting that particular answer (what indicators you
found in the candidate's response).
```

```
Then, provide the extracted answer as a single letter.
```

```
Use this exact format:
```

```
Extraction Reasoning: [Brief explanation of what
indicators led you to extract this answer from the
candidate's response]
```

```
Extracted Candidate's Answer: [A single letter:
A, B, C, or D. Use MULTIPLE_ANSWERS if the candidate
provided multiple different answers, or NO_ANSWER if
no clear answer was found.]
```

```

<Original Question Begin>:
Question: {input}

A. {A}
B. {B}
C. {C}
D. {D}

Answer:
<Original Question End>

<Candidate's Response Begin>:
{prediction}
<Candidate's Response End>
""

```

F.4 Failure Analysis (FA) rendering templates

For failed instances, we render corrective explanations in four styles. Each template receives the original problem (`{{prompt}}`), the model's proposed solution (`{{full_response}}`), and the gold target (`{{target}}`). All outputs are required to be self-contained and to place the final answer in `\boxed{. . .}`.

Educational textbook style (FA)

You are an educational content creator generating high-quality textbook explanations for academic learning.

Given:

The problem: `{{prompt}}`
 A proposed solution: `{{full_response}}`
 The correct answer: `{{target}}`

Content Requirements:

- Generate a comprehensive educational content of MAXIMUM 3000 words
- Final answers must appear within `\boxed{...}`
- Write in clear, pedagogical language suitable for textbooks
- Create appropriate section titles and structure that fit the specific topic and problem type
- Organize your explanation with logical sections that help students understand the concept, identify errors in the proposed solution, learn the correct approach, and apply these insights

Your Task:

Analyze the given problem and proposed solution. Create a comprehensive educational explanation that:

1. Includes the complete problem statement clearly within your explanation
2. Introduces the key concepts and principles relevant to this problem type
3. Examines the proposed solution, identifying where and why it goes wrong
4. Provides the correct solution approach that leads to the given target answer
5. Explains the underlying principles that make the correct method work
6. Discusses broader applications and common misconceptions
7. Concludes with actionable takeaways for students

IMPORTANT: Your textbook explanation must be completely self-contained. Include the full problem statement within your response so readers have all necessary information without needing external context.

Structure your response with appropriate headings and sections that naturally fit the subject matter and problem type

Web article style (FA)

You are a content creator specializing in engaging, informative web articles that break down complex problems and solutions.

Given:

The problem: {{prompt}}
A proposed solution: {{full_response}}
The correct answer: {{target}}

Content Requirements:

- Generate engaging web content of MAXIMUM 3000 words
- Use a conversational yet informative tone suitable for online readers
- Final answers must appear within \boxed{...}
- Create compelling headings and subheadings that work well for web reading
- Include relatable examples and practical insights
- Structure content for easy scanning with shorter paragraphs and clear sections

Your Task:

Create an engaging web article that breaks down this problem and solution. Your article should:

1. Start with the complete problem statement presented in an engaging way
2. Hook readers by explaining why this type of problem matters in real life
3. Analyze the proposed solution, showing where it goes wrong in an accessible way
4. Walk through the correct solution step-by-step with clear explanations
5. Explain why the correct approach works using relatable analogies when helpful
6. Share practical tips and common pitfalls readers should watch out for
7. End with actionable takeaways and encourage further learning

IMPORTANT: Your article must be completely self-contained and include the full problem statement. Write for a general audience interested in learning. Use engaging language that makes complex concepts accessible.

Structure your response with compelling headings that would work well for web content and encourage readers to keep reading.

Conversational dialogue style (FA)

You are creating a natural conversational dialogue between a curious student and a knowledgeable assistant discussing a problem and its solution.

Given:

The problem: {{prompt}}
A proposed solution: {{full_response}}
The correct answer: {{target}}

Content Requirements:

- Generate a comprehensive natural conversational dialogue of MAXIMUM 3000 words
- Use "User:" and "Assistant:" to clearly mark each speaker
- Final answers must appear within \boxed{...}
- Make the conversation flow naturally with realistic student questions
- Include follow-up questions and clarifications that feel authentic
- Create an engaging back-and-forth that teaches through dialogue

Your Task:

Create a natural conversation where a student asks about this problem and you provide helpful explanations. The dialogue should:

1. Start with the student presenting the complete problem they're working on
2. Include the student asking why this type of problem is important or interesting
3. Have the student share their attempted solution and ask for feedback
4. Show the assistant explaining what went wrong in a supportive way
5. Include the student asking for the correct approach step-by-step
6. Have natural follow-up questions about the reasoning and methods
7. End with the student asking for tips to avoid similar mistakes in the future

IMPORTANT: Create a completely self-contained dialogue that includes the full problem statement naturally within the conversation.

Make it feel like an authentic tutoring session with realistic questions and responses.

Present the entire response as a natural dialogue using "User:" and "Assistant:" labels.

Question-answer style (FA)

You are an expert tutor providing clear, direct answers to questions about problem-solving and reasoning.

Given:

The problem: {{prompt}}
A proposed solution: {{full_response}}
The correct answer: {{target}}

Content Requirements:

- Generate a focused Q&A content of MAXIMUM 3000 words
- Use clear, direct language with a helpful tutoring tone
- Final answers must appear within \boxed{...}
- Structure as natural Q&A flow that addresses the key learning points
- Focus on practical understanding and clear explanations
- Prioritize clarity and directness over lengthy explanations

Your Task:

Create a focused Q&A response that addresses this problem and solution. Your response should:

1. Present the complete problem clearly as the main question
2. Identify what makes this type of problem important or challenging
3. Analyze what went wrong in the proposed solution with specific examples
4. Provide the correct solution with step-by-step reasoning
5. Explain the key principle or method that ensures the right approach
6. Give practical advice for avoiding similar mistakes
7. Summarize the main takeaway in a clear, memorable way

IMPORTANT: Your Q&A must be completely self-contained and include the full problem statement. Write as if directly answering a student's question, focusing on the most important insights they need to understand.

Structure your response in a natural Q&A format that flows logically from question to comprehensive answer.

F.5 Option-Level Reasoning (OL) rendering templates

For successful instances, OL produces contrastive analyses in four styles. Each template receives the original MCQ ({{prompt}}) and the gold target ({{target}}). All outputs must be self-contained and must analyze the correct option first, followed by each incorrect option.

Educational textbook style (OL)

You are an educational content creator generating high-quality textbook explanations for multiple choice question analysis.

Given:

The question: {{prompt}}

The correct answer: {{target}}

Content Requirements:

- Generate MAXIMUM 3000 words of educational content
- Final answers must appear within \boxed{...}
- Write in clear, pedagogical language suitable for textbooks
- Create appropriate section titles and structure that fit the specific topic and problem type
- Organize your explanation with logical sections that help students understand the concept, analyze the correct option first, then the incorrect ones

Your Task:

Analyze the given multiple choice question and all answer options. Create a comprehensive educational explanation that:

1. Includes the complete question and all options clearly within your explanation
2. Introduces the key concepts and principles relevant to this problem type
3. First analyzes the correct answer option in detail, explaining why it is right with step-by-step reasoning
4. Provides thorough verification of why the correct option is accurate, identifying key principles and logical reasoning
5. Then examines each incorrect answer option systematically, explaining why each is wrong
6. Identifies specific errors, misconceptions, or flaws in each incorrect option
7. Discusses the underlying principles that distinguish correct from incorrect reasoning
8. Explores broader applications and common misconceptions related to this topic
9. Concludes with actionable strategies for approaching similar questions

IMPORTANT: Your textbook explanation must be completely self-contained. Include the full question and all answer options within

your response so readers have all necessary information without needing external context. Always analyze the correct option first, then the incorrect ones.

Structure your response with appropriate headings and sections that naturally fit the subject matter and question type, focusing on systematic analysis starting with the correct option.

Web article style (OL)

You are a content creator specializing in engaging, informative web articles that break down multiple choice questions and effective analysis strategies.

Given:

The question: {{prompt}}

The correct answer: {{target}}

Content Requirements:

- Generate MAXIMUM 3000 words of engaging web content
- Use a conversational yet informative tone suitable for online readers
- Final answers must appear within \boxed{...}
- Create compelling headings and subheadings that work well for web reading
- Include relatable examples and practical insights
- Structure content for easy scanning with shorter paragraphs and clear sections

Your Task:

Create an engaging web article that breaks down this multiple choice question and demonstrates effective analysis. Your article should:

1. Start with the complete question and all options presented in an engaging way
2. Hook readers by explaining why mastering multiple choice analysis matters in real life
3. First analyze the correct answer option in detail, walking through why it's right with clear explanations
4. Provide step-by-step verification of the correct option using relatable analogies when helpful
5. Then systematically analyze each incorrect answer option, explaining why each is wrong
6. Show the specific errors or misconceptions in each incorrect option using accessible language
7. Share practical tips and common pitfalls readers should watch out for when tackling similar questions
8. End with actionable takeaways and strategies for improving multiple choice performance

IMPORTANT: Your article must be completely self-contained and include the full question and all answer options. Write for a general audience interested in learning better test-taking and analytical thinking skills. Use engaging language that makes complex reasoning accessible. Always analyze the correct option first, then the incorrect ones.

Structure your response with compelling headings that would work well for web content and encourage readers to keep reading through the analysis of the correct option first, then the incorrect ones.

Question-answer style (OL)

You are an expert tutor providing clear, direct answers about multiple choice question analysis and reasoning.

Given:

The question: {{prompt}}

The correct answer: {{target}}

Content Requirements:

- Generate MAXIMUM 3000 words of focused Q&A content
- Use clear, direct language with a helpful tutoring tone
- Final answers must appear within \boxed{...}
- Structure as natural Q&A flow that addresses the key learning points
- Focus on practical understanding and clear explanations
- Prioritize clarity and directness over lengthy explanations

Your Task:

Create a focused Q&A response that addresses this multiple choice question.

Your response should:

1. Present the complete question and all options clearly as the main question
2. Identify what makes this type of question important or challenging
3. First analyze the correct answer option, explaining why it is right with step-by-step logic
4. Provide clear verification of the correct option's reasoning and principles
5. Then analyze each incorrect answer option systematically, explaining why each is wrong
6. Give specific examples of the errors or misconceptions in each incorrect option
7. Share practical advice for approaching similar multiple choice questions
8. Summarize the key principle or method that helps distinguish correct from incorrect options

IMPORTANT: Your Q&A must be completely self-contained and include the full question and all answer options. Write as if directly answering a student's question about how to analyze multiple choice options effectively. Always analyze the correct option first, then the incorrect ones.

Structure your response in a natural Q&A format that flows logically from the question to analysis of the correct option, then the incorrect options.

Conversational dialogue style (OL)

You are creating a natural conversational dialogue between a curious student and a knowledgeable assistant discussing a multiple choice question and its analysis.

Given:

The question: {{prompt}}

The correct answer: {{target}}

Content Requirements:

- Generate MAXIMUM 3000 words of natural conversational dialogue
- Use "User:" and "Assistant:" to clearly mark each speaker
- Final answers must appear within \boxed{...}

- Make the conversation flow naturally with realistic student questions
- Include follow-up questions and clarifications that feel authentic
- Create an engaging back-and-forth that teaches multiple choice analysis through dialogue

Your Task:

Create a natural conversation where a student asks about this multiple choice question and you provide helpful explanations. The dialogue should:

1. Start with the student presenting the complete question and all options they're working on
2. Include the student asking why this type of question is important or how to approach it
3. Have the student share their initial thoughts about the options and ask for guidance
4. Show the assistant first explaining why the correct option is right with detailed step-by-step reasoning
5. Include the student asking for clarification about the correct option's reasoning
6. Have the assistant then analyze each incorrect option, explaining why each is wrong
7. End with the student asking for general tips to improve at multiple choice questions

IMPORTANT: Create a completely self-contained dialogue that includes the full question and all answer options naturally within the conversation. Make it feel like an authentic tutoring session with realistic questions and responses about multiple choice strategy. Always analyze the correct option first, then the incorrect ones.

Present the entire response as a natural dialogue using "User:" and "Assistant:" labels.