

What pass@k Cannot Measure: Evaluating Diversity and Capability Retention after Post-Training

Subham Rath

Accenture Strategy & Consulting

Raj Dandekar¹ Rajat Dandekar¹ Sreedath Panat²
¹Vizuara AI Labs (vizuara.com) ²Vizuara AI Labs (vizuara.ai)

This paper was accepted to the NeurIPS 2026 Workshop on Transitioning from Pre-training to Post-training. A shorter, evaluation-focused companion version was accepted at the JUDGE 2026 workshop (Can We Trust the Judge?), scheduled for presentation on December 11, 2026. Both are non-archival.

Abstract

pass@ k , the fraction of problems a model solves within k sampled attempts, is the field’s default protocol for deciding whether reinforcement-learning (RL) post-training on verifiable rewards improved a model. At the population level, pass@ k depends only on a problem’s probability of a correct sample, with no term for how that probability is distributed across distinct outputs. We show this structural gap is not academic. Training Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct on grade-school math with Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) and with rejection-sampling fine-tuning (RFT, training on the model’s own shortest verifier-passed rollout) moves three complementary diversity measures (token-level entropy, answer-level entropy, and unique answers per prompt) in opposite directions, with zero overlap across three seeds per arm. The gap survives restricting to verifier-correct completions only (lexical diversity among correct solutions is 15% lower for GRPO, holding after controlling for completion length) and a count-controlled check that isolates diversity among incorrect answers alone, ruling out that the raw gap is just an artifact of GRPO’s higher accuracy shrinking its incorrect-answer pool. Yet pass@8 and pass@32 show no consistent winner on GSM8K, and a deliberately hard MATH-500 subset shows a related pattern: the arms separate only at low k and converge as k grows. Compared against the starting checkpoint, no trained arm significantly improves hard-problem coverage: RFT is significantly worse, while GRPO is statistically indistinguishable from the starting checkpoint – so GRPO’s pass@1 edge over RFT there reflects a smaller loss relative to Base, not a capability gain over it, a missing-control problem distinct from any failure of pass@ k itself. On GSM8K, only pass@1, with no role in detecting diversity by construction, separates the arms cleanly, and it rewards the arm whose correct solutions are the least diverse. We argue this is a concrete instance of a standard evaluation protocol missing a property it is routinely used to certify.

1 Introduction

Post-training is supposed to convert a broad-coverage base model into one that reliably solves the tasks it was tuned for, without secretly narrowing what the model can still do. Reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards (RLVR) is now standard practice for this conversion on reasoning tasks: a deterministic correctness check replaces a learned reward model, and training is judged almost entirely by pass@ k [Chen et al., 2021]: the probability that at least one of k independently sampled attempts at a problem is correct, computed with the unbiased estimator $1 - \binom{n-c}{k} / \binom{n}{k}$ over $n \geq k$

samples with c correct. $\text{pass}@1$ is treated as capability. $\text{pass}@k$ at larger k is treated, implicitly, as a check on whether that capability cost the model’s solution diversity: a model that merely rehearses one answer more confidently should still show it at large k , while a model that discarded alternative correct paths will not.

This intuition is itself a construct-validity claim, and it is worth stating precisely why it can fail. At the population level, for a problem with true per-sample correctness probability p , $\text{pass}@k(p) = 1 - (1 - p)^k$, a function of p alone. Two models with the same p have the same $\text{pass}@k$ at every k , regardless of how the remaining probability mass is arranged across distinct correct solutions, distinct incorrect ones, or reasoning paths that reach the same answer. $\text{pass}@k$ is a statement about how much correct mass exists, not about how it is distributed. A post-training method that redistributes mass among already-correct outputs, or among incorrect ones, without changing p much, is therefore invisible to it by construction rather than by an implementation gap. Whether this is the whole explanation for what follows is an empirical question we return to in §4. The point here is that the construct-validity gap has a structural reason to exist, and is not only something we happened to observe.

Yue et al. [2025] gave the first large-scale evidence for part of this picture: RLVR-trained models beat their base model at small k but are overtaken once k reaches the tens to hundreds, across six RL algorithms and model families at 7B+ parameters, a pattern consistent with post-training sharpening some capabilities while suppressing others rather than uniformly broadening them. Raising an RL-trained model’s sampling temperature to match the base model’s entropy narrows the $\text{pass}@k$ gap but does not close it (Yue et al., 2025, §4.5), so entropy is necessary but not sufficient to explain it, suggesting entropy and $\text{pass}@k$ coverage are not the same axis.

The literature disagrees on which post-training method causes the narrowing, and even on its direction. Nicolicioiu et al. [2026] find that on-policy self-distillation (training on one’s own sampled demonstrations) raises $\text{pass}@1$ while flattening $\text{pass}@16$, through a mechanism distinct from ordinary RL mode-seeking; in one of their settings, self-distillation has *higher* token entropy than RL despite *lower* $\text{pass}@16$. Kim et al. [2026] find the opposite sign for RL specifically: GRPO *increases* token entropy on two reasoning-distilled 7–8B models, while their self-distillation method (SDPO) decreases it, the reverse of what we report below for GRPO at a much smaller scale on easier problems. This is a genuine, page-cited disagreement: whether GRPO raises or lowers output entropy is unsettled, and appears to depend on scale, starting checkpoint, and task difficulty in ways neither paper isolates.

Recent work addresses part of this gap directly: Lee et al. [2026] introduce UCC@ k , which clusters correct completions by semantic similarity and sums per-cluster coverage, so a model that spreads correct mass across many distinct solutions scores higher than one that does not, even at matched $\text{pass}@k$. Our question is complementary: when two post-training methods produce reliably different changes across simpler, already-standard measures of the output distribution (entropy, unique-answer counts) on the same starting checkpoint, does the field’s existing, unmodified $\text{pass}@k$ protocol register that difference, and what does comparison against the starting checkpoint reveal about what post-training preserved? At a scale and difficulty level neither Yue et al. [2025], Nicolicioiu et al. [2026], nor Kim et al. [2026] tested (Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct, grade-school arithmetic), our answer is no. This reframes the contribution from “RL narrows diversity” (already claimed and disputed) to a claim about the protocol itself: $\text{pass}@k$ at the k values the field reports is not a valid standalone proxy for that construct, independent of which direction any given method moves it. This bears directly on evaluating post-training: an improved $\text{pass}@k$ alone cannot certify that post-training preserved, rather than narrowed, what the starting checkpoint could do.

2 Setup

Model and data. Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct is the pre-post-training baseline checkpoint for every arm below, already instruction-tuned by its original authors; we do not train it further until each arm’s own run starts. Each arm trains on a frozen pool of 1,500 GSM8K [Cobbe et al., 2021] problems, filtered once against this checkpoint to keep only problems where 1–7 of 8 sampled rollouts land correct (a zero-variance group produces zero GRPO advantage and a degenerate RFT target, so these are excluded once, before training). Evaluation is in-domain on a held-out 100-problem GSM8K set (32 samples/problem) and out-of-domain on MATH-500 [Lightman et al., 2023] (16 samples/problem, never trained on).

Arms. **GRPO** [Shao et al., 2024]: group-relative advantage over 8 rollouts/prompt, a standard clipped policy-gradient update, no KL penalty. **RFT** (rejection-sampling fine-tuning): 8 rollouts/prompt, keep only the shortest verifier-passed one, fine-tuned with plain cross-entropy on that single target, no distillation loss and no teacher distribution, the simplest possible instance of training on one’s own correct output. A second RFT variant adds a Kullback-Leibler penalty toward the frozen starting policy (RFT + KL brake). Both RFT arms train on model-generated, verifier-passed targets only, never the dataset’s reference solution. These three arms are the main comparison, each run at three seeds (0, 1, 2), 187 steps each. Three further arms run at a single seed for context, not a robustness claim: two GRPO variants with a length penalty added to the reward ($\lambda = 0.2, 0.5$), and on-policy self-distillation (OPD), a per-token reverse Kullback-Leibler divergence toward a hint-conditioned copy of the same model. Every generation call, in training and evaluation, uses temperature 1.0, top- p 1.0, no top- k truncation, and a 1,024-token completion budget; evaluation reuses the training-time top- p and top- k , so no eval-time decoding difference confounds a paper whose central claim is about entropy.

Metrics. Token-level entropy, answer-level entropy, and unique answers per prompt are all computed on the policy model’s own tokenizer output, never a third-party tokenizer, alongside pass@1/8/32. Each seed’s own pass@ k carries a 95% percentile bootstrap confidence interval over its 100 evaluation problems [Chen et al., 2021], computed at eval time. The 3-seed summaries reported below combine the three seeds’ intervals with a DerSimonian–Laird random-effects meta-analysis, which folds in between-seed variance rather than treating three different trained models as exact repeats of one measurement.

Three further metrics guard against a specific alternative explanation: that rising answer or token entropy, or a rising raw unique-answer count, could simply mean more kinds of wrong answers, or more answers because fewer are correct and available to repeat. (i) Distinct-3 [Li et al., 2016], the fraction of unique word-trigrams pooled across a problem’s verifier-correct completions only, computed on GSM8K rollouts where available (§5 for coverage) and again after truncating every completion to a shared word budget to rule out a completion-length confound. (ii) $D_{\text{incorrect}}$, the fraction of unique incorrect answers among a problem’s incorrect completions only, averaged over problems. Correct completions never enter its computation, but the size of the remaining incorrect-answer pool still scales with accuracy, so we also report a count-controlled variant that subsamples a fixed number of incorrect completions per problem (§3). (iii) pass@ k for $k \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\}$ on MATH-500 restricted to its hardest levels (4–5, 100 problems, chosen for headroom), generated freshly against each final checkpoint and against the same pre-intervention checkpoint (3 sampling seeds of the same frozen weights, since nothing is trained); the default pipeline only ever scored levels 1–2, so no rollouts existed here beforehand. Arm-difference confidence intervals use a bootstrap clustered by problem: resample the 100 problems, keep all 3 seeds or replicates per resample, and average the per-replicate differences.

3 Results

Diversity moves in opposite, seed-robust directions. Figure 1(a–c) and Table 1 report the change in each diversity metric from the first to the last evaluation checkpoint, as mean $\pm$ half-range across three seeds. Both RFT arms increase all three measures in every seed, and GRPO decreases all three in every seed, with no seed of either RFT arm close to zero or negative and no GRPO seed close to zero or positive. A mode-seeking account would predict self-distillation-style training on one’s own output as the mechanism that narrows diversity; our result is the opposite, since GRPO narrows diversity here despite being the arm least resembling self-distillation. One caveat applies to the unique-answers-per-prompt column specifically: GSM8K has one canonical correct answer, so a rising count could partly reflect an arm’s falling accuracy, since more incorrect samples mechanically allows more distinct values, rather than reflecting diversity on its own. §3 below isolates diversity among incorrect answers only, to check whether the direction survives once that mechanism is removed.

pass@1 separates the arms cleanly; pass@8/32 do not. Figure 1(d) and Table 2 report final-checkpoint pass@ k : the 3-seed DerSimonian–Laird pooled mean and 95% CI for the reseeded arms (§2), one seed’s own bootstrap CI for the others. GRPO’s pass@1 CI does not overlap either RFT arm’s, while at $k = 8$ and $k = 32$ all three overlap heavily. A direct paired bootstrap of




Figure 1: GSM8K, all three arms, 3 seeds each; shaded bands span the seed min–max, not a CI. **(a–c)** Token/answer entropy and unique answers over training: GRPO (green) and both RFT arms (blue, red) move in opposite directions, with no band overlap from step 75 onward. **(d)** Final-checkpoint pass@ k : cleanly separated at $k=1$; no statistically detectable separation at $k=8$ or $k=32$, same seeds and arms as (a–c).

Table 1: GSM8K diversity metrics, change from first to last checkpoint, mean $\pm$ half-range across 3 seeds. All three move in the same direction within an arm, opposite across arms, with zero cross-arm overlap in any seed.

Arm	Token entropy Δ	Unique answers/problem Δ	Answer entropy Δ
RFT (shortest-correct)	$+0.028 \pm 0.003$	$+0.56 \pm 0.06$	$+0.091 \pm 0.017$
RFT + KL brake	$+0.032 \pm 0.001$	$+0.52 \pm 0.11$	$+0.082 \pm 0.009$
GRPO	-0.055 ± 0.004	-1.30 ± 0.20	-0.164 ± 0.018
<i>Single seed each; context only, not a robustness claim:</i>			
GRPO + length penalty ($\lambda=0.2$)	-0.055	-1.26	-0.163
GRPO + length penalty ($\lambda=0.5$)	-0.050	-1.20	-0.150
On-policy self-distillation (OPD)	-0.003	-0.34	-0.035

the GRPO–RFT difference, jointly resampling (problem, seed) units from the 2 seeds with intact raw GSM8K rollouts (§5), sharpens this: the pass@1 gap is $+0.058$ [0.045, 0.071] against RFT-shortest and $+0.059$ [0.046, 0.073] against RFT+brake, both excluding zero, while the pass@8/32 gaps ($+0.005$ to $+0.020$) all include zero. Simulating this design at 80% power and $\alpha=0.05$ puts the minimum detectable pass@1 effect near 0.02, well below the observed gap; the same floor at pass@8/32 (0.02–0.03) means a real effect of that size could have gone undetected.

A more informative comparison is against the shared pre-intervention baseline rather than comparing trained arms only against one another, since it asks whether training earned its keep rather than merely outperformed a different treatment. Both RFT arms land below baseline on pass@1, in-domain and out-of-domain (GSM8K Δ : -0.019 to -0.008 ; MATH-500 levels 1–2 Δ : -0.037 to -0.014 , all 6

Table 2: GSM8K pass@ k , final checkpoint. Top: 3-seed DerSimonian–Laird pooled mean, 95% CI. Bottom: single seed, own bootstrap CI. Only pass@1’s CI separates cleanly across arms.

Arm	pass@1	pass@8	pass@32
RFT (shortest-correct)	0.571 [0.538, 0.605]	0.910 [0.886, 0.935]	0.972 [0.955, 0.990]
RFT + KL brake	0.574 [0.541, 0.607]	0.908 [0.882, 0.934]	0.967 [0.945, 0.988]
GRPO	0.634 [0.598, 0.669]	0.914 [0.887, 0.940]	0.969 [0.951, 0.988]
GRPO + length penalty ($\lambda=0.2$)	0.630 [0.565, 0.687]	0.913 [0.865, 0.954]	0.960 [0.920, 0.990]
GRPO + length penalty ($\lambda=0.5$)	0.625 [0.560, 0.682]	0.908 [0.858, 0.950]	0.950 [0.900, 0.990]
OPD	0.599 [0.532, 0.653]	0.911 [0.866, 0.952]	0.970 [0.930, 1.000]

RFT-family seeds), while GRPO’s gain (+0.048 to +0.052 GSM8K, +0.026 to +0.033 MATH-500 levels 1–2) transfers to the never-trained-on benchmark in every seed, on problems the baseline could already handle well. That gain does not survive on levels 4–5 (§3, Figure 2b), where GRPO’s pass@1 is statistically indistinguishable from baseline.

The gap survives restricting to correct solutions only. The sharpest objection is that raw unique-answer and answer-entropy counts pool correct and incorrect completions, so RFT’s higher numbers could simply mean more kinds of wrong answers rather than richer correct reasoning. Restricting to verifier-correct GSM8K completions and computing distinct-3, the fraction of unique word-trigrams pooled across a problem’s correct completions [Li et al., 2016], GRPO’s correct solutions are less diverse than RFT’s: 0.436 (GRPO) versus 0.512/0.509 (RFT arms), all $n=2$ seeds, a 15% gap in the same direction as the all-completions result, on the same pass@32 that cannot tell the arms apart. We could not compute the entropy analogue restricted to correct rollouts, since only a batch-mean is logged at eval time, never per-sample.

The correct-only gap is not a completion-length artifact. RFT’s correct completions are shorter than GRPO’s at the final checkpoint (mean tokens among verifier-correct completions: 272.7–272.8 versus 296.4; median: 263–266 versus 285–288; both $n=2$ seeds), consistent with training toward the shortest verifier-passed rollout. Distinct-3 is length-sensitive: pooling more text gives trigrams more chances to repeat. Truncating every correct completion to a shared word budget (157 words, the shorter arms’ own median) before recomputing distinct-3 gives 0.456 (GRPO) versus 0.531/0.528 (RFT arms), a 14% gap, within one point of the untruncated 15%.

Restricting to genuinely distinct wrong answers narrows the raw gap, but does not close it. A sharper version of the same objection: GSM8K has one canonical correct answer, so GRPO’s higher accuracy shrinks its incorrect pool, which can only reduce, never raise, how many distinct wrong values it contains, so part of Table 1’s gap could be accuracy passing through the metric. $D_{\text{incorrect}}$ (§2), computed entirely within incorrect completions, removes this specific mechanism: 0.758 (GRPO) versus 0.769/0.768 (RFT arms), an order of magnitude smaller than the raw delta and a real correction rather than a confirmation of it. This raw version still lets each arm’s incorrect-pool size vary with its accuracy, so we also count-control it (subsampling exactly 4 incorrect samples per problem where at least 4 exist): the gap widens to 0.873 versus 0.898/0.892, a 2.2–2.9% relative gap; both versions are real but small, and most of the raw magnitude in Table 1 is accuracy passing through the metric. The correct-only distinct-3 gap (14–15%) does not rely on the incorrect-answer pool at all and provides a complementary correct-only check, which is why it remains the strongest single diversity result.

A harder benchmark with real headroom shows the same loss of separation, ruling out saturation as the explanation. A standing objection to every result above is that GSM8K’s pass@ k is already near 0.9 by $k=8$ (Table 2), so convergence past $k=8$ could reflect a benchmark ceiling rather than a construct-validity gap. MATH-500 restricted to its hardest levels (4–5) is a stricter test of that objection: pass@1 is only 0.20–0.23, and pass@16 stays below 0.67, leaving substantial headroom at every k we test (Figure 2). GRPO exceeds both RFT variants at pass@1 and pass@2, with a clustered bootstrap CI that excludes zero at both, but from $k=4$ on the CI includes zero for both comparisons, a narrower claim than showing the methods equivalent. Because this happens far short of the benchmark’s own ceiling, the loss of separation cannot be explained solely by saturation. The same pattern appears on the full MATH-500 set, which has less headroom; levels 4–5 give the stricter test.

MATH-500 levels 4-5: no trained arm significantly improves over the starting checkpoint




Figure 2: MATH-500 levels 4–5 (100 problems, $n=16/\text{problem}$), chosen for headroom: pass@16 stays below 0.67. Bands are min–max over 3 seeds (trained arms) or 3 sampling seeds of the shared pre-intervention checkpoint (Base). (a) Base sits above every trained arm at every k . (b) Arm–Base, 95% bootstrap CI clustered by problem: RFT is significantly below baseline through $k=4$; GRPO never significantly differs from it. (c) GRPO–RFT, using the same method; the interval excludes zero at $k=1, 2$ and includes it from $k=4$ on.

No trained arm significantly improves over the starting checkpoint on hard problems. pass@1 correctly reports which treatment has more correct-answer mass; it does not by itself say whether either helped relative to no intervention, which requires comparison with the starting checkpoint. We evaluated the same starting checkpoint on the same 100 levels–4–5 problems, using 3 independent sampling seeds of the same frozen weights, since nothing is trained (§2). Figure 2(a,b) shows the baseline sitting above every trained arm at every k . A clustered bootstrap of arm minus baseline finds RFT significantly below baseline at $k=1, 2, 4$ (–3 to –3.5pp for both variants, CI excludes zero), meaning training actively cost coverage rather than merely failing to add it. GRPO never significantly differs from baseline, though its point estimate drifts from –0.7pp at $k=1$ to –3.7pp at $k=16$.

Read together with panel (c), GRPO’s win over RFT here reflects a smaller loss relative to the starting checkpoint rather than a capability gain over it, matching the distinction Yue et al. [2025] draw between sharpening existing capability and adding new support (§1), and the opposite of levels 1–2, where GRPO’s gain over baseline is real (above). This is also a different failure from the structural argument in §1: pass@1 measured the right quantity, correctly finding more correct mass in GRPO than in RFT, and the risk is entirely in reading a treatment gap as a capability claim with no control to check it against.

The arm that is actually self-distillation-shaped moves least of all. The literature this paper engages with (§1) is about self-distillation; RFT’s cross-entropy loss, lacking a teacher distribution or divergence term, does not really belong to that family, but OPD does. At one seed each, the length-penalized GRPO variants track plain GRPO closely on every diversity metric (Table 1), while OPD is the outlier, nearly unchanged from baseline on every diversity metric and on pass@1 ($0.593 \rightarrow 0.599$, GSM8K). This is consistent with under-training at this step budget, but equally consistent with genuine diversity preservation; one seed cannot distinguish the two. It does establish that OPD, this project’s actual self-distillation arm, does not reproduce Kim et al. [2026]’s finding that self-distillation sharply lowers entropy, at this scale. Separately, GSM8K truncation (≤ 0.0012 movement) and format-failure (0.0000 throughout) across GRPO seeds rule out a formatting artifact behind its pass@1 gain.

4 Discussion

An improved pass@ k does not certify that post-training preserved what the base model could do. Practitioners read pass@1 as evidence that a post-training run worked, and pass@ k at larger

k , implicitly, as evidence that it did not cost the model anything else. Here, that second reading fails even in a case with no evaluator to blame: the verifier and scoring rule are deterministic, so any blind spot in $\text{pass}@k$ is a property of the metric itself, not of noise in how it is scored. Even so, $\text{pass}@k$ still fails to certify a construct that three complementary measures show moved by a large, seed-robust margin in opposite directions for two post-training methods applied to the same starting checkpoint. $\text{pass}@k$ is a statement about correct-answer mass; it says nothing about how post-training reorganized the model’s output distribution to produce that mass.

This paper makes two separate claims. The first is structural (§1): $\text{pass}@k$ cannot see how probability mass is distributed across outputs, regardless of what it is compared against. The second is the baseline comparison in §3, where $\text{pass}@1$ correctly reports which treatment has more correct mass and the risk lies in reading that comparison without a control; only the first claim concerns construct validity.

The hard-problem regression is consistent with an alignment tax. On MATH-500 levels 4–5, RFT regresses significantly below the starting checkpoint through $k=4$, and GRPO never significantly improves over it (§3). Read as a post-training failure mode, this is consistent with an alignment-tax interpretation, where capability outside the training distribution degrades as a side effect of optimizing within it, although our experiments do not establish diversity narrowing as its cause. The diversity narrowing we measure elsewhere is a plausible, not causally established, mechanism for the same regression, consistent with Yue et al. [2025]’s boundary-narrowing result.

Across the RLVR literature, $\text{pass}@k$ at $k \in \{8, 32\}$ is used as evidence for whether training collapsed a model’s reasoning options. Here, three diversity measures moved in opposite directions for the two methods, detectable at $\text{pass}@1-2$ even on a hard, high-headroom benchmark, while $\text{pass}@8$ and $\text{pass}@32$ on GSM8K, and $\text{pass}@8$ and $\text{pass}@16$ on the harder MATH-500 subset, registered nothing beyond noise (§3). A practitioner reading only those larger- k values would see no detectable separation past $k=1-2$; one reading entropy and answer-diversity would conclude they are opposites. These observations are not contradictory; they reflect different constructs. $\text{pass}@k$ has its own blind spots, and treating large- k $\text{pass}@k$ as sufficient evidence about diversity can therefore lead to a construct-validity error when evaluating whether a post-training run changed more than the benchmark score shows, including in our own assumptions before this result. Which direction either method moves diversity is disputed elsewhere at larger scales [Nicolicioiu et al., 2026, Kim et al., 2026]; our claim concerns the protocol used to evaluate post-training, not which method is better.

5 Limitations

Scale. All results are at 1.5B parameters; whether the effect and the metric’s blindness to it hold at 7B+ is untested, and Yue et al. [2025] find $\text{pass}@k$ already near-saturated by $k = 1$ at that scale. **Data availability.** A since-fixed logging bug overwrote GSM8K’s raw per-sample rollouts for the first seed of every arm (MATH-500’s were unaffected, §2), so correct-only distinct-3, length-matched distinct-3, $D_{\text{incorrect}}$, and the paired arm-difference are $n=2$ seeds, weaker than the $n=3$ elsewhere. Table 2’s 3-seed CIs use a DerSimonian–Laird meta-analysis of only $k=3$ studies and should be read as approximate. **Confounded comparison.** RFT and GRPO differ on more than one axis at once (loss function, whether incorrect rollouts enter the gradient, a group-relative baseline), so this paper reports what the metric registered without identifying which mechanistic difference is responsible. **Single starting checkpoint.** Every arm post-trains the same Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct checkpoint; we vary post-training method, not base-model family, pretraining data, or starting-checkpoint properties, so this paper does not speak to what a base model must possess for post-training to succeed, only to how two post-training methods reorganize one particular starting point differently.

Acknowledgments

Experiments were run on Modal serverless GPU infrastructure. Generative AI tools were used for language editing, code assistance, and figure generation during manuscript preparation. The authors determined the research questions, experimental design, statistical methodology, interpretation, and conclusions, and independently verified the reported results and citations.

References

- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Jeonghye Kim, Xufang Luo, Minbeom Kim, Sangmook Lee, Dohyung Kim, Jiwon Jeon, Dongsheng Li, and Yuqing Yang. Why does self-distillation (sometimes) degrade the reasoning capability of LLMs? *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2026. *arXiv:2603.24472*.
- Doyeon Lee, Eunyi Lyou, Hyunsoo Cho, Sookyoung Kim, Joonseok Lee, and Jaemoo Choi. QUATRO: Query-adaptive trust region policy optimization for LLM fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.04620*, 2026.
- Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan. A diversity-promoting objective function for neural conversation models. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, 2016.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*, 2023.
- Andrei Liviu Nicolicioiu, Mohammad Pezeshki, and Aaron Courville. On-policy self-distillation with sampled demonstrations reduces output diversity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.26091*, 2026.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- Yang Yue, Zhiqi Chen, Rui Lu, Andrew Zhao, Zhaokai Wang, Yang Yue, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. Does reinforcement learning really incentivize reasoning capacity in LLMs beyond the base model? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.13837*, 2025. NeurIPS 2025.

Appendix: Implementation and Reproducibility Details

This appendix states only what is directly verifiable from this project’s saved run configurations (one `config.resolved.yaml` per run, committed alongside the training and analysis code) and the source itself. It is not a claim that every number in the paper can be reproduced exactly from released artifacts: the configs, scripts, and rollouts referenced below are not (yet) packaged for public release alongside this preprint.

Training. All arms fully fine-tune Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct in bfloat16, with no LoRA or other adapter layers; the optimizer is AdamW. **GRPO:** learning rate 1×10^{-6} , clip $\epsilon = 0.2$, KL coefficient $\beta = 0$ (no reference-model KL penalty), 8 rollouts/prompt, 8 prompts/batch, gradient accumulation over 8 steps, per-device batch size 8, 1 update per batch, 1 epoch over 1,500 training prompts. **RFT:** learning rate 1×10^{-6} , plain cross-entropy on the single shortest verifier-passed rollout per prompt, the same rollout/batch/prompt counts as GRPO.

Sampling and evaluation. Generation temperature 1.0, top- p 1.0, top- k unrestricted; maximum prompt and completion length 1,024 tokens each. In-domain (GSM8K) evaluation draws 32 samples/problem; out-of-domain (MATH-500) draws 16 samples/problem; checkpoints are evaluated every 25 training steps.

Verifier and answer normalization. Correctness is checked by a dedicated normalizer (`src/opsd/verify/math_verify.py`) that strips LaTeX wrapper commands (`\left`, `\text`, `\frac`, `\sqrt`, etc.), currency/percent symbols, thousands separators, and boilerplate phrasing such as “the answer is”; lower-cases the result; and compares numerically as an exact rational when both sides parse as numbers, falling back to normalized-string equality otherwise. The same function is used for the training reward and for evaluation scoring.

Entropy definitions. Both entropies are Shannon entropy in nats (`src/opsd/eval/diversity.py`). Token entropy at a generated position is $H_t = -\sum_v p_t(v) \log p_t(v)$ over the full next-token vocabulary (not a sampled estimate), averaged over generated positions and over the evaluation batch. Answer entropy for a prompt is the Shannon entropy of the categorical distribution of *normalized* final answers across that prompt’s samples; an unparseable completion counts as its own category rather than being dropped, so a model degenerating into format failures is not misread as more concentrated.

Distinct-3 and $D_{\text{incorrect}}$. Distinct-3 [Li et al., 2016] is the fraction of unique word-trigrams pooled across a problem’s completions, computed both over all completions and, separately, over verifier-correct completions only. $D_{\text{incorrect}}(\text{problem}) = |\text{unique incorrect answers}|/|\text{incorrect completions}|$, averaged over problems; correct completions never enter this computation.

Bootstrap and statistical procedure, by analysis. These are not one shared setting. (i) The GSM8K pass@16 recomputation and the per-seed pass@ k confidence intervals shown throughout use the training pipeline’s own unbiased estimator and percentile bootstrap (`src/opsd/eval/passk.py`, functions `pass_at_k_batch` and `bootstrap_ci`), 1,000 resamples, seed 0. (ii) The MATH-500 hard-level (levels 4–5) arm-versus-baseline clustered-by-problem bootstrap uses 3,000 resamples, seed 0. (iii) $D_{\text{incorrect}}$ and the count-controlled incorrect-only checks use 2,000 resamples, seed 0; the separate minimum-detectable-effect/power calculation reported in the abstract uses 1,500 resamples, seed 1 (deliberately a different seed, independent of the point-estimate bootstrap). (iv) The 3-seed pooled pass@ k summaries use a closed-form DerSimonian–Laird random-effects meta-analysis over each seed’s own point estimate and standard error, which is not a resampling bootstrap.

Seeds and run structure. Each trained arm has 3 independent training seeds. A since-fixed logging bug overwrote GSM8K’s raw per-sample rollouts for seed 0 of every arm (MATH-500 was unaffected); the correct-only distinct-3, length-matched distinct-3, $D_{\text{incorrect}}$, and paired arm-difference results are therefore $n = 2$ seeds rather than $n = 3$, as stated in §5.

Known gap. Per-rollout token entropy restricted to correct-only completions cannot be reconstructed from logged data: the training/eval pipeline stores only a batch-mean token entropy at

evaluation time, never a per-sample value to filter by correctness. This is stated where it matters, in §3, rather than approximated here.