

Meta-R1: Empowering Large Reasoning Models with Metacognition

Haonan Dong¹, Haoran Ye¹, Wenhao Zhu¹, Kehan Jiang¹, Guojie Song^{1*}

¹State Key Laboratory of General Artificial Intelligence,
School of Intelligence Science and Technology, Peking University
✉ hndong25@stu.pku.edu.cn, gjsong@pku.edu.cn

Abstract

Large Reasoning Models (LRMs) demonstrate remarkable capabilities on complex tasks, exhibiting emergent, human-like thinking patterns. Despite their advances, we identify a fundamental limitation: current LRMs lack a dedicated meta-level cognitive system—an essential faculty in human cognition that enables “thinking about thinking”. This absence leaves their emergent abilities *uncontrollable* (non-adaptive reasoning), *unreliable* (intermediate error), and *inflexible* (lack of a clear methodology). To address this gap, we introduce **Meta-R1**, a systematic and generic framework that endows LRMs with explicit metacognitive capabilities. Drawing on principles from cognitive science, **Meta-R1** decomposes the reasoning process into distinct *object-level* and *meta-level* components, orchestrating proactive planning, on-line regulation, and adaptive early stopping within a cascaded framework. Experiments on three challenging benchmarks and against eight competitive baselines demonstrate that **Meta-R1** is: **(I) high-performing**, surpassing state-of-the-art methods by up to 27.3%; **(II) token-efficient**, reducing token consumption to 15.7% ~ 32.7% and improving efficiency by up to 14.8% when compared to its vanilla counterparts; and **(III) transferable**, maintaining robust performance across datasets and model backbones.

1 Introduction

Large Reasoning Models (LRMs), exemplified by OpenAI-o1 (Jaech et al. 2024) and DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al. 2025), have achieved substantial progress across a wide range of complex tasks (Li et al. 2025c; Ye et al. 2025). Upon receiving a query, these models explicitly generate step-by-step chains of thought (CoT) (Wei et al. 2022) prior to producing final answers. They exhibit the capacity for *test-time scaling*, yielding improved solutions and tackling more challenging problems by extending reasoning duration (Snell et al. 2024; Yang et al. 2025b; Muennighoff et al. 2025). Glimpses of their reasoning reveal emergent, human-like cognitive behaviours—including *self-reflection*, *backtracking*, and *self-verification* (Ma et al. 2025b; Marjanović et al. 2025)—often attributed to reinforcement learning (RL) (Guan et al. 2025; Zhao et al. 2025a). Recent advances have further enhanced these models by increasing data efficiency (Ye et al. 2025; Li et al. 2025a; Muennighoff et al. 2025) and




Figure 1: Three manifestations of metacognitive deficiency in existing LRMs.

introducing novel training algorithms (Zhao et al. 2025b; Zhang et al. 2025a; Dai, Yang, and Si 2025).

However, closer examinations of the mainstream LRMs (Guo et al. 2025) reveal that their emergent behaviors are intrinsically uncontrollable, unreliable, and inflexible. As depicted in Figure 1, these models frequently produce redundant, erroneous, or unproductive reasoning steps or pivots. At a **surface level**, LRMs **(I)** fail to adaptively regulate the length of their reasoning in accordance with problem complexity, resulting in substantial token inefficiency; **(II)** exhibit persistent procedural errors, such as miscalculations in complex tasks; and **(III)** display insufficient methodological awareness, often manifesting as overconfidence, superficial attempts, or frequent, unwarranted changes in strategy. Indeed, similar findings are presented by (Chen et al. 2025; He et al. 2025; Barez et al. 2025; Chua and Evans 2025). At a **deeper level**, these deficiencies arise from the models’ autoregressive architecture, which impedes effective self-monitoring and regulation during next-token generation (Ma et al. 2025a; Lin et al. 2021).

These deficiencies collectively reveal a fundamental lack of metacognition in LRMs—a core human cognitive faculty

*Corresponding author.

underpinning the ability to “think about thinking” (Georghides 2004; Lai 2011). Metacognition orchestrates *strategic resource allocation, error detection and correction, and the flexible adaptation of reasoning processes*, all of which are essential for advanced human cognition (Davidson, Deuser, and Sternberg 1994; Martinez 2006; Kuhn 2022). According to the well-established two-level model of Nelson and Narens (Nelson 1990), metacognition comprises a meta-level, which governs the planning and regulation of reasoning, and an object-level, which executes the reasoning itself. Neurocognitive evidence further supports the existence of specialized brain regions dedicated to metacognitive control (Fleming and Dolan 2012). In contrast, current monolithic autoregressive architectures and RL training regimes lack the structural and functional complexity required to elicit such sophisticated, brain-like reasoning. We therefore argue that explicit cognition engineering (Xia et al. 2025b) is essential to scaffold LRMs toward their full potential.

In response to these challenges, we present **Meta-R1**, a systematic and generic framework that confers explicit metacognitive capabilities upon LRMs. Drawing on principles from cognitive science, **Meta-R1** decomposes the reasoning process into distinct *object-level* and *meta-level* modules, orchestrating three core metacognitive functions: **1 Proactive Metacognitive Planning**, which formalizes problem definitions, assesses difficulty, and selects strategies accordingly; **2 Online Metacognitive Regulation**, which facilitates real-time monitoring and control between levels through a pre-defined communication protocol; and **3 Satisficing Termination**, which determines when to conclude reasoning. Through extensive experiments on canonical mathematical benchmarks (MATH500, AIME24, GSM8K) against eight competitive baselines, we demonstrate that **Meta-R1** is **(I) high-performing**, surpassing state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods by up to 27.3%; **(II) token-efficient**, reducing token consumption to 15.7% ~ 32.7% and improving efficiency by up to 14.8% compared to its vanilla counterparts; and **(III) transferable**, maintaining robust performance across datasets and model backbones. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- ✿ **Paradigm Shift.** We identify the absence of metacognition as a fundamental limitation in current LRMs. By introducing metacognitive theory into the reasoning process, we advance large language model (LLM) reasoning towards the paradigm of explicit cognition engineering.
- ✿ **Practical Framework.** We present **Meta-R1**, a systematic framework that decouples the metacognitive system into distinct object- and meta-levels, and implements a systematic three-stage workflow for task resolution.
- ✿ **Experimental Validation.** Extensive experiments on canonical benchmarks demonstrate that **Meta-R1** **(I)** outperforms baseline methods by up to 27.3%, **(II)** reduces token consumption to 15.7% ~ 32.7% of that required by vanilla models, and **(III)** effectively transfers across datasets and models.

2 Method

Figure 2 illustrates how **Meta-R1** augments existing LRMs with metacognitive capabilities. Building on the theoretical framework of Nelson and Narens (Nelson 1990), our approach conceptualizes metacognition as a two-level architecture: an *object-level*, which directly engages with the task, and a *meta-level*, which regulates the object-level. In this design, the main LRM naturally serves as the object-level, while an additional LLM is introduced to function as the meta-level. **Meta-R1** implements a comprehensive three-stage process for task resolution. Specifically, given a query, the workflow proceeds as follows: **1 Proactive Metacognitive Planning:** Before problem-solving begins, the meta-level conducts an in-depth analysis of the problem to allocate cognitive resources. **2 Online Metacognitive Regulation:** During problem-solving, information flows continuously between the meta-level and object-level through dynamic *monitoring* and *control* mechanisms, mediated by a pre-defined communication protocol, enabling real-time metacognitive regulation. **3 Satisficing Termination:** The framework determines the appropriate moment to conclude the reasoning process and generates the final response.

2.1 Proactive Metacognitive Planning

From a cognitive science perspective, the primary distinction between experts and novices lies in their preparatory phase of problem-solving (Schenk, Vitalari, and Davis 1998; Persky and Robinson 2017). Experts, guided by metacognition, devote substantial cognitive effort to understanding the problem’s intricacies and assessing its complexity before allocating resources. In contrast, novices often bypass this critical analysis, prematurely resorting to trial-and-error or rote application of formulas. Our framework operationalizes this phase at the meta-level through a structured procedure: **(I)** Schema Activation for Problem Formalization, **(II)** Ease-of-Learning Judgments for Difficulty Assessment, and **(III)** Cognitive Resource Allocation via Strategy Selection.

Schema Activation for Problem Formalization. Schema activation entails retrieving relevant structured knowledge from long-term memory to interpret new problems (Brewer and Treyns 1981; Van Kesteren et al. 2012; Rumelhart 2017). This process facilitates effective reasoning by enabling recognition of a problem’s underlying logical structure beyond its superficial features. Accordingly, upon receiving a query Q , the meta-level is prompted via few-shot learning to perform a formal problem decomposition based on a context \mathcal{E}_{fp} , yielding a structured problem definition \mathcal{F}_Q . This definition is formulated as a tuple comprising three elements: *Knowns* (the explicit givens and premises) \mathcal{K}_Q , the *Goal* (the target outcome to be found, computed, or proven) \mathcal{G}_Q , and *Constraints* (the explicit or implicit conditions that govern the problem space) \mathcal{C}_Q . We formalize this decomposition as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_Q \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{meta}(Q | \mathcal{E}_{fp}) \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_Q = (\mathcal{K}_Q, \mathcal{G}_Q, \mathcal{C}_Q) \quad (2)$$




Figure 2: The methodological framework of Meta-R1. Given a query, the process involves: ① meta-level preparation, ② real-time monitoring and control between the two levels of reasoning, culminating in ③ system-triggered early stopping.

Ease-of-Learning Judgments for Difficulty Assessment.

Before tackling a cognitive task, individuals make metacognitive predictions about its difficulty, known as Ease-of-Learning (EOL) judgments (Nelson 1990; Koriat 1997; Jemstedt, Schwartz, and Jönsson 2018). We operationalize this approach by categorizing problem difficulty into three broad levels: *Hard*, *Medium*, and *Easy*. Using few-shot learning, the meta-level classifies the difficulty D_Q of a given problem Q based on a context \mathcal{E}_{fp} . While solving the problem may be complex, assessing its difficulty is comparatively straightforward. Formally, this process is defined as:

$$D_Q \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{meta}(Q | \mathcal{E}_{fp}) \quad (3)$$

Cognitive Resource Allocation via Strategy Selection.

Faced with multiple tasks or complex problems, individuals must efficiently allocate limited cognitive resources (Kahneman 1973; Norman and Bobrow 1975; Just and Carpenter 1992). This cognitive resource allocation, guided by prior difficulty assessment, determines the appropriate level of effort. In Meta-R1, we first construct a strategy pool \mathcal{S}_{pool} of mainstream reasoning strategies. Based on the meta-level’s difficulty assessment, we select a suitable reasoning strategy $\mathcal{S}_{thinking}$ for the object-level. This strategy is then combined with the formal problem definition \mathcal{F}_Q to construct the initial prompt for the object-level.

2.2 Online Metacognitive Regulation

After proactive metacognitive planning, the process advances to core problem-solving. According to Nelson and

Narens’ theory (Nelson 1990), this stage involves two main activities: monitoring and control. Information flows between the object-level and meta-level in a bidirectional manner—monitoring sends information from the object-level to the meta-level, while control sends it in the opposite direction. Metacognitive regulation, or “thinking about thinking,” focuses on detecting two error types: (I) factual errors, such as mistakes in specific solution steps, and (II) thinking errors, which are flaws in the reasoning methodology itself.

Monitoring. To efficiently detect and classify errors, we analyze the tokens generated during reasoning. Similar to prior works (Wang et al. 2025a; Galichin et al. 2025; Olson et al. 2025), we empirically observe that R1-like models generate a series of specific keywords during their reasoning process, such as “let” and “assume” during mathematical derivations, or “wait” and “alternatively” when shifting strategies. Specifically, tokens are grouped into two categories: *factual tokens* and *thinking tokens*, corresponding to factual and thinking errors, respectively (see Appendix C). For analysis, we define a *step* as a single paragraph of output, and a *chunk* as a sequence of steps. After generating chunk C_i , we compute the frequency of each token type \mathbb{T} :

$$\rho(C_i, \mathbb{T}) = \frac{N(C_i, \mathbb{T})}{|C_i|} \quad (4)$$

where $|C_i|$ is the total number of tokens in chunk C_i , and $N(C_i, \mathbb{T})$ counts the occurrences of tokens from set \mathbb{T} . Our monitoring mechanism uses two triggers: an *anomaly-based*

Algorithm 1: Meta-R1 Inference

Input: Query \mathcal{Q} , Meta-level $\mathcal{M}_{\text{meta}}$, Object-level \mathcal{M}_{obj}
Output: Final Answer $\mathcal{A}_{\text{final}}$

Stage 1: Proactive Metacognitive Planning
// Problem formalization
1: $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Q}} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{meta}}(\mathcal{Q} | \mathcal{E}_{fp})$ \triangleright Eq. 1
// Difficulty Assessment
2: $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Q}} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{meta}}(\mathcal{Q} | \mathcal{E}_{fp})$ \triangleright Eq. 3
3: Select strategy $\mathcal{S}_{\text{thinking}}$ and step budget B based on $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Q}}$
4: $\text{Prompt}_{\text{init}} \leftarrow \text{ConstructPrompt}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{thinking}})$
5: Initialize ReasoningTrace $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \emptyset, i \leftarrow 0, i_{\text{last}} \leftarrow 0$

Stage 2: Online Metacognitive Regulation
6: **while** $i < B$ **do** \triangleright Loop until budget is exceeded
// Object-level generates the next reasoning chunk
7: $C_i \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{obj}}(\text{Prompt}_{\text{init}} \cup \mathcal{R})$
8: $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup C_i; i \leftarrow i + 1$
// Meta-level monitors for potential errors
9: Trigger control action A_i based on token frequency anomaly or periodic safety interval \triangleright Eq. 5
10: **if** $A_i \neq \emptyset$ **then**
11: Get error type E_{type} from action A_i
// Meta-level generates advice upon detecting an error
12: $\mathcal{A}_{\text{meta}} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{meta}}(C_i, E_{\text{type}} | \mathcal{E}_{fc})$ \triangleright Eq. 6
13: **if** $\mathcal{A}_{\text{meta}}$ is not empty **then**
// Inject advice into the reasoning trace
14: $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\text{meta}}$ \triangleright Eq. 9
15: **end if**
16: $i_{\text{last}} \leftarrow i$
17: **end if**
18: **end while**

Stage 3: Satisficing Termination
// Force termination and generate the final answer
19: Inject termination latent prompt into \mathcal{M}_{obj}
20: $\mathcal{A}_{\text{final}} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{obj}}(\text{Prompt}_{\text{init}} \cup \mathcal{R})$
21: **return** $\mathcal{A}_{\text{final}}$

trigger and a *periodic safety trigger*. The anomaly-based trigger is threshold-based: if the frequency of any token type exceeds a predefined threshold τ , the corresponding error type is logged and control action \mathcal{V} is triggered. The periodic safety trigger provides regular oversight by defining a *safety interval* Θ_{safe} , the maximum number of chunks allowed without a trigger. If no monitoring occurs within this interval, a comprehensive control action \mathcal{V}_{all} for both factual and thinking errors is triggered. Formally, the action A_i triggered for chunk C_i is determined as follows:

$$A_i = \begin{cases} \mathcal{V}_{\text{fact}} & \text{if } \rho(C_i, \mathbb{T}_{\text{fact}}) > \tau_{\text{fact}} \\ \mathcal{V}_{\text{think}} & \text{if } \rho(C_i, \mathbb{T}_{\text{think}}) > \tau_{\text{think}} \\ \mathcal{V}_{\text{all}} & \text{if } i - i_{\text{last}} > \Theta_{\text{safe}} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Control. Upon receiving a chunk flagged for a potential error, the meta-level initiates a targeted check for the corresponding error type E_{type} , using a dedicated few-shot prompt \mathcal{E}_{fc} . To identify factual errors, the meta-level checks four aspects: (I) internal logical contradictions within the current chunk; (II) violations of the constraints $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ established in

the formal problem definition; (III) incorrect theorem application, specifically whether the necessary preconditions are met; and (IV) computational errors. To identify thinking errors, the meta-level assesses four conditions: (I) lack of progress towards the problem’s goal $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Q}}$; (II) reasoning loops, where the current line of thought is stagnating or repetitive; (III) stalled progress, indicating that the reasoning process is stuck; and (IV) strategic instability, such as prematurely abandoning a reasoning chain or frequently switching between approaches. If the meta-level confirms an error, it generates META ADVICE, denoted as $\mathcal{A}_{\text{meta}}$, which details the specific manifestation e_{spec} of the error and provides actionable suggestions s_{act} for correction. Finally, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{meta}}$ is passed as an information stream to the object-level. We formalize this process as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{meta}} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{meta}}(C_i, E_{\text{type}} | \mathcal{E}_{fc}) \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{meta}} = (e_{\text{spec}}, s_{\text{act}}) \quad (7)$$

Communication Protocols. We define our communication protocols for monitoring and control actions to enable information flow between the object-level and the meta-level. For a monitoring action, we explicitly provide the flagged chunk and its suspected error type to the meta-level as part of a standard prompt. For a control action, we introduce the *latent prompt*. In contrast to conventional prompt engineering, this method achieves dynamic, real-time intervention through token-level control. Specifically, we consider the object-level \mathcal{M}_{obj} , as a standard autoregressive generator. At each generation step t , given the preceding sequence of tokens $x_{<t}$, it outputs a probability distribution P_t for the next token x_t :

$$P_t(x_t | x_{<t}) = \text{Softmax}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{obj}}(x_{<t})) \quad (8)$$

The latent prompt method intervenes in this process to inject the META ADVICE, denoted as a token sequence $\mathcal{A}_{\text{meta}} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_L)$ of length L . This injection occurs over L consecutive generation steps, starting from step t_{start} . For each step t during this injection (where $t = t_{\text{start}} + k - 1$ for $k = 1, \dots, L$), we override the original distribution P_t with a modified distribution P'_t . This new distribution forces the generation of the specific advice token a_k by setting its probability to 1, effectively creating a Dirac delta distribution centered on a_k :

$$P'_{t_{\text{start}}+k-1}(x | x_{<t_{\text{start}}}, a_{<k}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = a_k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The viability of this dynamic injection hinges on a predefined INTERACTION PROTOCOL within the object-level’s system prompt, which familiarizes the object-level with the nature of the advice.

2.3 Satisficing Termination

To ensure both efficiency and plausibility in reasoning, we introduce a Satisficing Termination mechanism, which is grounded in Herbert Simon’s work on Bounded Rationality and Satisficing (Simon 1955, 1956, 1995). The theory states that individuals do not seek to optimize, but rather

| Method | GSM8K | | | AIME2024 | | | MATH500 | | | Avg. | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| | Acc \uparrow | Tokens \downarrow | RSE \uparrow | Acc \uparrow | Tokens \downarrow | RSE \uparrow | Acc \uparrow | Tokens \downarrow | RSE \uparrow | Acc \uparrow | Tokens \downarrow | RSE \uparrow |
| <i>DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vanilla | 94.2 | 2129 | 88.6 | 64.4 | 11099 | 50.0 | 93.5 | 3844 | 84.2 | 84.0 | 5691 | 74.3 |
| DEER | 93.3 | 982 | 90.6 | 70.0 | 10335 | <u>54.8</u> | 91.4 | 2753 | 84.6 | 84.9 | 4690 | 76.7 |
| GRPO | 95.3 | 2120 | 89.7 | 65.8 | 13504 | 48.7 | 84.0 | 4471 | 74.5 | 81.7 | 6698 | 71.0 |
| RL + Length Penalty | 94.7 | 775 | 92.5 | 55.0 | 7950 | 45.1 | 92.4 | 1993 | <u>87.3</u> | 80.7 | <u>3573</u> | 75.0 |
| S-GRPO | 96.2 | 724 | <u>94.1</u> | 64.4 | 6712 | 54.2 | 93.6 | <u>2146</u> | 88.0 | 84.7 | 3194 | 78.8 |
| Meta-R1 | <u>95.9</u> | 691 | <u>93.9</u> | <u>66.7</u> | <u>7899</u> | <u>54.8</u> | <u>94.5</u> | <u>2903</u> | 87.1 | <u>85.7</u> | 3831 | <u>78.6</u> |
| Meta-R1 Pro | 96.2 | <u>717</u> | 94.2 | 70.0 | 8020 | 57.4 | 94.8 | 3085 | 87.0 | 87.0 | 3941 | 79.5 |
| <i>DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-32B</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vanilla | 95.6 | 875 | 93.2 | 72.0 | 9347 | 57.5 | 94.5 | 3543 | 85.7 | 87.4 | 4588 | 78.8 |
| DEER | 95.1 | 819 | 92.8 | 63.3 | 7424 | 52.5 | 90.4 | 2425 | 84.4 | 82.9 | 3556 | 76.6 |
| Greedy | 95.3 | 1048 | 92.4 | 63.3 | 8050 | 51.8 | 93.0 | 3651 | 84.1 | 83.9 | 4250 | 76.1 |
| Soft Thinking | 95.8 | 785 | <u>93.6</u> | 76.7 | 6620 | 64.7 | <u>95.0</u> | 3373 | 86.5 | <u>89.2</u> | 3593 | <u>81.6</u> |
| Meta-R1 | <u>96.3</u> | 651 | 94.4 | <u>73.3</u> | <u>6720</u> | 61.7 | <u>95.0</u> | <u>2535</u> | 88.4 | 88.2 | 3302 | 81.5 |
| Meta-R1 Pro | 96.5 | <u>733</u> | 94.4 | 76.7 | 6978 | <u>64.2</u> | 95.2 | 2722 | <u>88.2</u> | 89.5 | <u>3478</u> | 82.3 |

Table 1: Performance comparison of **Meta-R1** versus baselines on the GSM8K, AIME2024, and MATH500 benchmarks, using DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B and 32B. We report accuracy (Acc), token consumption (Tokens), and efficiency (RSE). Higher values are better for Acc and RSE, lower values are better for Tokens. The best results are highlighted in **bold**, and the runners-up are underlined.

to find a good enough solution and then conclude their search. To apply this principle, we set distinct reasoning step budgets for problems of different difficulty levels. If the object-level exceeds this budget, we intervene with our latent prompt method (“\n\nOkay I have finished thinking.\nFinal Answer: \n</think>\n”) to force the immediate termination of the reasoning process, prompting the object-level to synthesize and output the best possible answer based on its existing line of thought.

3 Experiments

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to answer the following research questions: (**RQ1**) How does **Meta-R1** perform across various model scales and datasets? (**RQ2**) How token-efficient is **Meta-R1**? (**RQ3**) How does the scale of meta-level affect both performance and token efficiency? (**RQ4**) Can meta-level accurately assess problem difficulty? (**RQ5**) What is the contribution of each stage?

3.1 Experimental Setup

Baselines. For our baseline evaluation, we select a range of representative baseline methods, which are categorized into three groups: ■ **Vanilla Models:** DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-32B (Guo et al. 2025); ■ **Training-Free Methods:** DEER (Yang et al. 2025a), Greedy CoT Thinking (Wei et al. 2022), and Soft Thinking (Zhang et al. 2025d); and ■ **RL-based Methods:** GRPO (Shao et al. 2024), RL + Length Penalty (Arora and Zanette 2025), and S-GRPO (Dai, Yang, and Si 2025).

Datasets. We evaluate **Meta-R1** on three benchmarks widely used for assessing advanced reasoning in large models: GSM8K (Cobbe et al. 2021), MATH500 (Hendrycks et al. 2021), and AIME2024 (MAA Committees). Detailed information about the datasets is provided in Appendix B.

Metrics. For our evaluation metrics, we not only consider accuracy and total token consumption, but also aim to comprehensively assess the model’s reasoning efficiency. Prior works have often measured efficiency using linear metrics (Fan et al. 2025; Qu et al. 2025), which can overlook the diminishing marginal returns of token consumption. To address this limitation, we propose a new metric: **Root-Scaled Efficiency** (RSE). Specifically, it is defined as:

$$\text{RSE} = \frac{A}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{L}{L_{\max}}}}, \quad (10)$$

where A denotes the accuracy, L represents the total token consumption, and L_{\max} is the maximum output length of the model in tokens. See Appendix D for more details.

Implementation Details. For the object-level, we select two prominent large reasoning models: DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-32B (Guo et al. 2025). For the meta-level, we employ two small instruct models (Qwen et al. 2025; Team 2024), defining our two framework variants: **Meta-R1** (using Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct) and **Meta-R1 Pro** (using Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct). All meta-level LLMs are accessed via API. Our *strategy pool* is composed of three reasoning methods: Chain-of-Thought (Wei et al. 2022), Chain-of-Draft (Xu et al. 2025a), and No-Thinking (Ma et al. 2025c). All experiments are conducted on four NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPUs. All parameter settings and prompts are detailed in Appendix E.

3.2 Main Results (**RQ1** & **RQ2**)

To answer **RQ1** and **RQ2**, we conduct a comparative analysis of **Meta-R1** against eight baselines on three widely-used benchmarks: GSM8K, AIME2024, and MATH500. The evaluation focuses on accuracy, token consumption, and




Figure 3: Comparison of accuracy and efficiency between Meta-R1 and baseline methods on two models.

overall efficiency, with the results summarized in Table 1. Based on these results, we have the following observations:

Obs. ① Meta-R1 achieves optimal performance across all model scales and datasets. On average, Meta-R1 improves performance by 0.9% ~ 3.6% compared to the vanilla models. Against the other baseline methods, the average improvement is even more pronounced, ranging from 0.3% ~ 8.0%, with a peak gain of 27.3%. Specifically, when using DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B as the backbone on AIME2024, Meta-R1 Pro surpasses the vanilla baseline by 8.7%. Similarly, with the DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-32B backbone on MATH500, Meta-R1 Pro achieves a 5.3% improvement over DEER.

Obs. ② Meta-R1 demonstrates significant token efficiency. Compared to vanilla models, Meta-R1 reduces token consumption by an average of 24.2% ~ 32.7%. Notably, on GSM8K, Meta-R1 ranks as the runner-up in accuracy across all model scales while consistently using a minimal number of tokens. In terms of our comprehensive efficiency metric, Meta-R1 attains the top RSE values. It boosts efficiency by an average of 3.4% ~ 7.0% over vanilla models, with a maximum increase of 14.8%. Specifically, on MATH500, Meta-R1 shows a 16.9% efficiency gain over GRPO. In Figure 3, we plot the average performance versus efficiency of all methods, aggregated across two backbones and three benchmarks. The visualization clearly demonstrates that, compared to the baseline methods, Meta-R1 achieves both better performance and higher efficiency.

3.3 Analysis of Meta-Level (RQ3 & RQ4)

Firstly, we posit that instruct models, in contrast to reasoning models, are characterized by concise and rapid responses (Fan et al. 2025; Yang et al. 2025c). For this reason, we adopt them for the meta-level. To answer RQ3 and RQ4, we conduct a series of analytical experiments focusing on the meta-level, from which we derive the following observations:

Obs. ③ Small models suffice for an effective and efficient meta-level. To compare the impact of using different model sizes for the meta-level, we test four Qwen2.5-




Figure 4: Effect of meta-level model scale on accuracy and token consumption. We vary the size of meta-level (1.5B to 14B) while using two fixed object-level models (DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B and 32B), with evaluations performed on the GSM8K and MATH500 benchmarks.

Instruct models of varying sizes (1.5B, 3B, 7B, 14B) as the meta-level across our two backbones on GSM8K and MATH500. As shown in Figure 4, while scaling up the meta-level model size does yield a corresponding increase in both performance and token cost, we observe that the 1.5B and 3B models strike the optimal balance. For instance, with the DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B backbone, scaling the meta-level from 3B to 7B yields no performance improvement despite a 14.4% \uparrow increase in token consumption, while scaling to 14B provides a marginal 0.1 gain at the cost of 18.6% \uparrow more tokens. For this reason, we adopt the 1.5B and 3B models as the meta-level in our main experiments.

Obs. ④ Small models are capable of assessing problem difficulty. To validate the capability of small instruct models in assessing problem difficulty, we prompt the Qwen2.5-Instruct-1.5B and 3B models to rate problems from the MATH500 dataset. Specifically, we manually categorize the problems into three tiers based on their original labels: Levels 1-2 are defined as *Easy*, Level 3 as *Medium*, and Levels 4-5 as *Difficult*. As depicted in Figure 5, the results show that while small models do not yet sharply delineate the boundaries between difficulty levels, they demonstrate a general ability to correctly assess the overall difficulty.




Figure 5: Assessment of problem difficulty using Qwen2.5-Instruct-1.5B and 3B as the meta-level models.

| Dataset | GSM8K | | MATH500 | |
|----------------|-------|--------|---------|--------|
| Metric | Acc | Tokens | Acc | Tokens |
| Meta-R1 | 95.9 | 691 | 94.5 | 2903 |
| <i>w/o S1</i> | 95.7 | 983 | 94.2 | 3307 |
| <i>w/o S2</i> | 94.5 | 650 | 93.8 | 2770 |
| <i>w/o S3</i> | 95.8 | 971 | 94.4 | 3096 |

Table 2: Ablation study of Meta-R1.

3.4 Ablation & Case Study ($\mathcal{RQ5}$)

Ablation Study. To evaluate the contribution of the different stages in Meta-R1, we propose three variants: (1) *w/o S1*, (2) *w/o S2*, and (3) *w/o S3*, which represent the removal of each of the three stages, respectively. We compare three variants against Meta-R1 on GSM8K and MATH500, using the DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B model. We observe from Table 2: ❶ Removing any single stage results in a performance degradation, with the removal of *S2* causing the most significant impact. This indicates that online metacognitive regulation is the key to enhance reasoning. ❷ The removal of different stages leads to varied changes in token consumption. Removing *S1* and *S3* increases token usage, whereas removing *S2* reduces it.

Case Study. We present a detailed case study and visualization of Meta-R1 in Appendix F.

4 Related Work

Large Language Models Reasoning. Recently, large reasoning models such as OpenAI-o1 and DeepSeek-R1 have achieved a series of significant advances in advanced reasoning tasks. The current mainstream approaches for further enhancing the reasoning capabilities of R1-like models can be broadly divided into five categories: ❶ **RL-based** recasts the autoregressive generation process as a sequential decision-making problem, in which each reasoning step is treated as an action chosen to maximize long-term reward, thereby balancing the accuracy of the final answer with the quality of intermediate reasoning, as exemplified by GRPO (Shao et al. 2024), S-GRPO (Dai, Yang, and Si 2025) and AdaptThink (Zhang et al. 2025a). ❷ **Data-driven** constructs large volumes of high-quality intermediate reasoning trajectories to

enrich the training signal and guide the model toward more coherent thought processes, including (Ye et al. 2025; Muenighoff et al. 2025; Zhou et al. 2025). ❸ **SFT-based** directly teaches the model to generate structured chains of thought by maximizing the likelihood of teacher-provided rationales, including TokenSkip (Xia et al. 2025a), C3oT (Kang et al. 2024) and CoT-Valve (Ma et al. 2025d). ❹ **Prompt-based** leverages prompt engineering to elicit detailed reasoning paths from the model, including (Alazraki et al. 2025; Bi et al. 2025; Xu et al. 2025a; Ye et al. 2024). ❺ **Latent reasoning**, in contrast to explicit chain-of-thought techniques, performs the reasoning process entirely within the model’s latent space, bypassing the need to generate explicit intermediate steps, such as Coconut (Hao et al. 2024), SoftCoT (Xu et al. 2025b) and LightThinker (Zhang et al. 2025b). In contrast to these lines of work, our work successfully introduces metacognitive theories from cognitive science into LLM reasoning, thereby achieving further improvements in overall reasoning performance.

Cognitive Science For LLMs. Recent efforts to integrate cognitive science principles into large language models can be broadly classified into four main categories: ❶ **Memory systems**, which adapt human-inspired memory architectures by distinguishing sensory, short-term, and long-term storage and endowing LLMs with structured retrieval mechanisms, including Memory³ (Yang et al. 2024), MemOS (Li et al. 2025b) and Mem0 (Chhikara et al. 2025). ❷ **Theory of Mind**, which evaluates and extends LLMs’ ability to infer and reason about other agents’ mental states, as exemplified by (Sclar et al. 2023; Chen et al. 2024; Jamali, Williams, and Cai 2023). ❸ **Dual-Process Theory**, which maps the fast, intuitive operations of System 1 and the slow, reflective operations of System 2 onto separate LLM subsystems. Representative works include DualR (Liu et al. 2025a), ACPO (Cheng et al. 2025) and DPT-Agent (Zhang et al. 2025c). ❹ **Developmental Learning**, which guides LLMs through staged curricula mirroring human cognitive maturation, such as CogLM (Wang et al. 2025b), TD-MCL (Han et al. 2025) and LLM-BabyBench (Choukrani et al. 2025). Furthermore, there have been recent attempts to explore metacognitive integration with large-scale models, including Meta-Reasoner (Sui et al. 2025), MetaScale (Liu et al. 2025c) and IoRT (Liu et al. 2025b). However, these works merely focus on constructing meta-prompts and predominantly target foundation models (GPT-4o, Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct). In contrast, our work is dedicated to R1-like reasoning architectures and fully incorporates the complete metacognitive theory from cognitive science, delivering a more principled enhancement of reasoning performance.

5 Conclusion

This work advances the paradigm of cognition engineering by systematically integrating metacognitive theory into LRMs. We identify that current LRMs lack metacognitive capabilities essential for controllable, reliable, and flexible reasoning. To address this, we introduce Meta-R1, a general framework that decomposes reasoning into object-level and meta-level processes, operationalized through a princi-

pled three-stage architecture for complex problem solving. Grounded in cognitive science, **Meta-R1** delivers substantial gains in both reasoning performance and token efficiency. We anticipate that **Meta-R1** will stimulate further research towards the development of artificial general intelligence endowed with human-like cognitive abilities.

References

- Alazraki, L.; Mozes, M.; Campos, J. A.; Yi-Chern, T.; Rei, M.; and Bartolo, M. 2025. No Need for Explanations: LLMs can implicitly learn from mistakes in-context. arXiv:2502.08550.
- Arora, D.; and Zanette, A. 2025. Training Language Models to Reason Efficiently. *CoRR*, abs/2502.04463.
- Barez, F.; Wu, T.-Y.; Arcuschin, I.; Lan, M.; Wang, V.; Siegel, N.; Collignon, N.; Neo, C.; Lee, I.; Paren, A.; et al. 2025. Chain-of-Thought Is Not Explainability. *Preprint, alphaXiv*, v2.
- Bi, Z.; Han, K.; Liu, C.; Tang, Y.; and Wang, Y. 2025. Forest-of-Thought: Scaling Test-Time Compute for Enhancing LLM Reasoning. arXiv:2412.09078.
- Brewer, W. F.; and Treyns, J. C. 1981. Role of schemata in memory for places. *Cognitive psychology*, 13(2): 207–230.
- Chen, X.; Xu, J.; Liang, T.; He, Z.; Pang, J.; Yu, D.; Song, L.; Liu, Q.; Zhou, M.; Zhang, Z.; Wang, R.; Tu, Z.; Mi, H.; and Yu, D. 2025. Do NOT Think That Much for $2+3=?$ On the Overthinking of o1-Like LLMs. arXiv:2412.21187.
- Chen, Z.; Wu, J.; Zhou, J.; Wen, B.; Bi, G.; Jiang, G.; Cao, Y.; Hu, M.; Lai, Y.; Xiong, Z.; and Huang, M. 2024. ToMBench: Benchmarking Theory of Mind in Large Language Models. In Ku, L.; Martins, A.; and Srikumar, V., eds., *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, 15959–15983. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cheng, X.; Li, J.; Zhang, Z.; Tang, X.; Zhao, W. X.; Kong, X.; and Zhang, Z. 2025. Incentivizing Dual Process Thinking for Efficient Large Language Model Reasoning. arXiv:2505.16315.
- Chhikara, P.; Khant, D.; Aryan, S.; Singh, T.; and Yadav, D. 2025. Mem0: Building Production-Ready AI Agents with Scalable Long-Term Memory. arXiv:2504.19413.
- Choukrani, O.; Malek, I.; Orel, D.; Xie, Z.; Iklassov, Z.; Takáč, M.; and Lahlou, S. 2025. LLM-BABYBENCH: Understanding and Evaluating Grounded Planning and Reasoning in LLMs. arXiv:2505.12135.
- Chua, J.; and Evans, O. 2025. Are DeepSeek R1 And Other Reasoning Models More Faithful? arXiv:2501.08156.
- Cobbe, K.; Kosaraju, V.; Bavarian, M.; Chen, M.; Jun, H.; Kaiser, L.; Plappert, M.; Tworek, J.; Hilton, J.; Nakano, R.; Hesse, C.; and Schulman, J. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Dai, M.; Yang, C.; and Si, Q. 2025. S-GRPO: Early Exit via Reinforcement Learning in Reasoning Models. *CoRR*, abs/2505.07686.
- Davidson, J. E.; Deuser, R.; and Sternberg, R. J. 1994. The role of metacognition in problem solving. *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing*, 207: 226.
- Fan, S.; Han, P.; Shang, S.; Wang, Y.; and Sun, A. 2025. Co-Think: Token-Efficient Reasoning via Instruct Models Guiding Reasoning Models. *CoRR*, abs/2505.22017.
- Fleming, S. M.; and Dolan, R. J. 2012. The neural basis of metacognitive ability. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367(1594): 1338–1349.
- Galichin, A.; Dontsov, A.; Druzhinina, P.; Razzhigaev, A.; Rogov, O. Y.; Tutubalina, E.; and Oseledets, I. 2025. I Have Covered All the Bases Here: Interpreting Reasoning Features in Large Language Models via Sparse Autoencoders. arXiv:2503.18878.
- Georghiades, P. 2004. From the general to the situated: Three decades of metacognition. *International journal of science education*, 26(3): 365–383.
- Guan, X.; Zhang, L. L.; Liu, Y.; Shang, N.; Sun, Y.; Zhu, Y.; Yang, F.; and Yang, M. 2025. rStar-Math: Small LLMs Can Master Math Reasoning with Self-Evolved Deep Thinking. *CoRR*, abs/2501.04519.
- Guo, D.; Yang, D.; Zhang, H.; Song, J.; Zhang, R.; Xu, R.; Zhu, Q.; Ma, S.; Wang, P.; Bi, X.; et al. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.
- Han, B.; Zhao, F.; Sun, Y.; Pan, W.; and Zeng, Y. 2025. Continual Learning of Multiple Cognitive Functions with Brain-inspired Temporal Development Mechanism. arXiv:2504.05621.
- Hao, S.; Sukhbaatar, S.; Su, D.; Li, X.; Hu, Z.; Weston, J.; and Tian, Y. 2024. Training Large Language Models to Reason in a Continuous Latent Space. arXiv:2412.06769.
- He, Y.; Li, S.; Liu, J.; Wang, W.; Bu, X.; Zhang, G.; Peng, Z.; Zhang, Z.; Zheng, Z.; Su, W.; and Zheng, B. 2025. Can Large Language Models Detect Errors in Long Chain-of-Thought Reasoning? arXiv:2502.19361.
- Hendrycks, D.; Burns, C.; Kadavath, S.; Arora, A.; Basart, S.; Tang, E.; Song, D.; and Steinhardt, J. 2021. Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset. In Vanschoren, J.; and Yeung, S., eds., *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1, NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks 2021, December 2021, virtual*.
- Jaech, A.; Kalai, A.; Lerer, A.; Richardson, A.; El-Kishky, A.; Low, A.; Helyar, A.; Madry, A.; Beutel, A.; Carney, A.; et al. 2024. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*.
- Jamali, M.; Williams, Z. M.; and Cai, J. 2023. Unveiling Theory of Mind in Large Language Models: A Parallel to Single Neurons in the Human Brain. *CoRR*, abs/2309.01660.
- Jemstedt, A.; Schwartz, B. L.; and Jönsson, F. U. 2018. Ease-of-learning judgments are based on both processing fluency and beliefs. *Memory*, 26(6): 807–815.

- Just, M. A.; and Carpenter, P. A. 1992. A capacity theory of comprehension: individual differences in working memory. *Psychological review*, 99(1): 122.
- Kahneman, D. 1973. *Attention and effort*, volume 1063. Citeseer.
- Kang, Y.; Sun, X.; Chen, L.; and Zou, W. 2024. C3oT: Generating Shorter Chain-of-Thought without Compromising Effectiveness. arXiv:2412.11664.
- Koriat, A. 1997. Monitoring one's own knowledge during study: A cue-utilization approach to judgments of learning. *Journal of experimental psychology: General*, 126(4): 349.
- Kuhn, D. 2022. Metacognition matters in many ways. *Educational Psychologist*, 57(2): 73–86.
- Lai, E. R. 2011. Metacognition: A literature review.
- Li, D.; Cao, S.; Griggs, T.; Liu, S.; Mo, X.; Tang, E.; Hegde, S.; Hakhamaneshi, K.; Patil, S. G.; Zaharia, M.; Gonzalez, J. E.; and Stoica, I. 2025a. LLMs Can Easily Learn to Reason from Demonstrations Structure, not content, is what matters! *CoRR*, abs/2502.07374.
- Li, Z.; Song, S.; Xi, C.; Wang, H.; Tang, C.; Niu, S.; Chen, D.; Yang, J.; Li, C.; Yu, Q.; Zhao, J.; Wang, Y.; Liu, P.; Lin, Z.; Wang, P.; Huo, J.; Chen, T.; Chen, K.; Li, K.; Tao, Z.; Ren, J.; Lai, H.; Wu, H.; Tang, B.; Wang, Z.; Fan, Z.; Zhang, N.; Zhang, L.; Yan, J.; Yang, M.; Xu, T.; Xu, W.; Chen, H.; Wang, H.; Yang, H.; Zhang, W.; Xu, Z.-Q. J.; Chen, S.; and Xiong, F. 2025b. MemOS: A Memory OS for AI System. arXiv:2507.03724.
- Li, Z.-Z.; Zhang, D.; Zhang, M.-L.; Zhang, J.; Liu, Z.; Yao, Y.; Xu, H.; Zheng, J.; Wang, P.-J.; et al. 2025c. From System 1 to System 2: A Survey of Reasoning Large Language Models. arXiv:2502.17419.
- Lin, C.; Jaech, A.; Li, X.; Gormley, M. R.; and Eisner, J. 2021. Limitations of Autoregressive Models and Their Alternatives. In Toutanova, K.; Rumshisky, A.; Zettlemoyer, L.; Hakkani-Tür, D.; Beltagy, I.; Bethard, S.; Cotterell, R.; Chakraborty, T.; and Zhou, Y., eds., *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, 5147–5173. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Liu, G.; Zhang, Y.; Li, Y.; and Yao, Q. 2025a. Dual Reasoning: A GNN-LLM Collaborative Framework for Knowledge Graph Question Answering. arXiv:2406.01145.
- Liu, L.; Zhang, C.; Wu, L.; Zhao, C.; Hu, Z.; He, M.; and Fan, J. 2025b. Instruct-of-Reflection: Enhancing Large Language Models Iterative Reflection Capabilities via Dynamic-Meta Instruction. arXiv:2503.00902.
- Liu, Q.; Zhou, W.; Xu, N.; Huang, J. Y.; Wang, F.; Zhang, S.; Poon, H.; and Chen, M. 2025c. MetaScale: Test-Time Scaling with Evolving Meta-Thoughts. arXiv:2503.13447.
- Ma, C.; Zhao, H.; Zhang, J.; He, J.; and Kong, L. 2025a. Non-myopic Generation of Language Models for Reasoning and Planning. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ma, R.; Wang, P.; Liu, C.; Liu, X.; Chen, J.; Zhang, B.; Zhou, X.; Du, N.; and Li, J. 2025b. S²R: Teaching LLMs to Self-verify and Self-correct via Reinforcement Learning. *CoRR*, abs/2502.12853.
- Ma, W.; He, J.; Snell, C.; Griggs, T.; Min, S.; and Zaharia, M. 2025c. Reasoning Models Can Be Effective Without Thinking. *CoRR*, abs/2504.09858.
- Ma, X.; Wan, G.; Yu, R.; Fang, G.; and Wang, X. 2025d. CoT-Valve: Length-Compressible Chain-of-Thought Tuning. arXiv:2502.09601.
- Marjanović, S. V.; Patel, A.; Adlakha, V.; Aghajohari, M.; BehnamGhader, P.; Bhatia, M.; Khandelwal, A.; et al. 2025. DeepSeek-R1 Thoughtology: Let's think about LLM Reasoning. arXiv:2504.07128.
- Martinez, M. E. 2006. What is metacognition? *Phi delta kappan*, 87(9): 696–699.
- MAA Committees. ????. AIME Problems and Solutions. https://artofproblemsolving.com/wiki/index.php/AIME.Problems_and_Solutions.
- Muennighoff, N.; Yang, Z.; Shi, W.; Li, X. L.; Fei-Fei, L.; Hajishirzi, H.; Zettlemoyer, L.; Liang, P.; Candès, E. J.; and Hashimoto, T. 2025. s1: Simple test-time scaling. *CoRR*, abs/2501.19393.
- Nelson, T. O. 1990. Metamemory: A theoretical framework and new findings. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 26, 125–173. Elsevier.
- Norman, D. A.; and Bobrow, D. G. 1975. On data-limited and resource-limited processes. *Cognitive psychology*, 7(1): 44–64.
- Olson, M. L.; Ratzlaff, N.; Hinck, M.; Luo, M.; Yu, S.; Xue, C.; and Lal, V. 2025. Probing Semantic Routing in Large Mixture-of-Expert Models. arXiv:2502.10928.
- Persky, A. M.; and Robinson, J. D. 2017. Moving from novice to expertise and its implications for instruction. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, 81(9): 6065.
- Qu, X.; Li, Y.; Su, Z.; Sun, W.; Yan, J.; Liu, D.; Cui, G.; Liu, D.; Liang, S.; He, J.; Li, P.; Wei, W.; Shao, J.; Lu, C.; Zhang, Y.; Hua, X.; Zhou, B.; and Cheng, Y. 2025. A Survey of Efficient Reasoning for Large Reasoning Models: Language, Multimodality, and Beyond. *CoRR*, abs/2503.21614.
- Qwen; ; Yang, A.; Yang, B.; Zhang, B.; Hui, B.; Zheng, B.; Yu, B.; Li, C.; Liu, D.; Huang, F.; Wei, H.; Lin, H.; Yang, J.; Tu, J.; Zhang, J.; Yang, J.; Yang, J.; Zhou, J.; Lin, J.; Dang, K.; Lu, K.; Bao, K.; Yang, K.; Yu, L.; Li, M.; Xue, M.; Zhang, P.; Zhu, Q.; Men, R.; Lin, R.; Li, T.; Tang, T.; Xia, T.; Ren, X.; Ren, X.; Fan, Y.; Su, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Wan, Y.; Liu, Y.; Cui, Z.; Zhang, Z.; and Qiu, Z. 2025. Qwen2.5 Technical Report. arXiv:2412.15115.
- Rumelhart, D. E. 2017. Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension*, 33–58. Routledge.
- Schenk, K. D.; Vitalari, N. P.; and Davis, K. S. 1998. Differences between novice and expert systems analysts: What do we know and what do we do? *Journal of management information systems*, 15(1): 9–50.
- Sclar, M.; Kumar, S.; West, P.; Suhr, A.; Choi, Y.; and Tsvetkov, Y. 2023. Minding Language Models' (Lack of) Theory of Mind: A Plug-and-Play Multi-Character Belief

- Tracker. In Rogers, A.; Boyd-Graber, J. L.; and Okazaki, N., eds., *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, 13960–13980. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shao, Z.; Wang, P.; Zhu, Q.; Xu, R.; Song, J.; Zhang, M.; Li, Y. K.; Wu, Y.; and Guo, D. 2024. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models. *CoRR*, abs/2402.03300.
- Simon, H. A. 1955. A behavioral model of rational choice. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 99–118.
- Simon, H. A. 1956. Rational choice and the structure of the environment. *Psychological review*, 63(2): 129.
- Simon, H. A. 1995. Artificial intelligence: an empirical science. *Artificial intelligence*, 77(1): 95–127.
- Snell, C.; Lee, J.; Xu, K.; and Kumar, A. 2024. Scaling LLM Test-Time Compute Optimally can be More Effective than Scaling Model Parameters. *CoRR*, abs/2408.03314.
- Sui, Y.; He, Y.; Cao, T.; Han, S.; Chen, Y.; and Hooi, B. 2025. Meta-Reasoner: Dynamic Guidance for Optimized Inference-time Reasoning in Large Language Models. arXiv:2502.19918.
- Team, Q. 2024. Qwen2.5: A Party of Foundation Models.
- Van Kesteren, M. T.; Ruiters, D. J.; Fernández, G.; and Henson, R. N. 2012. How schema and novelty augment memory formation. *Trends in neurosciences*, 35(4): 211–219.
- Wang, C.; Feng, Y.; Chen, D.; Chu, Z.; Krishna, R.; and Zhou, T. 2025a. Wait, We Don’t Need to” Wait”! Removing Thinking Tokens Improves Reasoning Efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08343*.
- Wang, X.; Yuan, P.; Feng, S.; Li, Y.; Pan, B.; Wang, H.; Hu, Y.; and Li, K. 2025b. CogLM: Tracking Cognitive Development of Large Language Models. In Chiruzzo, L.; Ritter, A.; and Wang, L., eds., *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL 2025 - Volume 1: Long Papers, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, April 29 - May 4, 2025*, 73–87. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wei, J.; Wang, X.; Schuurmans, D.; Bosma, M.; Ichter, B.; Xia, F.; Chi, E. H.; Le, Q. V.; and Zhou, D. 2022. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In Koyejo, S.; Mohamed, S.; Agarwal, A.; Belgrave, D.; Cho, K.; and Oh, A., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Xia, H.; Leong, C. T.; Wang, W.; Li, Y.; and Li, W. 2025a. TokenSkip: Controllable Chain-of-Thought Compression in LLMs. arXiv:2502.12067.
- Xia, S.; Qin, Y.; Li, X.; Ma, Y.; Fan, R.; Chern, S.; Zou, H.; Zhou, F.; Hu, X.; Jin, J.; He, Y.; Ye, Y.; Liu, Y.; and Liu, P. 2025b. Generative AI Act II: Test Time Scaling Drives Cognition Engineering. *CoRR*, abs/2504.13828.
- Xu, S.; Xie, W.; Zhao, L.; and He, P. 2025a. Chain of Draft: Thinking Faster by Writing Less. *CoRR*, abs/2502.18600.
- Xu, Y.; Guo, X.; Zeng, Z.; and Miao, C. 2025b. SoftCoT: Soft Chain-of-Thought for Efficient Reasoning with LLMs. In *Proceedings of ACL*.
- Yang, C.; Si, Q.; Duan, Y.; Zhu, Z.; Zhu, C.; Lin, Z.; Cao, L.; and Wang, W. 2025a. Dynamic Early Exit in Reasoning Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15895*.
- Yang, H.; Lin, Z.; Wang, W.; Wu, H.; Li, Z.; Tang, B.; Wei, W.; Wang, J.; Tang, Z.; Song, S.; Xi, C.; Yu, Y.; Chen, K.; Xiong, F.; Tang, L.; and E, W. 2024. Memory³: Language Modeling with Explicit Memory. *CoRR*, abs/2407.01178.
- Yang, W.; Ma, S.; Lin, Y.; and Wei, F. 2025b. Towards Thinking-Optimal Scaling of Test-Time Compute for LLM Reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2502.18080.
- Yang, W.; Yue, X.; Chaudhary, V.; and Han, X. 2025c. Speculative Thinking: Enhancing Small-Model Reasoning with Large Model Guidance at Inference Time. arXiv:2504.12329.
- Ye, H.; Wang, J.; Cao, Z.; Berto, F.; Hua, C.; Kim, H.; Park, J.; and Song, G. 2024. Reevo: Large language models as hyper-heuristics with reflective evolution. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 37: 43571–43608.
- Ye, Y.; Huang, Z.; Xiao, Y.; Chern, E.; Xia, S.; and Liu, P. 2025. LIMO: Less is More for Reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2502.03387.
- Yeo, E.; Tong, Y.; Niu, M.; Neubig, G.; and Yue, X. 2025. Demystifying Long Chain-of-Thought Reasoning in LLMs. arXiv:2502.03373.
- Zhang, J.; Lin, N.; Hou, L.; Feng, L.; and Li, J. 2025a. AdaptThink: Reasoning Models Can Learn When to Think. *CoRR*, abs/2505.13417.
- Zhang, J.; Zhu, Y.; Sun, M.; Luo, Y.; Qiao, S.; Du, L.; Zheng, D.; Chen, H.; and Zhang, N. 2025b. LightThinker: Thinking Step-by-Step Compression. *CoRR*, abs/2502.15589.
- Zhang, S.; Wang, X.; Zhang, W.; Li, C.; Song, J.; Li, T.; Qiu, L.; Cao, X.; Cai, X.; Yao, W.; Zhang, W.; Wang, X.; and Wen, Y. 2025c. Leveraging Dual Process Theory in Language Agent Framework for Real-time Simultaneous Human-AI Collaboration. *CoRR*, abs/2502.11882.
- Zhang, Z.; He, X.; Yan, W.; Shen, A.; Zhao, C.; Wang, S.; Shen, Y.; and Wang, X. E. 2025d. Soft Thinking: Unlocking the Reasoning Potential of LLMs in Continuous Concept Space. *CoRR*, abs/2505.15778.
- Zhao, A.; Wu, Y.; Yue, Y.; Wu, T.; Xu, Q.; Yue, Y.; Lin, M.; Wang, S.; Wu, Q.; Zheng, Z.; and Huang, G. 2025a. Absolute Zero: Reinforced Self-play Reasoning with Zero Data. arXiv:2505.03335.
- Zhao, A.; Wu, Y.; Yue, Y.; Wu, T.; Xu, Q.; Yue, Y.; Lin, M.; Wang, S.; Wu, Q.; Zheng, Z.; and Huang, G. 2025b. Absolute Zero: Reinforced Self-play Reasoning with Zero Data. *CoRR*, abs/2505.03335.
- Zhou, F.; Wang, Z.; Ranjan, N.; Cheng, Z.; Tang, L.; He, G.; Liu, Z.; and Xing, E. P. 2025. MegaMath: Pushing the Limits of Open Math Corpora. arXiv:2504.02807.

Meta-R1: Empowering Large Reasoning Models with Metacognition (Appendix)

Appendix Contents

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Notations | 2 |
| B | Datasets and Models | 2 |
| B.1 | Dataset Details | 2 |
| B.2 | Model Details | 3 |
| C | Specifics of Keywords Categorization | 3 |
| D | Theoretical Analysis of Root-Scaled Efficiency (RSE) | 3 |
| E | Technical Details | 4 |
| E.1 | Hyperparameter Configuration | 4 |
| E.2 | Prompt | 5 |
| F | Case Study | 14 |
| G | Broader Impact | 14 |

A Notations

We conclude the commonly used notations throughout the manuscript in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of notation used throughout the paper.

| Notation | Definition |
|---|--|
| \mathcal{Q} | Input problem / query. |
| $\mathcal{M}_{\text{meta}}$ | <i>Meta-level</i> : an additional LLM. |
| \mathcal{M}_{obj} | <i>Object-level</i> : large reasoning model. |
| \mathcal{E}_{fp} | Few-shot prompt used in Stage 1. |
| \mathcal{E}_{fc} | Few-shot prompt used in Stage 2. |
| $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ | Formalised representation of \mathcal{Q} . |
| $(\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ | Knowns, Goals, and Constraints extracted from \mathcal{Q} . |
| $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ | Difficulty label predicted for \mathcal{Q} . |
| $\mathcal{S}_{\text{pool}}$ | Pool of candidate reasoning strategies. |
| $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3$ | Three metacognitive stages. |
| \mathbb{T} | Different types of tokens. |
| C_i | The i^{th} chunk of the reasoning process. |
| A_i | Action triggered for chunk C_i . |
| \mathcal{V} | Specific control action triggered. |
| $\rho(C_i, \mathbb{T})$ | Frequency of token \mathbb{T} in chunk C_i . |
| $\Theta_{\text{saf}e}$ | The interval of the periodic safety trigger. |
| E_{type} | Potential error type. |
| e_{spec} | Specific error manifestation. |
| s_{act} | Actionable corrective suggestions. |
| τ | Frequency threshold for specific token type. |
| t_{start} | Step where latent prompt injection begins. |
| P_t | Original next-token distribution of \mathcal{M}_{obj} at step t . |
| P'_t | Distribution after the k -th latent-prompt action. |
| A, L | Task accuracy and consumed tokens, respectively. |
| L_{max} | Predefined maximum sequence length. |
| RSE | Root-Scaled Efficiency metric. |

B Datasets and Models

B.1 Dataset Details

GSM8K. GSM8K is a high-quality benchmark dataset comprising 8,500 grade school level mathematics word problems [1]. Each problem is designed to be solvable by a talented middle school student and typically requires a sequence of 2 to 8 reasoning steps. The dataset is notable for its linguistic diversity and the complexity of its problem statements, which necessitates robust natural language understanding to correctly parse the problem and formulate a solution plan. The solutions are provided as step-by-step natural language explanations interspersed with calculations, making GSM8K an ideal benchmark for evaluating the quantitative reasoning and chain-of-thought capabilities of language models.

AIME2024. The AIME (American Invitational Mathematics Examination) dataset consists of problems from the prestigious high school mathematics competition of the same name [2]. The problems featured in AIME are significantly more challenging than standard high school mathematics and cover a wide range of topics, including advanced algebra, geometry, number theory, and combinatorics. Solving these problems requires not only deep domain knowledge but also significant creative insight and non-trivial problem-solving strategies. As a benchmark, AIME serves to test the upper limits of a model’s mathematical reasoning abilities, pushing them to tackle problems that are considered difficult even for accomplished human students. The problems are typically concise, but their solutions are often complex and require multiple non-obvious logical leaps.

MATH500. The MATH500 dataset is a subset of the comprehensive MATH dataset, a benchmark designed to evaluate the mathematical problem-solving capabilities of machine learning models on questions from high school math competitions [3]. The dataset spans seven subjects: Prealgebra, Algebra, Number Theory, Counting & Probability, Geometry, Intermediate Algebra, and Precalculus. A key feature of the MATH dataset is that its problems are categorized into five difficulty levels (Level 1 to 5), enabling a fine-grained analysis of a model’s performance across a spectrum of complexity. Problems and their step-by-step solutions are provided in LaTeX format, which requires models to correctly parse and generate complex mathematical notation. MATH500 serves as a robust benchmark for assessing a model’s ability to generalize its reasoning skills across diverse mathematical topics and difficulty gradients.

B.2 Model Details

DeepSeek-R1 Series. The DeepSeek-R1 series [4], developed by DeepSeek AI, represents a family of open-source models specifically engineered to enhance logical reasoning capabilities. These models are typically released under a "Base-Instruct" paradigm, where a powerful base model is first trained on a massive corpus of data, followed by a meticulous instruction-tuning phase using high-quality data. This process is designed to elicit and refine the model’s potential in complex domains such as mathematics, programming, and logical deduction. Due to their state-of-the-art reasoning performance, models from the DeepSeek-R1 series are frequently employed as strong backbones for developing and evaluating more advanced reasoning algorithms.

Qwen2.5-Instruct Series. The Qwen2.5-Instruct series [5, 6] is developed by the Qwen team at Alibaba Cloud and consists of a range of general-purpose conversational models that have undergone large-scale instruction tuning. A key characteristic of this series is its comprehensive coverage of various model sizes, offering multiple variants from billion-scale to hundred-billion-scale parameters to suit different application scenarios and computational constraints. The "Instruct" models are specifically optimized to follow user commands, often yielding responses that are more concise and direct. This makes them particularly effective in scenarios that demand rapid responses and precise task execution.

C Specifics of Keywords Categorization

In Table 2, we present the two categories of keywords (factual and thinking) considered in our work. Consistent with [7], after obtaining the keywords, we expand them into a token-level list. For example, for the keyword "wait," there are variants such as "WAIT", "Wait", "Wait,", and " wait". We achieve this by iterating through the full vocabulary and identifying all variant tokens whose textual representation contains any keyword as a substring. Furthermore, we manually prune the list to remove entries that, despite containing a substring, are not contextually valid.

Table 2: Keyword list and categorization.

| Category | Keywords |
|-----------------|---|
| Factual | “let”, “assume”, “suppose”, “define”, “definition”, “=”, “>”, “<”, “prove”, “proof”, “calculate”, “compute”, “derive”, “solve”, “theorem”, “lemma”, “corollary”, “property”, “rule”, “equation”, “formula”, “integrate”, “differentiate”, “derivative”, “integral”, “ \Rightarrow ”, “ \rightarrow ”, “implies”, “therefore”, “hence”, “thus” |
| Thinking | “wait”, “hmm”, “no”, “but”, “however”, “alternatively”, “revisit”, “check”, “double-check”, “verify”, “another”, “maybe”, “perhaps”, “might”, “could”, “seems”, “appears”, “uncertain”, “unsure”, “not sure”, “possible”, “potential”, “guess”, “suspect”, “ah”, “oh” |

D Theoretical Analysis of Root-Scaled Efficiency (RSE)

Motivation. Conventional linear efficiency metrics, such as the direct ratio of accuracy to token consumption, suffer from a core limitation: they penalize token consumption linearly. This leads to an overemphasis on token economy, often undervaluing significant gains in accuracy. However, we

argue that for complex reasoning tasks, the utility gained from an accuracy improvement should be amplified relative to the cost of token reduction.

To address this, we propose Root-Scaled Efficiency (RSE), a new metric that applies a sub-linear penalty to token consumption, thereby better modeling the diminishing marginal cost of tokens:

$$\text{RSE} = \frac{A}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{L}{L_{\max}}}}, \quad (1)$$

where A denotes the accuracy, L represents the total token consumption, and L_{\max} is the maximum output length of the model in tokens. In our implementation, we set L_{\max} to 16384 for the DeepSeek-R1 series models.

Specifically, we employ square root scaling in the denominator. Consequently, when the token length L is small, any increase has a substantial impact on the penalty; conversely, when L is large, the impact diminishes. This design effectively captures the desired ‘‘diminishing marginal cost’’ effect. Furthermore, we normalize token consumption by dividing the total generated length L by the maximum possible length L_{\max} . This transforms the metric into a relative, dimensionless value, facilitating fair comparisons across models with different context windows. Finally, the inclusion of a translation term in the denominator serves a dual purpose: it prevents division-by-zero errors and ensures that the theoretical maximum of RSE is equal to the accuracy A . This aligns with the intuition that a model accomplishing a task with zero resource expenditure should have an efficiency equal to its performance.

Marginal Penalty Analysis. A key mathematical property of the Root-Scaled Efficiency (RSE) metric is its token penalization mechanism. To formalize this, we define the **marginal penalty** as the magnitude of the partial derivative of RSE with respect to token consumption L . Applying the chain rule, this partial derivative is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(\text{RSE})}{\partial L} &= A \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{L}{L_{\max}}\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{L_{\max}} \\ &= -\frac{A}{2L_{\max} \left(1 + \frac{L}{L_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The marginal penalty is the absolute value of this derivative, representing the cost of an incremental increase in token consumption:

$$\left| \frac{\partial(\text{RSE})}{\partial L} \right| = \frac{A}{2L_{\max} \left(1 + \frac{L}{L_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad (3)$$

From Equation 3, it is evident that the term $\left(1 + \frac{L}{L_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ in the denominator is a monotonically increasing function of L . Consequently, the entire expression for the marginal penalty $\left| \frac{\partial(\text{RSE})}{\partial L} \right|$, is a monotonically decreasing function.

This result rigorously proves that the RSE metric exhibits a diminishing marginal penalty. Specifically, the penalty for consuming an additional token is highest when total consumption L is low and diminishes as L increases. This behavior directly aligns with our design objective: to more leniently evaluate models that achieve higher accuracy through longer reasoning chains, acknowledging the principle of diminishing marginal cost for token consumption.

E Technical Details

E.1 Hyperparameter Configuration

We provide the hyperparameter settings used in our experiments in Table 3.

Table 3: Default hyperparameter configuration used across all experiments.

| Hyperparameter | Value |
|--|-------|
| Max Response Length (\mathcal{M}_{obj}) | 16384 |
| Temperature (\mathcal{M}_{obj}) | 0.6 |
| Max Response Length (\mathcal{M}_{meta}) | 2048 |
| Temperature (\mathcal{M}_{meta}) | 0.7 |
| Chunk Size | 5 |
| Θ_{safe} | 5 |
| τ_{fact} | 6e-3 |
| τ_{think} | 3e-3 |
| Max Chunks (Difficult) | 40 |
| Max Chunks (Medium) | 30 |

E.2 Prompt

Difficulty Assessment and Problem Formalization. In our implementation, the two components of Stage 1 (Proactive Metacognitive Planning), Schema Activation for Problem Formalization and Ease-of-Learning Judgments for Difficulty Assessment, are jointly executed using a single few-shot prompt.

Difficulty Assessment and Problem Formalization

```

prompt = f"""
# ROLE: Problem Analyzer

# OBJECTIVE:
Analyze the mathematical problem provided below. Your task is to
  classify its difficulty level and structure its core components
  (Knowns, Goal, Constraints) without solving it.

# TASKS:
1. Classify Difficulty: Assign EXACTLY ONE level. Base your
  judgment on the cognitive process required to find the solution
  path.
  * `Difficult`: The solution requires a non-obvious "trick" or
  creative leap of insight. Standard methods alone are
  insufficient; a hidden key idea must be discovered (for example,
  an unexpected substitution or auxiliary construction).
  * `Mid`: The main challenge is to translate the problem into a
  standard mathematical framework. Once that model is built,
  routine techniques complete the work. This matches level-3
  questions in the MATH500 dataset.
  * `Easy`: The problem explicitly signals which standard formulas
  or procedures to use. Solving is a direct application of well-
  known rules.

2. Formalize Problem: Extract essentials into the sections below
  .
  * `Knowns`: All given facts, values, equations, or definitions.
  * `Goal`: What must be found, proven, or decided (split into 2-3
  bullets if useful).
  * `Constraints`: All explicit or obvious restrictions (domains,
  ranges, non-zero denominators, integer conditions, and so on).

# OUTPUT FORMAT (Strictly Adhere):
--- BEGIN OUTPUT ---
DIFFICULTY: [Difficult | Mid | Easy]

```

```

FORMALIZED PROBLEM:
Knowns:
* [List known item 1]
* [List known item 2]
...
Goal:
* [State goal item 1]
...
Constraints:
* [List constraint item 1]
* [List constraint item 2]
...
--- END OUTPUT ---

# RULES:
* **DO NOT SOLVE** the problem.
* Output only the block above; no extra commentary.
* Use bullet points (*) in Knowns, Goal, Constraints.
* Use plain-text math such as 'x^2 + y^2 = 1' or 'n >= 1'; do **not
  ** use LaTeX.
* If a section is empty, write '* None'.

# EXAMPLES OF PAST ANALYSES
---
## Example 1 (Easy)
INPUT:
Find the roots of the quadratic equation  $3x^2 + 12x + 9 = 0$ .
OUTPUT:
--- BEGIN OUTPUT ---
DIFFICULTY: Easy
FORMALIZED PROBLEM:
Knowns:
* A quadratic equation  $3x^2 + 12x + 9 = 0$  is provided.
* The quadratic formula applies to any equation of the form  $ax^2 +
  bx + c = 0$ .
Goal:
* Identify both roots of the given quadratic equation.
Constraints:
* Coefficients are  $a = 3$ ,  $b = 12$ ,  $c = 9$ .
* Roots may be real or complex numbers.
--- END OUTPUT ---
---
## Example 2 (Mid)
INPUT:
Three consecutive positive integers have a product equal to 120
  times their sum. Determine the integers and their sum.
OUTPUT:
--- BEGIN OUTPUT ---
DIFFICULTY: Mid
FORMALIZED PROBLEM:
Knowns:
* The integers are consecutive and positive.
* The product of the three integers equals 120 times their sum.
Goal:
* Find each of the three integers.
* Compute the sum of these integers.
Constraints:
* Let the integers be  $k$ ,  $k+1$ ,  $k+2$  for some positive integer  $k$ .
* All integers must be positive.
--- END OUTPUT ---
---
## Example 3 (Difficult)
INPUT:

```

```

Find all pairs of distinct positive integers (m, n) such that  $m^n = n^m$ .
OUTPUT:
--- BEGIN OUTPUT ---
DIFFICULTY: Difficult
FORMALIZED PROBLEM:
Knowns:
* m and n are positive integers.
* The equality  $m^n = n^m$  must hold exactly.
Goal:
* List every ordered pair (m, n) that satisfies the equality.
* Verify that each pair consists of distinct integers.
Constraints:
* m and n are positive (greater than zero).
* m is not equal to n.
--- END OUTPUT ---
---
## YOUR CURRENT TASK: ANALYZE THE NEW PROBLEM
You have reviewed the instructions and examples of past analyses.
    Now, perform a fresh and original analysis for the following **
    new** problem. Do not copy the examples.
PROBLEM:
{query}
"""

```

Communication Protocol (Object-Level). We present the system prompt supplied to the object-level model as part of the communication protocol.

Communication Protocol (Object-Level)

```

prompt = """
# ROLE: Advanced Mathematical Problem Solver

# OBJECTIVE:
Your primary goal is to solve the mathematical problem provided,
demonstrating a detailed, step-by-step reasoning process. Your
output should naturally use the standard '<think>' tags for your
reasoning steps and the '<answer>' tag for the final result.

# INTERACTION PROTOCOL:
You will receive specific tagged messages during your reasoning
process. Act upon these tags immediately within your '<think>'
process without explicit acknowledgment:
* **'[META ADVICE (FACTUAL)]'**: This tag indicates feedback on the
accuracy of your reasoning (e.g., logical fallacies, calculation
errors, constraint violations).
  * **Action:** Immediately review the specific point of feedback.
    Correct the identified error and adjust subsequent
    reasoning steps accordingly. Continue your reasoning from
    the point of correction.
* **'[META ADVICE (THINKING)]'**: This tag provides suggestions
regarding your problem-solving approach or strategy (e.g.,
potential loops, alternative methods, getting stuck).
  * **Action:** Carefully consider the suggested alternative or
    feedback on your current method. Adjust your strategy or
    explore the suggested path if deemed appropriate. Continue
    your reasoning with the potentially modified approach.
* **'[META ADVICE (COMPREHENSIVE)]'**: This tag offers feedback on
the overall direction or progress of your reasoning.

```

```

* **Action:** Consider this feedback for guiding the subsequent
  phases of your reasoning. Ensure your ongoing process aligns
  with the feedback provided.

# REASONING GUIDELINES:
* **Output Structure:** Present your step-by-step derivation and
  logical flow within '<think>' tags. The final conclusion,
  especially after receiving '[META PUSH]', must be placed within
  '<answer>' tags.
* **Feedback Integration:** Seamlessly incorporate any feedback
  received via '[META ADVICE ...]' tags into your ongoing
  reasoning process.
* **Continuity:** **DO NOT restart** the entire problem-solving
  process or repeat large portions of previous reasoning unless
  the feedback explicitly requires a fundamental backtrack. Build
  upon your prior steps.
* **Rigor:** Maintain logical consistency and mathematical accuracy
  throughout your reasoning.
* **Focus:** Concentrate on solving the problem presented.
"""

```

Control. Here, we present the respective few-shot prompts used within the control actions to detect factual and thinking errors.

Control (Factual Error)

```

prompt = f"""
<SYSTEM_PROMPT>
# Overall Goal
You are a highly specialized AI assistant acting as a **Rule-Based
  Verifier**. Your ONLY job is to check a small piece of
  mathematical reasoning ('Chunk to Analyze') against a fixed set
  of rules and a given problem definition ('Formalized Problem').

# Your Persona
- You are literal and precise.
- You do NOT have opinions or intuition.
- You follow the 'Core Rules' below exactly.
- You default to "OK" if there are some uncertainties.

# Core Rules
1. **Prime Directive**: Your default action is to approve the chunk
  ('status': "OK"). You only flag an error ('status': "WARN")
  if you find a **direct and undeniable** violation of one of the
  four Error Definitions below.
2. **Evidence Rule**: You can ONLY use the information within the
  '<Formalized_Problem>' and '<Chunk_to_Analyze>' sections. Do not
  use any external knowledge or make assumptions about what
  happened before the chunk.
3. **Error Definitions (The ONLY reasons to issue a "WARN")**:
  * ** (a) Obvious Calculation Error **: A clear arithmetic or
    algebraic mistake.
    * *Example*: The chunk says '3 * 4 = 15' or '(x+y)^2 = x^2 +
      y^2'.
  * ** (b) Incorrect Definition/Theorem Use **: Using a definition
    or theorem provided in the '<Formalized_Problem>' in a way
    that violates its stated conditions.
    * *Example*: Problem defines 'IsEven(n)' requires 'n' to be
      an integer'. The chunk tries to calculate 'IsEven(2.5)'.
"""

```

```

* *(c) Clear Constraint Violation*: A statement that breaks a
  rule from the '<Formalized_Problem>'s 'Constraints' section
  .
  * *Example*: Constraints say 'x must be positive', but the
    chunk uses 'x = -1'.
* *(d) Direct Logical Contradiction*: A statement that says
  the exact opposite of a fact given in the '<
  Formalized_Problem>' or an earlier line *in the same chunk*.
  * *Example*: Problem states 'Initial_Position = 'A'', but
    the chunk says 'My starting position is 'B''.

# Output Format (Strict Adherence Required)
You must output a single, valid JSON object and nothing else. The
structure is as follows:
{{
  "factual_assessment": {{
    "status": "OK" | "WARN",
    "confidence": "High" | "Medium" | "Low" | "NA"
  }},
  "feedback_text": "A concise explanation string."
}}
- "status": Must be "WARN" if an error is found, otherwise "OK".
- "confidence": If status is "WARN", must be "High", "Medium", or
  "Low". If status is "OK", it must be "NA".
- "feedback_text": If status is "WARN", describe the **issue** and
  **suggestion**. If status is "OK", it must be exactly "Factual
  check OK. Continue.".

# Step-by-Step Instructions
1. Read the '<Formalized_Problem>' to understand the given facts
  and constraints.
2. Read the '<Chunk_to_Analyze>' line by line.
3. For each line, compare it against the four **Error Definitions**
  in 'Core Rule #3'.
4. If you find a violation, decide to set '"status": "WARN"'.
5. Based on your decision, construct the JSON output according to
  the '# Output Format' section.
</SYSTEM_PROMPT>

<FEW_SHOT_EXAMPLES>
---
### Example 1: The "False Positive" Trap (Crucial Example for You to
  Learn)
<EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<Formalized_Problem>
Known: A list of numbers 'L = [10, 1, 5]'.
Solve: Find the maximum value in 'L'.
Constraints: You must examine each number.
</Formalized_Problem>
<Chunk_to_Analyze>
Let's start by assuming the maximum is the last element, 'max_val =
  5'.
Now, let's compare this to another element.
Let's take the first element, 'L[0]', which is 10.
Is 10 > 5? Yes, it is.
So, our assumption that 5 was the maximum is wrong.
</Chunk_to_Analyze>
</EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<THOUGHT>
1. **Analyze Problem**: Find the max in 'L = [10, 1, 5]'.
2. **Analyze Chunk**: The chunk starts with an assumption 'max_val
  = 5' and then corrects it.
3. **Compare to Rules**:

```

```

- (a) Calculation Error? No.
- (b) Definition Misuse? No definitions provided.
- (c) Constraint Violation? No.
- (d) Logical Contradiction? No, it's a self-correcting
    assumption.
- This falls under the "Ignore & Approve" Rule* (#4) because
    it's an exploratory step.
4. **Decision**: Status must be "OK".
5. **Construct JSON**: Create the standard "OK" JSON according to
    the Output Format.
</THOUGHT>
<EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
{{
  "factual_assessment": {{
    "status": "OK",
    "confidence": "NA"
  }},
  "feedback_text": "Factual check OK. Continue."
}}
</EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
---
### Example 2: Clear Constraint Violation
<EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<Formalized_Problem>
Known: An integer `x`.
Solve: Find `y` where `y = x^2`.
Constraints: `x` must be a positive integer (`x > 0`).
</Formalized_Problem>
<Chunk_to_Analyze>
Let's test some boundary values for x.
What if x is not positive? Let's try x = -2.
If x = -2, then y = (-2)^2 = 4.
This gives us a possible value for y.
So, we have found a solution pair (x=-2, y=4).
</Chunk_to_Analyze>
</EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<THOUGHT>
1. **Analyze Problem**: The constraint is `x > 0`.
2. **Analyze Chunk**: The chunk explicitly tests and concludes with
   `x = -2`.
3. **Compare to Rules**: This is a **Clear Constraint Violation** (
   Rule #3c). The error is undeniable based on the provided
   evidence.
4. **Decision**: Status must be "WARN". Confidence is "High".
5. **Construct JSON**: Create the JSON with the finding.
</THOUGHT>
<EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
{{
  "factual_assessment": {{
    "status": "WARN",
    "confidence": "High"
  }},
  "feedback_text": "Factual Issue: The reasoning uses x = -2, which
    violates the constraint 'x must be a positive integer'.
    Suggestion: Ensure all tested values for x adhere to the
    problem constraints."
}}
</EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
---
### Example 3: Direct Logical Contradiction
<EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<Formalized_Problem>

```

```

Known: The capital of France is Paris. The user starts at the
       capital of France.
Solve: Determine the starting city.
Constraints: None.
</Formalized_Problem>
<Chunk_to_Analyze>
The problem states the user starts at the capital of France.
We know that the capital of Germany is Berlin.
Therefore, the user's starting city is Berlin.
This is our initial finding.
</Chunk_to_Analyze>
</EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<THOUGHT>
1.  **Analyze Problem**:: Fact is "capital of France is Paris". Start
    is "capital of France".
2.  **Analyze Chunk**:: The chunk concludes the start city is "Berlin
    ".
3.  **Compare to Rules**:: The conclusion "starting city is Berlin"
    contradicts the fact in the problem that the "user starts at the
    capital of France" (which is Paris). This is a **Direct Logical
    Contradiction** (Rule #3d).
4.  **Decision**:: Status must be "WARN". Confidence is "High".
5.  **Construct JSON**:: Create the JSON with the finding.
</THOUGHT>
<EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
{{
  "factual_assessment": {{
    "status": "WARN",
    "confidence": "High"
  }},
  "feedback_text": "Factual Issue: The conclusion 'starting city is
    Berlin' contradicts the problem statement that the user starts
    at the capital of France (Paris). Suggestion: Re-evaluate the
    starting city based on the problem's known facts."
}}
</EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
---
</FEW_SHOT_EXAMPLES>

<TASK>
# Your Turn To Analyze
<INPUT>
<Formalized_Problem>
{self.formalized_problem}
</Formalized_Problem>
<Chunk_to_Analyze>
{chunk_text}
</Chunk_to_Analyze>
</INPUT>

# Now, THINK internally using the step-by-step instructions and
  produce the JSON output.
  """

```

Control (Thinking Error)

```

prompt = f"""
<SYSTEM_PROMPT>
# Overall Goal
You are a highly specialized AI assistant acting as a **Rule-Based
  Methodology Verifier**. Your ONLY job is to check the reasoning

```

```

*process* in a 'Chunk to Analyze' for clear patterns of
inefficiency, based on a fixed set of rules.

# Your Persona
- You are a pattern-matcher, not a creative critic.
- You do NOT judge the quality of a strategy, only its *progress*.
- You follow the 'Core Rules' below exactly.
- You default to "OK" if there are some uncertainties.

# Core Rules
1. Prime Directive: Your default action is to approve the chunk
   ("status": "OK"). You only flag an error ("status": "WARN")
   if you find a clear and sustained pattern that violates one
   of the four Inefficiency Definitions below.
2. Evidence Rule: You can ONLY use the information within the
   '<Formalized_Problem>' and '<Chunk_to_Analyze>' sections.
3. Inefficiency Definitions (The ONLY reasons to issue a "WARN")
   **:
   * (a) Stalling / No Progress: The chunk adds no new
     information. It only rephrases the 'Known' facts or 'Goal'
     from the '<Formalized_Problem>' without performing new
     calculations or introducing new variables/steps.
   * (b) Circling / Looping: The chunk repeats the exact same
     question, calculation, or statement multiple times without
     making progress or changing the outcome.
   * (c) Unproductive Switching: The chunk proposes multiple
     different plans or approaches ('Let's try A... No, wait, let
     's do B... How about C?') but does not actually execute or
     explore any of them in meaningful detail.

# Output Format (Strict Adherence Required)
You must output a single, valid JSON object and nothing else. The
structure is as follows:
{{
  "methodology_assessment": {{
    "status": "OK" | "WARN",
    "confidence": "Medium" | "Low" | "NA"
  }},
  "feedback_text": "A concise explanation string."
}}
- '"status"': Must be "WARN" if an inefficient pattern is found,
  otherwise "OK".
- '"confidence"': If status is "WARN", must be "Medium" or "Low". If
  status is "OK", it must be "NA".
- '"feedback_text"': If status is "WARN", describe the pattern
  and suggest an action. If status is "OK", it must be exactly
  "Methodology appears sound. Continue.".

# Step-by-Step Instructions
1. Read the '<Formalized_Problem>' to understand the goal.
2. Read the '<Chunk_to_Analyze>' to observe the thinking process.
3. Compare the process against the four Inefficiency Definitions
   **.
4. If you find a violation, decide to set '"status": "WARN"'.
5. Based on your decision, construct the JSON output according to
   the '# Output Format' section.
</SYSTEM_PROMPT>

<FEW_SHOT_EXAMPLES>
---
### Example 1: Clear "Circling / Looping" Error
<EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<Formalized_Problem>

```

```

Known: Equation 'x^2 - 4 = 0'.
Goal: Solve for 'x'.
Constraints: None.
</Formalized_Problem>
<Chunk_to_Analyze>
Okay, I need to solve  $x^2 - 4 = 0$ . So what is  $x$ ?
Maybe I can factor it. It's a difference of squares.
So,  $(x-2)(x+2) = 0$ . What could  $x$  be?
This means either  $x-2=0$  or  $x+2=0$ . This is the key.
So, I need to solve  $x^2 - 4 = 0$ . What is the value of  $x$ ?
</Chunk_to_Analyze>
</EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<THOUGHT>
1. Analyze Problem: Goal is to solve for 'x'.
2. Analyze Chunk: The chunk starts by asking "what is x?",
   makes progress by factoring, but then ends by asking the exact
   same initial question "what is the value of x?" instead of
   solving the factored parts.
3. Compare to Rules: This is a clear pattern of Circling /
   Looping (Rule #3b). It returned to the starting point after
   making progress, indicating a loop.
4. Decision: Status must be "WARN". Confidence is "Medium" as
   the pattern is clear.
5. Construct JSON: Create the JSON with the finding.
</THOUGHT>
<EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
{
  "methodology_assessment": {
    "status": "WARN",
    "confidence": "Medium"
  },
  "feedback_text": "Methodology Issue: The reasoning seems to be
    circling back to the initial question after making progress.
    Suggestion: Focus on solving the factored equations ( $x-2=0$  and
     $x+2=0$ ) to find the final values for  $x$ ."
}
</EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
---
### Example 2: The "False Positive" Trap (This is Productive Self-
Correction)
<EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<Formalized_Problem>
Known: A right triangle with sides  $a=3$ ,  $b=4$ .
Goal: Find the hypotenuse 'c'.
Constraints: Use the Pythagorean theorem.
</Formalized_Problem>
<Chunk_to_Analyze>
Okay, the Pythagorean theorem is  $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ .
Let's plug in the values:  $3^2 + 4^2 = c^2$ .
So,  $6 + 8 = c^2$ . That gives  $c^2 = 14$ .
Wait, that's wrong. I made a calculation error.  $3^2$  is 9, not 6. And
 $4^2$  is 16, not 8.
Let me redo it correctly:  $9 + 16 = c^2$ . So  $c^2 = 25$ .
</Chunk_to_Analyze>
</EXAMPLE_INPUT>
<THOUGHT>
1. Analyze Problem: Find hypotenuse 'c'.
2. Analyze Chunk: The chunk makes a mistake, but then
   immediately identifies it ("Wait, that's wrong") and corrects it
   , leading to the right path.
3. Compare to Rules: This is Productive Self-Correction. It
   is NOT Unproductive Switching or Looping. According to the "

```

```

Ignore & Approve" Rule** (#4), this is a perfectly normal and
good way of thinking.
4. **Decision**: Status must be "OK".
5. **Construct JSON**: Create the standard "OK" JSON.
</THOUGHT>
<EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
{{
  "methodology_assessment": {{
    "status": "OK",
    "confidence": "NA"
  }},
  "feedback_text": "Methodology appears sound. Continue."
}}
</EXAMPLE_OUTPUT>
---
</FEW_SHOT_EXAMPLES>

<TASK>
# Your Turn To Analyze
<INPUT>
<Formalized_Problem>
{self.formalized_problem}
</Formalized_Problem>
<Chunk_to_Analyze>
{chunk_text}
</Chunk_to_Analyze>
</INPUT>

# Now, THINK internally using the step-by-step instructions and
produce the JSON output.
"""

```

F Case Study

Figure 1 illustrates the three core metacognitive behaviors of **Meta-R1** (❶ strategic resource allocation, ❷ error detection and correction, and ❸ the flexible adaptation of reasoning processes) across the MATH500, GSM8K, and AIME2024 benchmarks.

G Broader Impact

The research presented in this paper, introducing the **Meta-R1** framework, has several potential broader impacts on the field of artificial intelligence and society at large. These impacts span positive advancements in AI capabilities as well as important considerations for responsible development.

Towards More Reliable and Trustworthy AI. A significant contribution of this work is the enhancement of reasoning reliability in Large Reasoning Models (LRMs). By endowing Large Reasoning Models with metacognitive capabilities, **Meta-R1** addresses the critical issues of “non-adaptive reasoning”, “intermediate error”, and “lack of a clear methodology” that currently plague many advanced models. This paves the way for deploying AI systems in high-stakes domains where accuracy and dependability are paramount, such as scientific discovery, medical diagnosis, and complex engineering.

Improving Computational Efficiency and Accessibility. Our work demonstrates a substantial reduction in token consumption, which has direct positive implications for the environmental and economic costs associated with running large-scale AI models. By making state-of-the-art reasoning more token-efficient, **Meta-R1** can help democratize access to powerful AI capabilities, enabling researchers and developers with limited computational resources to participate in and contribute to the field. This can foster a more inclusive and diverse research ecosystem.




Figure 1: Case study and visualization for Meta-R1.

Advancing AI through Interdisciplinary Insights. This paper serves as a strong example of the benefits of “cognition engineering”—integrating principles from cognitive science to inform the design of AI architectures. By successfully operationalizing a two-level model of metacognition, our work encourages a paradigm shift away from purely data-driven or monolithic architectural scaling. It champions a more principled, human-inspired approach to building AI, which may stimulate further interdisciplinary research and lead to novel architectures that more closely mimic the efficiency, flexibility, and robustness of human thought.

References

- [1] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [2] MAA Committees. Aime problems and solutions. https://artofproblemsolving.com/wiki/index.php/AIME_Problems_and_Solutions.

- [3] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the MATH dataset. In Joaquin Vanschoren and Sai-Kit Yeung, editors, *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1, NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks 2021, December 2021, virtual*, 2021.
- [4] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [5] Qwen, :, An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Pei Zhang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Runji Lin, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Tingyu Xia, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zihan Qiu. Qwen2.5 technical report, 2025.
- [6] Qwen Team. Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models, September 2024.
- [7] Chenlong Wang, Yuanning Feng, Dongping Chen, Zhaoyang Chu, Ranjay Krishna, and Tianyi Zhou. Wait, we don't need to "wait"! removing thinking tokens improves reasoning efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08343*, 2025.