

DOoM: Difficult Olympiads of Math

Ilya Kuleshov
HSE University
kul757.48@mail.ru

Ilin Pavel
ITMO
ilinpashtet@yandex.ru

Nikolay Kompanets
Vikhr Models
lakomoor@gmail.com

Ksenia Sycheva
Vikhr Models
KS9270022@gmail.com

Aleksandr Nikolich
Vikhr Models
alex.n@whitecircle.ai

Abstract

This paper introduces DOoM, a new open-source benchmark designed to assess the capabilities of language models in solving mathematics and physics problems in Russian. The benchmark includes problems of varying difficulty, ranging from school-level tasks to university Olympiad and entrance exam questions. In this paper we discuss the motivation behind its creation, describe dataset’s structure and evaluation methodology, and present initial results from testing various models. Analysis of the results shows a correlation between model performance and the number of tokens used, and highlights differences in performance between mathematics and physics tasks.

1 Introduction

With the rise of language models’ reasoning abilities, interest in using them to solve complex problems has increased within the development community. This motivated development of various benchmarks designed to assess models’ abilities to perform multi-step reasoning in specific domains, like math, physics, or coding. Despite the availability of English-language benchmarks for mathematics (Cobbe et al., 2021; Chernyshev et al., 2025; Wu et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2024) and physics (Xu et al., 2025; Feng et al., 2025; Shen et al., 2025), there are virtually no open, modern counterparts for the Russian language.

In this work, we present a new Russian-language benchmark, **DOoM** (Difficult olympiads of math), which incorporates mathematics and physics problems collected from a variety of sources. The tasks in DOoM span a wide range of difficulty levels, starting from high school exam problems and extending to university-level and olympiad-style tasks. We begin by providing an overview of related work and the motivation behind creating DOoM in Section 2. In Section 3, we describe DOoM and its collection process in detail.

2 Related Work

2.1 Math and Physics Benchmarks

Many benchmarks have been designed to assess models’ abilities to perform multi-step reasoning. MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021) tests models’ knowledge with multiple-choice questions across 57 diverse subjects, including abstract algebra, high-school level mathematics, and physics, making it a strong general-purpose benchmark for evaluating factual recall and reasoning across domains. ARC (Clark et al., 2018) on the other hand, presents tasks that require more abstract and commonsense reasoning. It consists of grade school science questions that often involve multi-step inference and the application of basic knowledge to novel scenarios. In contrast to MMLU and ARC, many works have focused specifically on mathematical and physical reasoning, aiming to capture domain-specific multi-step problem-solving abilities in greater depth.

Math. One of the most popular math benchmarks is GSM8k (Cobbe et al., 2021), which consists of 8.5K school-level math word problems. These problems typically require performing basic arithmetic operations, finding the greatest common divisor, or solving systems of linear equations. Solving such problems requires models to demonstrate multi-step reasoning and numerical understanding. However, GSM8k does not evaluate a model’s grasp of more advanced mathematical concepts. Several works attempted to cover this gap. Gao et al. (2024) collected a benchmark that focuses on mathematical olympiad-level tasks exclusively, crawling problems and solutions from sources such as the IMO, IMC, and AoPS online forum, which often includes detailed human-written solutions. Wu et al. (2024) introduced a bilingual dataset with math problems aimed at evaluating models’ understanding of

a wide range of mathematical concepts. Their benchmark is organized hierarchically, enabling fine-grained evaluation at the level of individual concepts. Recently [Chernyshev et al. \(2025\)](#) published a benchmark consisting of 1100 university-level math problems. All these works demonstrate that models achieving high scores on GSM8k struggle with these more complex tasks, indicating a significant gap in current models’ mathematical reasoning capabilities when it comes to challenging, expert-level problems.

Physics. Models have been evaluated in the physics domain less extensively than in mathematics so far. [Xu et al. \(2025\)](#) designed a benchmark to evaluate models on undergraduate-level physics problems. [Zhang et al. \(2025\)](#) collected tasks that involve, on average, eight steps of reasoning per solution and require multi-modal comprehension, such as interpreting diagrams, graphs, and symbolic equations. [Shen et al. \(2025\)](#) also focus on multi-modal reasoning, organizing their benchmark around six core areas of physics to assess models’ ability to integrate visual and textual information in complex problem-solving settings. State-of-the-art models such as GPT-4o ([OpenAI, 2024](#)), GPT-4o-mini ([OpenAI, 2025a](#)), and Claude 3.7 Sonnet ([Anthropic, 2025](#)) still struggle with these physics benchmarks, highlighting the difficulty of multi-step, multi-modal reasoning in this domain.

2.2 Russian Reasoning Benchmarks

Reasoning benchmarks have also emerged for the Russian language specifically. One of the first works in this direction is RussianSuperGLUE ([Shavrina et al., 2020](#)), which consists of nine datasets covering various natural language understanding tasks. Some works have focused on more specific properties. ruArenaHard is an adaptation of Arena-Hard ([Li et al., 2024](#)) to Russian, evaluating models’ instruction-following abilities. Another benchmark, Shlepa, is designed to assess knowledge of Russian cultural context, including laws, popular music, books, and films. Both benchmarks have found widespread use among model providers.

[Nefedov \(2020\)](#) translated the synthetically generated DeepMind Mathematics Dataset into Russian, while [Khrulev \(2025\)](#) created an evaluation suite for assessing models on handwritten solutions to Russian-language math problems. [Zhang et al. \(2025\)](#) also included approximately 20K physics

problems in Russian in their benchmark. However, overall evaluation of multi-step reasoning capabilities of language models in Russian—particularly in mathematics and physics—remains even more limited than in English. In this work, we aim to help bridge this gap.

3 DOoM Benchmark

The DOoM benchmark consists of two datasets covering distinct knowledge domains - mathematics (62.1%) and physics (37.9%) - which we refer to as **RussianMath** and **RussianPhysics**, respectively. The problems span a wide range of topics and difficulty levels, from high school exams to university coursework and olympiad-level challenges. We begin by describing the data collection process in Section 3.1, followed by detailed descriptions of the mathematics and physics datasets in Section 3.2 and Section 3.3, respectively.

3.1 Data Collection

One challenge in collecting tasks is the need for verifiable solutions. Initially, we attempted to parse the problem book by Demidovich ([Demidovich, 1970](#)), which contains a large number of exercises in mathematical analysis. However, this idea was ultimately abandoned due to the lack of verifiable solutions, making [Demidovich \(1970\)](#) and similar books an impractical source for benchmark construction. Instead, we relied on Russian school textbooks and archives of school and university-level olympiads, which often include either official solutions or community-verified answers. Tables 1 and 2 list all data sources and the percentage of tasks from each of them included in DOoM.

3.2 Mathematics Section

The RussianMath dataset spans a wide range of mathematical topics, including combinatorics, algebraic and geometric progressions, and equations involving complex numbers. More advanced examples, drawn from entrance exams to leading universities, may require proving properties of intersecting parabolas given their focal parameters and positions of their focal points—tasks that demand a deep understanding of conic sections and coordinate geometry. Examples translated from Russian into English are shown in Figure 1.

3.3 Physics Section

The RussianPhysics primarily consists of problems from various stages of the All-Russian Olympiad

<p>Vasya thought of a two-digit number. Then he added the digit 1 to the left of it and the digit 8 to the right, and the resulting number turned out to be 28 times greater than the original. What number could Vasya have thought of? (Find all possible values and prove that there are no others.)</p>	<p>For real numbers a, b, c it is known that $abc + a + b + c = 10$, $ab + ac + bc = 9$ For which real numbers x can one assert that at least one of a, b, c equals x? (Find all such x and prove there are no others.)</p>	<p>Find the sum of all roots of the equation $x^2 - 31x + 220 = 2^x(31 - 2x - 2^x)$</p>
<p>Let the original number be n. Appending the digit 8 to the right gives $10n + 8$. Then, appending the digit 1 to the left increases it by another 1000, so the result is $10n + 1008 = 28n$ $18n = 1008$ $n = 56$</p>	<p>Subtract the second given equation from the first and refactor: $(a - 1)(b - 1)(c - 1) = 0$ Hence at least one of a, b, c equals 1. Therefore $x = 1$ is a solution. No other solutions exist, because triples $(4, 1, 1)$ and $(0, 9, 1)$ satisfy conditions.</p>	<p>Rearrange the equation: $x^2 - 31x + 220 + 2^x(-31 + 2x + 2^x) = 0$ This factors as a quadratic in the combination $x + 2^x$: $(x + 2^x)^2 - 31(x + 2^x) + 220 = 0$ Hence $x + 2^x$ is 11 or 20. The function $f(x) = x + 2^x$ is strictly increasing, so each equation has one root - 3 and 4.</p>
<p>Answer 56</p>	<p>Answer 1</p>	<p>Answer 7</p>

Figure 1: Examples of mathematics problems from the DOoM dataset, arranged in order of increasing difficulty from left to right: left — Grade 8 school problem; middle — HSE Olympiad, Grade 10; right — MSU Olympiad, Grade 11. All examples are translated from Russian.

Math Source	% of DOoM
School Level Olympiad	47.7%
Regional Olympiads	6.5%
MSU Entrance Problems	4.5%
MIPT Olympiads	10.1%
HSE Olympiads	10.1%
Joint Interuniversity Olympiad	19.1%
All-Russian Olympiad	2.0%

Table 1: Math sources in DOoM. Nearly half of the math problems are sourced from school textbooks and state exam archives. The rest are drawn from regional olympiads and olympiads for school students hosted by major Russian universities.

for school children and covers various physics domains, including mechanics, kinematics, and thermodynamics.

4 Evaluation Results

Initial testing of several models on the DOoM benchmark has revealed interesting trends. We start by describing evaluation methodology and then discuss our findings.

4.1 Evaluation Methodology

Answer Processing. For each task, the model-generated answer is compared against a known

Physics Source	% of DOoM
School Level Olympiad	88.2%
Regional Olympiads	0.9%
1st Stage Olympiads	0.9%
All-Russian Olympiad	10.0%

Table 2: Physics sources in DOoM. The majority of physics problems are taken from school curricula and state exams. More advanced questions come from various stages of the Russian Physics Olympiad.

reference solution. Since answers can be expressed in different formats, we first attempt to compare them as fractions, then as natural numbers, and finally - if both checks fail - by evaluating parsed LaTeX/Python expressions for equivalence.

Scoring. After processing, each answer is assigned a binary score: 1 if it matches the reference, and 0 otherwise. The RussianMath and RussianPhysics scores are computed as the average of binary scores across all tasks in their respective datasets. The final score is the mean of the math and physics scores.

4.2 Overall Model Performance

To evaluate the overall capabilities of modern models in mathematical and physical reasoning, we assessed several families of API-based (OpenAI,

Table 3: Performance of different models on Russian Math and Physics tasks. We report scores for each subject separately as well as the overall average, and provide the total number of tokens generated by each model (including reasoning tokens). Within each model family, the best scores are highlighted in **bold**. The results reveal two notable patterns: (1) all evaluated models perform better on math than on physics, and (2) models that generate more tokens tend to achieve higher scores.

Model Name	Math Score	Physics Score	Overall Score	# Tokens
Gemini 2.0 Flash	0.558	0.469	0.514	495,313
Gemini 2.5 Pro	0.874	0.582	0.728	2,227,721
OpenAI GPT-4o	0.432	0.245	0.338	399,483
OpenAI GPT-4.1	0.584	0.347	0.466	549,983
OpenAI GPT-OSS 20B	0.789	0.377	0.583	1,034,077
OpenAI GPT-5-mini	0.849	0.418	0.634	993,326
OpenAI GPT-5-nano	0.839	0.459	0.649	2,218,450
OpenAI o4-mini (high reasoning)	0.868	0.459	0.664	1,997,548
OpenAI o3 (base)	0.868	0.469	0.669	1,164,000
OpenAI GPT-OSS 120B	0.849	0.500	0.675	671,703
OpenAI o3-mini (high reasoning)	0.884	0.500	0.692	2,186,756
OpenAI GPT-5	0.910	0.500	0.705	1,374,085
Claude 3.5 Sonnet	0.416	0.337	0.376	252,843
Claude 3.7 Sonnet	0.542	0.398	0.470	405,583
Claude Sonnet 4	0.633	0.469	0.551	490,996
Gemma 3 4B	0.258	0.102	0.180	726,285
Gemma 3 27B	0.474	0.327	0.400	384,164
Qwen2.5 72B Instruct	0.379	0.000	0.189	322,441
Qwen3 8B	0.538	0.296	0.417	1,576,445
Qwen QwQ 32B	0.653	0.408	0.530	2,112,951
DeepSeek V3-0324	0.432	0.255	0.343	339,857
DeepSeek-R1 Distill (Qwen-14B)	0.447	0.245	0.346	806,258
GigaChat 2	0.095	0.071	0.083	136,051
GigaChat Max	0.189	0.173	0.181	200,271
GigaChat 2 Pro	0.316	0.224	0.270	215,297
GigaChat 2 Max	0.363	0.265	0.314	185,204

2024, 2025b,a; Anthropic, 2024) and open-source models (Yang et al., 2025b,a) on the DOoM benchmark. The results, reported in Table 3, expose a significant performance gap, with all models outperforming in mathematics over physics. The highest overall score was achieved by Gemini 2.5 Pro, with 0.874 in math and 0.582 in physics. We hypothesize that this performance gap can be attributed to two primary factors: (1) the inherent complexity of physics problems, which require models to construct a qualitative mental model of a physical situation, apply relevant common-sense knowledge (e.g., friction, forces, or energy), and then select the appropriate mathematical formalism; and (2)

the nature of large language models’ training data, which is scraped from internet-scale sources that are inherently biased towards formal mathematics (e.g., code, proofs, equations) available in structured formats, thus providing less robust training for physics reasoning.

4.3 Analysis of Token Usage

In addition to reporting scores, we also measured the total number of tokens generated during evaluation (Table 3). As shown in Figure 2, there is a clear positive correlation between the number of tokens and performance, with correlation coefficients of 0.79 for math and 0.60 for physics. When allowed to generate freely without limiting the number of




Figure 2: Correlation between number of generated tokens and benchmark performance. The strong positive relationship (Pearson’s $r = 0.707$, $p < 0.001$) indicates that more extensive reasoning is a critical factor for success.

tokens, models producing more tokens (around two million) consistently achieve higher scores. Notably, the number of tokens varies substantially across models, ranging from 100,000 to 2,000,000.

4.4 Analysis of Processing Speed

Unlike the clear relationship with token count, the connection between processing speed and performance is less straightforward. We observe a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.50$); however, this trend is not universal. The results reveal notable outliers, including high-accuracy models with comparatively slow processing speeds and vice versa, indicating that raw inference speed alone is not a reliable predictor of overall capability.

5 Conclusion

This paper has introduced the D0oM benchmark, a comprehensive open-source tool for assessing the capabilities of language models in solving mathematics and physics problems in Russian. By providing a structured dataset of problems ranging from school-level to Olympiad difficulty, D0oM addresses a pronounced lack of resources for evaluating reasoning skills in the Russian language.

Our initial evaluation of various models reveals two key insights: a strong correlation between performance and the volume of tokens generated during reasoning, and a significant performance gap




Figure 3: Correlation between inference speed (tokens/second) and performance. The moderate positive relationship ($r = 0.531$) suggests a trade-off between reasoning thoroughness and computational efficiency.

between mathematics and physics tasks, suggesting the latter presents a uniquely complex challenge.

We offer D0oM to the global AI research community as a foundation for future work. We anticipate expanding the benchmark’s scope and complexity and welcome collaborative efforts to ensure it remains a robust and evolving standard for evaluating reasoning capabilities.

References

Anthropic. 2024. Introducing claude 3.5 sonnet. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>.

Anthropic. 2025. Claude 3.7 sonnet and claude code. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-7-sonnet>.

Konstantin Chernyshev, Vitaliy Polshkov, Ekaterina Artemova, Alex Myasnikov, Vlad Stepanov, Alexei Miasnikov, and Sergei Tilga. 2025. *U-math: A university-level benchmark for evaluating mathematical skills in llms*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.03205.

Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. *Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge*. *Preprint*, arXiv:1803.05457.

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. 2021. [Training verifiers to solve math word problems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.14168.
- B. P. Demidovich. 1970. *Problems in Mathematical Analysis*. Mir Titles, Moscow. Translated from Russian.
- Kaiyue Feng, Yilun Zhao, Yixin Liu, Tianyu Yang, Chen Zhao, John Sous, and Arman Cohan. 2025. [Physics: Benchmarking foundation models on university-level physics problem solving](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.21821.
- Bofei Gao, Feifan Song, Zhe Yang, Zefan Cai, Yibo Miao, Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Chenghao Ma, Liang Chen, Runxin Xu, Zhengyang Tang, Benyou Wang, Daoguang Zan, Shanghaoran Quan, Ge Zhang, Lei Sha, Yichang Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Tianyu Liu, and Baobao Chang. 2024. [Omni-math: A universal olympiad level mathematic benchmark for large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.07985.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2009.03300.
- Ruslan Khrulev. 2025. [Check-mat: Checking handwritten mathematical answers for the russian unified state exam](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2507.22958.
- Tianle Li, Wei-Lin Chiang, Evan Frick, Lisa Dunlap, Tianhao Wu, Banghua Zhu, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2024. From crowdsourced data to high-quality benchmarks: Arena-hard and benchbuilder pipeline. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11939*.
- Mikhail Nefedov. 2020. *Dataset for Evaluation of Mathematical Reasoning Abilities in Russian*, pages 135–144.
- OpenAI. 2024. [Gpt-4o system card](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.21276.
- OpenAI. 2025a. [Introducing openai o3 and o4-mini](#). <https://openai.com/index/introducing-o3-and-o4-mini/>.
- OpenAI. 2025b. [Openai o3-mini: Pushing the frontier of cost-effective reasoning](#). <https://openai.com/index/openai-o3-mini/>.
- Tatiana Shavrina, Alena Fenogenova, Emelyanov Anton, Denis Shevelev, Ekaterina Artemova, Valentin Mal'kh, Vladislav Mikhailov, Maria Tikhonova, Andrey Chertok, and Andrey Evlampiev. 2020. [Russiansu-perglue: A russian language understanding evaluation benchmark](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hui Shen, Taiqiang Wu, Qi Han, Yunta Hsieh, Jizhou Wang, Yuyue Zhang, Yuxin Cheng, Zijian Hao, Yuan-sheng Ni, Xin Wang, Zhongwei Wan, Kai Zhang, Wendong Xu, Jing Xiong, Ping Luo, Wenhui Chen, Chaofan Tao, Zhuoqing Mao, and Ngai Wong. 2025. [Phyx: Does your model have the "wits" for physical reasoning?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.15929.
- Yanan Wu, Jie Liu, Xingyuan Bu, Jiaheng Liu, Zhanhui Zhou, Yuanxing Zhang, Chenchen Zhang, Zhiqi Bai, Haibin Chen, Tiezheng Ge, Wanli Ouyang, Wenbo Su, and Bo Zheng. 2024. [Conceptmath: A bilingual concept-wise benchmark for measuring mathematical reasoning of large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.14660.
- Xin Xu, Qiyun Xu, Tong Xiao, Tianhao Chen, Yuchen Yan, Jiabin Zhang, Shizhe Diao, Can Yang, and Yang Wang. 2025. [Ugphysics: A comprehensive benchmark for undergraduate physics reasoning with large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.00334.
- An Yang, Anpeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, Chujie Zheng, Dayiheng Liu, Fan Zhou, Fei Huang, Feng Hu, Hao Ge, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jing Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Lianghao Deng, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Mingze Li, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Shixuan Liu, Shuang Luo, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Wenbiao Yin, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Wang, Xinyu Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yinger Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zekun Wang, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhipeng Zhou, and Zihan Qiu. 2025a. [Qwen3 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.09388.
- 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. 2025b. [Qwen2.5 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.15115.
- Xinyu Zhang, Yuxuan Dong, Yanrui Wu, Jiaying Huang, Chengyou Jia, Basura Fernando, Mike Zheng Shou, Lingling Zhang, and Jun Liu. 2025. [Physreason: A comprehensive benchmark towards physics-based reasoning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.12054.