

REST-RL: ACHIEVING ACCURATE CODE REASONING OF LLMs WITH OPTIMIZED SELF-TRAINING AND DECODING

Sining Zhou^{1*}, Dan Zhang¹, Yuxiao Dong¹, Jie Tang¹

¹The Knowledge Engineering Group (KEG), Tsinghua University

ABSTRACT

With respect to improving the reasoning accuracy of LLMs, the representative reinforcement learning (RL) method GRPO faces failure due to insignificant reward variance, while verification methods based on process reward models (PRMs) suffer from difficulties with training data acquisition and verification effectiveness. To tackle these problems, this paper introduces **ReST-RL**, a unified LLM RL paradigm that significantly improves LLM’s code reasoning ability by combining an improved GRPO algorithm with a meticulously designed test time decoding method assisted by a value model (VM). As the first stage of policy reinforcement, **ReST-GRPO** adopts an optimized ReST algorithm to filter and assemble high-value training data, increasing the reward variance of GRPO sampling, thus improving the effectiveness and efficiency of training. After the basic reasoning ability of LLM policy has been improved, we further propose a test time decoding optimization method called **VM-MCTS**. Through Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS), we collect accurate value targets with no annotation required, on which VM training is based. When decoding, the VM is deployed by an adapted MCTS algorithm to provide precise process signals as well as verification scores, assisting the LLM policy to achieve high reasoning accuracy. We validate the effectiveness of the proposed RL paradigm through extensive experiments on coding problems. Upon comparison, our approach significantly outperforms other reinforcement training baselines (e.g., naive GRPO and ReST-DPO), as well as decoding and verification baselines (e.g., PRM-BoN and ORM-MCTS) on well-known coding benchmarks of various levels (e.g., APPS, BigCodeBench, and HumanEval), indicating its power to strengthen the reasoning ability of LLM policies. Overall, our work demonstrates that even with very limited data, we can still mine the value within it through well-designed training and decoding mechanisms, attaining significant improvement in LLM’s reasoning capabilities while balancing efficiency, cost and generalizability. Codes for our project can be found at <https://github.com/THUDM/ReST-RL>.

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, although Large Language Models (LLMs) have made remarkable advances in reasoning tasks [1; 2], they still face challenges when solving complex ones [3; 4]. With more evidence that reinforcement learning (RL) can further improve the reasoning ability of LLMs [5; 6], developing RL algorithms for LLMs has become a research priority [7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12]. Among these proposed algorithms, some use online RL where data sampling and model updating take place simultaneously [7; 9; 10], which is represented by Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) [10]. While other algorithms suggest obtaining training data through offline sampling and filtering mechanisms [8; 11; 12]—a paradigm often termed self-training—this approach is represented by Reinforced Self-Training (ReST) [8; 12]. Though having different training mechanisms, both paths have been shown to be effective in improving the reasoning abilities of LLMs. In addition, the reward models (RMs) are gradually attracting more attention due to their function in output verification. It has been demonstrated that the reasoning accuracy of LLMs can be improved by an outcome reward model (ORM) that verifies the final output of LLMs [13; 14]. More recently, various process

*Work done when interned at Z.ai.

reward models (PRMs) that provide feedback for intermediate steps have been proposed, indicating better verification accuracies than ORMs [14; 6; 15; 12]. There are also methods that deploy RMs in combination with special decoding algorithms, such as Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS), which helps them achieve further enhancements [12; 16].

However, there are still some shortcomings in these methods. On one hand, online RL algorithms represented by GRPO often lead to *unsatisfactory training results due to insignificant differences in reward signals* [17; 18]. Although some approaches attempt to mitigate this problem through specially designed step-wise rewards or simple dynamic sampling [17; 18], they lead to higher training computation costs and insufficient generalizability, also increasing the complexity of the RL algorithm. On the other hand, although PRMs can validate the output of LLMs more accurately than ORMs, they often require *high quality annotated data* [14; 6]. Considering that data annotation can be very expensive, the scaling up of PRM training data encounters difficulties, limiting the accuracy and reliability of PRMs. To tackle the problem, some methods propose to estimate and collect process rewards through Monte-Carlo simulations [6; 12]. Nevertheless, these methods fail to generalize to richer reasoning tasks such as coding, and their reliance on result matching mechanisms limits the scenarios in which they can be applied [12]. Overall, although current LLM reinforcement methods have been attempted in terms of online training and output verification, they cannot simultaneously guarantee *low data collection costs, decent generalization, satisfactory reinforcement results, and training efficiency*.

In this paper, we introduce ReST-RL, a unified LLM RL framework that can significantly improve LLM’s reasoning ability while balancing other factors. Our approach proposes to enhance LLMs through two stages, leveraging both an improved online RL algorithm and verified decoding, i.e., ReST-GRPO and VM-MCTS. As the first stage of LLM reinforcement, ReST-GRPO adopts an optimized ReST algorithm to filter and assemble high-value training data, increasing the reward variance of GRPO sampling, thus improving the effectiveness and efficiency of training. As the second stage of reinforcement, VM-MCTS optimizes test time decoding through an elaborately designed value model (VM) and MCTS. Estimated value targets are collected using MCTS and a reward function without any extra annotation, enabling training of the VM at low cost. When decoding, the VM is deployed by an adapted MCTS algorithm to provide precise process signals as well as verification scores, assisting the LLM to achieve high reasoning accuracy. We validate the effectiveness of the proposed RL paradigm and its components through extensive experiments on coding problems. Upon comparison, our approach significantly outperforms other reinforce training baselines such as naive GRPO and ReST-DPO, as well as decoding and verification baselines such as PRM-BoN and ORM-MCTS on well-known coding benchmarks of various levels such as APPS [3], BigCodeBench [4] and HumanEval [19]. We show that ReST-RL has the power to strengthen the reasoning ability of LLM policies while balancing other aspects such as efficiency, cost and generalizability.

To summarize, our contributions are:

- We propose ReST-RL, a LLM RL paradigm that enhances LLM’s reasoning ability by ReST-GRPO and VM-MCTS. The highlight of the method is that it combines the advantages of offline self-training, online learning algorithms, optimized decoding algorithms, and verification methods, achieving balanced efficiency, generalizability, cost, and effectiveness. We show that ReST-RL and its components outperform other reinforce training baselines (e.g., naive GRPO and ReST-DPO, in Table 1) and decoding and verification baselines (e.g., PRM-BoN and ORM-MCTS, in Table 2).
- By comparing the test performance under same training steps, we demonstrate that ReST-GRPO has higher training efficiency compared to naive GRPO and DAPO, as shown in Figure 3 (a).
- Given the same budget for decoding verification, VM-MCTS and its VM achieve better accuracy than previous Math-Shepherd style PRM or ORM trained on curated public data, as shown in Figure 3 (b).

2 RELATED WORK

LLMs for reasoning and code synthesis. Recent advancements have facilitated the growing application of LLMs to reasoning tasks like coding [20; 2; 21; 22] and math [1; 10]. To assist LLMs on code synthesis, previous approaches use test cases to provide reward signals [23]. However, though




Figure 1: Framework of ReST-RL.

demonstrating notable performance on elementary programming tasks, LLMs continue to struggle with complex ones, such as those found in competitive programming platforms like Codeforces [3].

Improving reasoning abilities of LLMs. Previous methods that attempt to enhance the reasoning abilities of LLM mainly divide into two paths: LLM training and optimized decoding. For the first path, aside from basic pretraining methods [1; 24], some suggest adopting supervised fine-tuning (SFT) with filtered web-source data [19] or self-generated data [11; 25]. To address the problem of insufficient data volume and expensive labeling, LLM self-training methods such as ReST have been proposed [8; 11; 12]. These methods use the LLM itself for data sampling, and after filtering these data are used for SFT. Alternatively, some approaches utilize reinforcement learning (RL) to achieve LLM enhancement through reward-based optimization algorithms [26; 27], represented by GRPO [10]. However, more recently, some researches have shown that GRPO may have problems in the effectiveness of its reward [18; 17]. As for the second path, prompting methods such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) are proved to be convenient and useful for decoding [28]. Tree search algorithms like Tree-of-Thought (ToT) [29] and Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) [12; 30; 31] are also proven to be effective when incorporated into the decoding process.

Output verification with reward models. Leveraging reward models, outputs of LLMs can be further verified, enabling selection of those that are more desirable and reliable. Existing reward models are divided into two main categories: (1) Outcome Reward Model (ORM) which provides an evaluation score for the entire output. (2) Process Reward Model (PRM) [14; 13] which evaluates intermediate steps or actions. Despite outperforming ORMs in many situations [14; 13], PRMs require more high-quality process training data. Since PRM data annotation is expensive, some approaches try to estimate rewards through Monte-Carlo simulation [6; 12], which makes it possible to scale up PRMs, but also faces higher noise within reward data [15]. Moreover, although PRMs obtained by such methods can provide process signals, the essence of these signals is more closely related to expected values than step-level rewards [15]. Therefore, a more appropriate designation for these RMs is Value Model (VM) rather than PRM, and we also use this designation in this paper.

3 METHOD

In order to unify RL algorithms and decoding methods for LLMs and to address the issues of training reward variance and PRM accuracy, we propose a new approach, i.e., ReST-RL. As a new RL paradigm, ReST-RL strengthens the ability of LLMs to solve difficult reasoning tasks. ReST-RL is composed of two main components, namely ReST-GRPO and VM-MCTS.

- **ReST-GRPO** is the first stage of learning, which adopts an optimized ReST algorithm to perform GRPO to enhance the policy’s capability on complex reasoning tasks.
- **VM-MCTS** is the second stage of reinforcement, which focuses on training and utilizing a value model (VM) that assists the policy in decoding phase during test.

3.1 TASK SETUP

For a specific reasoning task, there is generally an instruction or question, denoted as q , which describes the background information and problem details in text. There may exist a ground truth answer g . For coding tasks, there may also be some test cases $t_{1,2,\dots,m}$. Deploying a LLM policy known as π_θ , we can gradually generate solutions to the problem, following the predicted output token probabilities of the policy. This process can be regarded as a Markov Process, where the policy takes an action a_i step by step following $\pi_\theta(a_i|a_{1,2,\dots,i-1}, q)$, based on previously generated content a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{i-1} and the instruction q . Here, an action can represent a single token, a line of text, or even a reasoning step. Eventually, when the eos token or stop strings are generated, the process stops, forming a final solution $A = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$.

In our approach, to align with the definitions in common RL, we define an action as a single line of text, which is separated by a line break. We also define an intermediate state as the combination of the instruction and a partial solution that contains a few lines of text, i.e. $S_i = (q, a_{1,2,\dots,i})$. This means an intermediate state always terminates with a line break. In comparison, an end state stands for the combination of the instruction and a full solution that terminates with an eos token, i.e. $S_{end} = S_k = (q, a_{1,2,\dots,k})$. In consistency with conventional settings for reasoning scenarios, the transition to the next state after an action was taken is considered to be deterministic. For our case, this means a new line of solution is appended to the current partial solution.

In terms of reward, we assign rewards for a reached state only when it is an end state. The function that determines the reward for an end state is denoted by $R = R(S_{end})$, which can be either rule-based or model-based (ORM, PRM). Moreover, the value function, or the expectation of reward under a certain policy, is defined by Equation 1.

$$V^\pi(S_i) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[R(S_{end})|S_i]. \tag{1}$$

Under this setting, the state-action value function (Q function) can also be unified to the value function, as illustrated in Equation 2.

$$Q^\pi(S_i, a_{i+1}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[R(S_{end})|S_i, a_{i+1}] = \mathbb{E}_\pi[R(S_{end})|S_{i+1}] = V^\pi(S_{i+1}). \tag{2}$$

3.2 REST-GRPO

Inspired by the discoveries of ReST [8] and GRPO [10] algorithms, we propose Reinforced Self-Training with Group Relative Policy Optimization (ReST-GRPO), a novel LLM RL algorithm that improves the efficiency and effectiveness of GRPO training through a few sampling and filtering mechanisms. As a crucial first step of our paradigm, ReST-GRPO leverages the policy itself to provide insight into train data selection and assembly, mitigating the reward failure problem of GRPO [17]. It strengthens the capability of the policy to generate reliable reasoning traces, getting it prepared for the second stage of reinforcement.

ReST-GRPO is designed to be an iterative process that reinforces the policy through multiple self-train iterations. In each iteration, the training process deploys the policy state at the end of last round. The main algorithm of ReST-GRPO consists of three parts within each reinforce iteration: (1) pre-train solution sampling, (2) train data filtering and assembly, (3) training with the GRPO objective. We present it in Algorithm 1.

3.2.1 PRE-TRAIN SOLUTION SAMPLING

Similar to the ReST algorithm that augments the initial training dataset with samples from the policy itself, ReST-GRPO also utilizes the sample solutions generated from the policy for further train data selection and assembly. Within each iteration, we first collect N solutions for every instruction prompt in the original dataset using the current policy. By configuring the LLM’s sampling temperature, we can control the randomness and diversity of these solutions. Then, we utilize a fixed reward function to obtain rewards for all solutions, which are used for the subsequent filtering process.

Algorithm 1: ReST-GRPO algorithm for policy training.

Input: base LLM policy π_θ , reward function (model) R , original question dataset Q , original prompt dataset P_Q , number of solution samples N , standard deviation threshold σ_0 , reward threshold r_0 , ratio of data to sample β , sampling exponent factor α , number of iterations T .

- 1: **for** $i = 1$ to T **do**
- 2: $P_Q^+ \leftarrow \emptyset$ // initialize train set
- 3: **for** prompt p in P_Q **do**
- 4: Sample N solutions $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | p)$ // generate solutions samples
- 5: Get reward $\{r_i = R(p, A_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ // obtain rewards for samples
- 6: $\sigma \leftarrow std(\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N)$ // calculate standard deviation for reward
- 7: **if** $\sigma \geq \sigma_0$ **then**
- 8: $P_Q^+ \leftarrow p$
- 9: **if** $max_i(r_i) \geq r_0$ **then**
- 10: $A \leftarrow argmax_{A_i}(r_i)$ // get the solution with highest reward
- 11: $D_A \leftarrow \{a_{1,2,\dots,j}\}_{j=1}^{|A|}$ // extract partial solutions
- 12: $D_A^* \leftarrow do_sample(D_A, \beta, \alpha)$ // sample partial solutions for train data assembly
- 13: **for** partial solution p^* in D_A^* **do**
- 14: $P_Q^+ \leftarrow p + p^*$
- 15: **end for**
- 16: **end if**
- 17: **end if**
- 18: **end for**
- 19: $\pi_\theta \leftarrow GRPO(P_Q^+, \pi_\theta, R)$ // train the policy with the GRPO objective
- 20: **end for**

Output: π_θ

3.2.2 DATA FILTERING BY REWARD

An LLM policy’s output solutions and their corresponding rewards contain a wealth of information indicating its strength and weakness toward the target task domain, which can be leveraged to filter out ineffective train data. For GRPO, policy update relies on group relative advantage. This means effective training signals depend on discrepancies between rewards, giving us three key enlightenments:

- If a policy’s output solutions obtain similar rewards on a question, there’s nothing much for it to learn from this question.
- For questions or tasks where the current policy faces an enormous action space but only few output traces lead to a substantial reward, normal sampling from the initial state may be ineffective for training.
- For a question that the current policy does not perform well, high-reward solution traces are crucial for training. Since high-reward solutions often share some common patterns, sampling from a partial solution state of a high-reward solution may be helpful for obtaining more high-reward traces, thus beneficial for training.

We design our algorithm’s filtering and train data assembly process based on these enlightenments. Firstly, we use standard deviation to evaluate the variety of rewards. For question prompts that the policy’s solutions achieve a reward standard deviation less than a given threshold σ_0 , we filter them out from the train dataset, because they will possibly result in very little improvement of the policy. For other prompts, we add them to the train dataset. Secondly, we focus on high-reward solution traces that may be beneficial for training. Specifically, we filter out question prompts that the policy only achieve rewards lower than a certain threshold r_0 . For other prompts, we extract their corresponding solution trace with the highest reward. Finally, its partial solution states are utilized to assemble new train data, as illustrated in Section 3.2.3. In addition, we present in Figure 2 the

comparison of training reward variances between ReST-GRPO and naive GRPO, which validates the effect of ReST-GRPO in improving the variance of rewards.

3.2.3 TRAIN DATA ASSEMBLY

Considering that a partial state belonging to a high-reward solution may possibly be a good state for the policy to begin with, we extract a subset of all these partial solution states for new train data assembly. For simplicity, we only select from partial states of the solution trace A with the highest reward for each prompt p . Denoted by $a_{1,2,\dots,j}$, a partial state contains the first j actions (i.e. lines in our setting) of A taken by the policy. In the assembly process, we first sample a subset of these partial states D_A^* based on a discrete finite exponential distribution, using a fixed positive exponent factor $\alpha < 1.0$. Similar to a geometric distribution, except that the random variable only takes a finite number of values, we sample each time following the probability mass function defined by Equation 3. This p.m.f is designed to control the diversity of reward, maintaining some probability for the policy to start from partial states that are close to a high-reward final solution during training, while assigning more probability weight to initial states. Using this p.m.f, we sample $\beta|A|$ partial states and add them to D_A^* , where β is a preconfigured ratio parameter. Then, every partial state within D_A^* is appended to the initial prompt p , forming new train data. Note that our method is similar to common GRPO when α is close to 0, since it only uses the initial prompt state for training.

$$p(a_{1,2,\dots,j}) = \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 - \alpha^{|A|}} \alpha^{j-1}, j = 1, 2, \dots, |A| \quad (3)$$

3.2.4 GRPO TRAINING

After training data for each iteration are obtained, online reinforce training is performed. Policy update is based on the objective displayed in Equation 4, which is basically the common GRPO objective, except that the policy’s input prompt can be a combination of question and sampled partial solution from the train set P_Q^+ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(\theta) = & \mathbb{E}[p \sim P_Q^+, \{o_i\}_{i=1}^G \sim \pi_{\theta_{old}}(O|p)] \\ & \frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G \frac{1}{|o_i|} \sum_{t=1}^{|o_i|} \{ \min[\frac{\pi_{\theta}(o_{i,t}|p, o_{i,<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_{i,t}|p, o_{i,<t})} \hat{A}_{i,t}, \text{clip}(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(o_{i,t}|p, o_{i,<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_{i,t}|p, o_{i,<t})}, 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) \hat{A}_{i,t}] \} \\ & - \beta' \mathbb{D}_{KL}[\pi_{\theta} || \pi_{ref}] \} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

3.3 VM-MCTS

In this section, we present Value Model based Monte-Carlo Tree Search (VM-MCTS), a LLM test time decoding reinforcement method that balances exploration and exploitation during decoding process through an adapted MCTS algorithm, while also boosting the policy output’s accuracy and reliability via an elaborately designed VM. By performing MCTS with a reward function, accurate process value targets are collected, enabling the training of a VM. As an essential component for test




Figure 2: Distribution of standard deviation of group rewards during policy training. We can observe a clear distributional shift between two algorithms. Training configurations are illustrated in Section 4.2, and the base LLM policy here is OpenCodeInterpreter-DS-6.7B.

time MCTS-based decoding, the VM plays a similar role as a PRM. It not only provides verification signals, but also guides the LLM policy to search for high potential reasoning traces.

VM-MCTS is a continuation and expansion of the previous Math-Shepherd (M-S) method [6]. We generalize the M-S style PRM to our definition of VM. Although the value target introduces some extra noise, it actually leads to better performance when decoding, with the assistance of MCTS.

3.3.1 THE VALUE TARGET

In the M-S method, the quality of an intermediate step is defined as its potential to deduce the correct final answer, which is an expectation-based evaluation target, resembling the value function. For VM-MCTS, we summarize this to the value target defined in Equation 1. Rather than evaluating a single step or action, the value target emphasizes the evaluation of the whole partial state including the last action. It naturally reflects the potential for a policy to reach high-reward end states from the current partial state, which can be leveraged to assist policy decoding. In fact, the M-S method can be regarded as a special case where the reward function R is defined by Equation 5.

$$\begin{aligned} R(S_{end}) &= \mathbb{I}(a_A = a^*), \\ s.t. \quad S_{end} &= (q, A) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

3.3.2 VALUE MODEL TRAINING

We adopt MCTS when collecting training data for the VM, as it balances exploration of different reasoning paths and exploitation of promising intermediate states. In our MCTS algorithm, the root node of the search tree is set to the initial state $S_{init} = S_0 = (q, \emptyset)$, while other nodes represent intermediate states or end states $S_i = (q, a_{1,2,\dots,i})$. As illustrated in Section 3.1, an action represents a line of text. Through multiple rounds of MC simulation, value targets of partial states and end states are gradually updated and precisely estimated, distinguished from the all-at-once estimation used by M-S. We present the pseudocode for this process in Algorithm 2. Once sufficient value data are acquired, a VM V_ϕ is trained on these data to predict the value target of different states. The loss function used by VM-MCTS in the training process is demonstrated in Equation 6.

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi = \mathbb{E}_{(S,v) \sim D_{value}} (V_\phi(S) - v)^2 \tag{6}$$

3.3.3 ASSISTED DECODING

Previous approaches like PPO-MCTS [16] have demonstrated the effectiveness of conventional VMs and MCTS in token-level assisted decoding process. For our case, a VM fully trained with our method can accurately predict the expected reward of partial states based on current policy, as well as the determined reward of end states, indicating its potential for assisted decoding. For VM-MCTS, we use an adapted version of MCTS to assist policy decoding in test time. Deploying our VM, we are also able to perform verification in the decoding process, similar to common PRMs. As shown in Algorithm 3, the adapted search algorithm deploys the VM to provide value signals for MC rollouts, while also verifying and selecting solutions by Best-of-N as previous verification methods do [14]. The algorithm uses value estimations to decide which paths to decode and explore, which improves search efficiency and accuracy. We also prove in Appendix A.4 that our value-based MC rollout estimates partial state values more precisely than the usual complete trace rollout method, resulting in better search performance.

4 EXPERIMENTS

As an important branch of LLM reasoning tasks, code writing has received much attention in recent years [23; 20; 27]. In this research, we also focus on coding problems, considering that they have a more comprehensive test of LLM’s reasoning, planning, and invocation abilities. In this section, we present various experiments to validate our proposed method ReST-RL. As two main components of ReST-RL, ReST-GRPO and VM-MCTS are separately verified through comparison to baseline training or decoding methods on multiple well-known benchmarks such as HumanEval [19], MBPP [32] and APPS [3]. As a whole, we demonstrate that the combination of these two components leads to optimal test results, justifying our overall approach.

Table 1: Main results for policy training. LLM policies are evaluated after each training iteration ends. We use the same sampling temperature of 0.7 for every LLM when testing.

Model	Training Method	HumanEval	HumanEval+	MBPP	MBPP+	APPS-500	BCB	Avg.
Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct	Base (0th iter.)	0.872	0.799	0.817	0.683	0.287	0.381	0.563
	Below are results for sequential training iterations							
	ReST-DPO (1st iter.)	0.884	0.823	0.820	0.688	0.321	0.386	0.579
	GRPO (1st iter.)	0.896	0.835	0.812	0.693	0.350	0.405	0.593
	ReST-GRPO (1st iter.)	0.872	0.817	0.823	0.701	0.401	0.441	0.612
	ReST-DPO (2nd iter.)	0.872	0.823	0.796	0.669	0.330	0.400	0.578
	GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.872	0.799	0.815	0.685	0.356	0.403	0.586
	ReST-GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.890	0.835	0.849	0.712	0.415	0.462	0.630
	Base (0th iter.)	0.805	0.732	0.81	0.677	0.148	0.348	0.502
CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat	Below are results for sequential training iterations							
	ReST-DPO (1st iter.)	0.823	0.774	0.759	0.659	0.167	0.353	0.507
	GRPO (1st iter.)	0.829	0.750	0.788	0.653	0.244	0.365	0.530
	ReST-GRPO (1st iter.)	0.854	0.793	0.804	0.690	0.27	0.389	0.557
	ReST-DPO (2nd iter.)	0.841	0.780	0.799	0.672	0.176	0.339	0.515
	GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.878	0.823	0.815	0.672	0.255	0.375	0.556
	ReST-GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.878	0.816	0.828	0.706	0.278	0.425	0.579
	Base (0th iter.)	0.744	0.677	0.741	0.646	0.230	0.338	0.493
	DS-Coder-6.7b-Instruct	Below are results for sequential training iterations						
ReST-DPO (1st iter.)		0.756	0.683	0.725	0.635	0.251	0.329	0.495
GRPO (1st iter.)		0.726	0.646	0.735	0.632	0.262	0.342	0.493
ReST-GRPO (1st iter.)		0.756	0.683	0.743	0.635	0.282	0.355	0.511
ReST-DPO (2nd iter.)		0.756	0.689	0.720	0.632	0.242	0.329	0.492
GRPO (2nd iter.)		0.707	0.634	0.730	0.624	0.283	0.357	0.497
ReST-GRPO (2nd iter.)		0.793	0.707	0.749	0.646	0.300	0.368	0.529
Base (0th iter.)		0.756	0.707	0.722	0.630	0.204	0.331	0.486
OpenCI-DS-6.7B		Below are results for sequential training iterations						
	ReST-DPO (1st iter.)	0.756	0.677	0.714	0.622	0.212	0.351	0.487
	GRPO (1st iter.)	0.726	0.677	0.733	0.632	0.277	0.363	0.506
	ReST-GRPO (1st iter.)	0.726	0.677	0.725	0.635	0.281	0.374	0.509
	ReST-DPO (2nd iter.)	0.744	0.671	0.725	0.630	0.232	0.336	0.488
	GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.750	0.689	0.743	0.648	0.279	0.352	0.512
	ReST-GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.774	0.713	0.725	0.630	0.325	0.377	0.531

Table 2: Average results of ReST-RL and different verification methods on all benchmarks. For all LLM policies, we set the sampling temperature to 0.7. All verification is based on 100 samples.

Method	Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct	CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat	DS-Coder-6.7b-Instruct	OpenCI-DS-6.7B	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct
Base	0.563	0.502	0.493	0.486	0.435
ORM	0.592	0.542	0.542	0.537	0.480
PRM	0.591	0.526	0.539	0.532	0.466
ORM-MCTS	0.588	0.545	0.547	0.535	0.481
VM-MCTS	0.652	0.599	0.576	0.569	0.519
ReST-RL	0.673	0.616	0.584	0.583	0.556

4.1 EXPERIMENT SETTINGS

Base LLM Policies. In our experiment, we primarily test the proposed method with four recent base LLM policies, namely Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct [33], CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat [21], Deepseek-Coder-6.7B-Instruct [2] and OpenCodeInterpreter-DS-6.7B [22]. Although these LLMs already have decent base capabilities in coding tasks, we show that ReST-RL can still significantly improve their programming skills. To testify our method for general LLMs, we additionally include two representative Llama models in part of our experiments: Llama-3-8B and Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct [34], indicating the generalizability of our approach.

Training Datasets. In terms of source datasets for training, we select three well-known open-source coding datasets: BigCodeBench (BCB) [4], DS-1000 [35] and APPS [3]. After filtering out training data without test cases, we obtain a final train dataset Q_{train} of 6945 coding prompts. For experiments mentioned in Section 4.2 and Section 4.3, training of policies and value models with ReST-RL and other baselines are all based on this dataset.

Evaluation Benchmarks. To comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of different methods, we conduct test on six renowned benchmarks: HumanEval [19], HumanEval+ [36], MBPP [32], MBPP+ [36], BigCodeBench (BCB) [4] and APPS [3]. Among them, since the APPS test set is too large, we construct a new test set known as APPS-500 by randomly selecting 500 data from it, which is used as the final test dataset. As for evaluation metrics, we use pass@1 for all benchmarks except APPS-500. For APPS-500, we use the original Test Case Average metric proposed by the authors of APPS. In addition, all our evaluations use zero-shot performance.

Base Reward Function. According to previous research, the use of model-based learned reward functions in reinforcement learning scenarios may increase the risk of reward hacking [37], causing undesirable effects on our experimental results. Therefore, we primarily adopt a rule-based reward function that uses test cases to calculate reward, as shown in Equation 7. It evaluates generated codes with the ratio of passed test cases to total test cases, which naturally reflects the functional correctness of these codes. Somewhat differently, two additional rewards have been added to improve stability and effectiveness for ReST-GRPO and naive GRPO training, which is illustrated in Section 4.2.

$$R_{base}(S_{end}) = R_{base}(q, A) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{I}(eval(A, t_i) = y_i), \quad (7)$$

where t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m are test cases, and y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m are desired test outputs.

4.2 EVALUATION OF LLM POLICY TRAINING METHODS


In order to assess the effectiveness of ReST-GRPO, we conduct experiments on LLM policy training, comparing ReST-GRPO to two other baselines: ReST-DPO and naive GRPO. The main configurations for these approaches are shown as follow. Note that for all policies and methods, sampling temperature is set to 0.7, and learning rate is set to $1e - 7$.

- **ReST-GRPO:** In terms of reward function used during training, two additional rewards have been involved to improve training results, as demonstrated in Equation 8. The first reward examines whether the output code contains certain essential substrings (such as identifiers for code segments), while the second reward penalizes redundant characters (mainly meaningless characters after the end of the required program). In our experiments, we set $\omega_1 = 1e - 3$ and $\omega_2 = 1e - 6$. As for other settings, the question dataset is set to Q_{train} within each self-train iteration. Taking into account time and resource constraints, we set $N = 30$, $\sigma_0 = 0.05$, $r_0 = 0.9$, $\beta = 0.5$ and $\alpha = 0.95$. When training with GRPO, the number of generations per group is set to 8.
- **GRPO:** To validate the effectiveness of ReST on GRPO training, we involve naive GRPO as a baseline. For this baseline, the same reward function R_{GRPO} is adopted for training. The number of generations per group is also set to 8. In contrast, different from ReST-GRPO, questions in Q_{train} are directly used for training. This means that each question in Q_{train} will be used once within a single training iteration.
- **ReST-DPO:** We compare another self-train baseline ReST-DPO, which is similar to the ReST^{EM} [11] method, except that the policy update algorithm is replaced from SFT to DPO [9]. For ReST-DPO, we also perform solution sampling with initial LLM policy on Q_{train} within each self-train iteration, with the number of samples per question set to 30. Subsequently, the base reward function R_{base} is deployed to obtain rewards for generated solutions, which are then used for the construction of preference pairs. Finally, we update the policy with the DPO objective, based on generated preference data.

$$R_{GRPO}(q, A) = R_{base}(q, A) + \omega_1 * \mathbb{I}(s \subseteq A) - \omega_2 * n_{redundant_char}(A), \quad (8)$$

where s is an essential substring, and ω_1, ω_2 are weight parameters.

Performance comparison for iterative policy training. We compare ReST-GRPO with other baselines by performing 2 sequential training iterations on Q_{train} . Performance of four LLM policies after each training iteration on all benchmarks is shown in Table 1, and additional results for Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct are shown in Appendix A.3. We discover that for all LLMs, ReST-GRPO significantly outperforms ReST-DPO and naive GRPO regarding average score for each iteration. After two iterations of training, ReST-GRPO achieves optimal improvements in average score of 6.7%, 7.7%, 3.6% and 4.5% respectively for the selected LLMs. Considering that these base LLMs already



(a) Training efficiency assessment for ReST-GRPO, DAPO, and naive GRPO based on average score on all benchmarks. We adopt Llama-3-8B as the base policy, which is then trained for 10k steps using two methods. Policy performance is evaluated every 1k steps. (b) Budgeted verification results based on CodeQwen. We evaluate the Test Case Average score of verified outputs on APPS-500, using different verification methods. Sampling temperature is set to 0.7 for all methods.

Figure 3: Test of training efficiency and budgeted verification.

have a decent performance in coding tasks, such an enhancement is quite satisfactory. Moreover, We also find that ReST-GRPO is the only approach which does not degrade on any of the benchmarks after two rounds of training.

Assessment of training efficiency for ReST-GRPO, DAPO and naive GRPO. By evaluating policy performance after same number of training steps, we can get a glimpse of the difference in training efficiency between ReST-GRPO, DAPO [17] and naive GRPO. In Figure 3 (a), we display average accuracy results of Llama-3-8B on all benchmarks within 10k training steps. We select Llama-3-8B as base policy for mainly two reasons: (1) As a LLM not specifically finetuned on coding tasks, there is more space for improvement in its coding capabilities. Differences in training effectiveness between methods may be more pronounced. (2) We would like to examine the effectiveness of our method for general base LLMs. In terms of results, we find that although in the first 2k training steps the performance of the three algorithms are comparable, ReST-GRPO’s lead shows a gradual increase after 2k steps. At 10k steps, ReST-GRPO attains a substantial improvement of 12.3%, greatly outperforming 7.8% achieved by naive GRPO, and 8.1% achieved by DAPO. This indicates both efficiency and sustainability of our method, implying its long term effectiveness on policy training.

4.3 ASSESSMENT OF DECODING AND VERIFICATION METHODS

In this part, we present experiment results that verify the superiority of VM-MCTS over some widely used decoding and verification methods, which are primarily based on ORMs and PRMs. In our experiments, we compare VM-MCTS with three other baselines: ORM+Best-of-N (denoted by ORM), PRM+Best-of-N (denoted by PRM) and ORM-MCTS. Since previous work [12; 30] has shown that MCTS is more effective compared to BFS and DFS based tree search algorithms, we do not include them as baselines here. The main configurations are described below. For all methods, the temperature for decoding is set to 0.7. Detailed description of decoding and verification methods in Appendix A.2.

Comparison of method accuracy on all benchmarks. We test VM-MCTS and other baselines on various base LLM policies. In Table 2, we present average results on all benchmarks, with the number of samples for verification limited to 100. Results show that VM-MCTS significantly surpasses other baselines for every base LLM, achieving average improvement of 8.9%, 9.7%, 8.3%, 8.3% and 8.4% respectively for Qwen2.5-Coder, CodeQwen, DS-Coder, OpenCI and Llama3.1. The lead of VM-MCTS over ORM-MCTS validates the effectiveness of our VM for the decoding process.

Verification results based on controlled budget. By comparing verification methods under various controlled search budgets, We can comprehensively examine their performance and trends in effectiveness. In Figure 3 (b), we show verification results on APPS-500 under different number of

samples from 1 to 100, using CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat as the base LLM. We find that our method substantially outperforms other baselines at all budgets and generally has a higher growth rate with increasing number of samples, again demonstrating the superiority of our method.

4.4 VALIDATION OF THE OVERALL APPROACH

Based on the final LLM policies trained with ReST-GRPO, which is mentioned in Section 4.2, we further test their performance on benchmarks assisted by VM-MCTS. As shown in Table 2, the combined approach achieves best average results for all base LLMs, surpassing separately used ReST-GRPO or VM-MCTS. This proves the necessity and effectiveness of the overall ReST-RL methodology.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce **ReST-RL**, a unified LLM RL paradigm that is capable of significantly improving the reasoning ability of LLMs by combining an improved GRPO algorithm with a meticulously designed test time decoding method assisted by a value model. Through extensive experiments, we showcase the superiority of the proposed method over other training and decoding baselines on coding tasks. Regarding future work, we believe that the out-of-domain accuracy of value model is still understudied, and we would like to further investigate the generalizability of ReST-RL to a wider range of tasks.

REFERENCES

- [1] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [2] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Fuli Luo, Yingfei Xiong, and Wenfeng Liang. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming – the rise of code intelligence, 2024.
- [3] Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Saurav Kadavath, Mantas Mazeika, Akul Arora, Ethan Guo, Collin Burns, Samir Puranik, Horace He, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring coding challenge competence with apps, 2021.
- [4] Terry Yue Zhuo, Minh Chien Vu, Jenny Chim, Han Hu, Wenhao Yu, Ratnadira Widyasari, Imam Nur Bani Yusuf, Haolan Zhan, Junda He, Indraneil Paul, Simon Brunner, Chen Gong, Thong Hoang, Armel Randy Zebaze, Xiaoheng Hong, Wen-Ding Li, Jean Kaddour, Ming Xu, Zhihan Zhang, Prateek Yadav, Naman Jain, Alex Gu, Zhoujun Cheng, Jiawei Liu, Qian Liu, Zijian Wang, Binyuan Hui, Niklas Muennighoff, David Lo, Daniel Fried, Xiaoning Du, Harm de Vries, and Leandro Von Werra. Bigcodebench: Benchmarking code generation with diverse function calls and complex instructions, 2025.
- [5] Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, Yansong Tang, and Dongmei Zhang. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct, 2025.
- [6] Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Zhihong Shao, R. X. Xu, Damai Dai, Yifei Li, Deli Chen, Y. Wu, and Zhifang Sui. Math-shepherd: Verify and reinforce llms step-by-step without human annotations, 2024.
- [7] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms, 2017.
- [8] Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Ksenia Konyushkova, Lotte Weerts, Abhishek Sharma, Aditya Siddhant, Alex Ahern, Miaosen Wang, Chenjie Gu, Wolfgang Macherey, Arnaud Doucet, Orhan Firat, and Nando de Freitas. Reinforced self-training (rest) for language modeling, 2023.
- [9] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

-
- [10] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models, 2024.
- [11] Avi Singh, John D Co-Reyes, Rishabh Agarwal, Ankesh Anand, Piyush Patil, Peter J Liu, James Harrison, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, Aaron Parisi, et al. Beyond human data: Scaling self-training for problem-solving with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06585*, 2023.
- [12] Dan Zhang, Sining Zhoubian, Ziniu Hu, Yisong Yue, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Rest-mcts*: Llm self-training via process reward guided tree search, 2024.
- [13] Jonathan Uesato, Nate Kushman, Ramana Kumar, Francis Song, Noah Siegel, Lisa Wang, Antonia Creswell, Geoffrey Irving, and Irina Higgins. Solving math word problems with process- and outcome-based feedback, 2022.
- [14] Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step, 2023.
- [15] Zhenru Zhang, Chujie Zheng, Yangzhen Wu, Beichen Zhang, Runji Lin, Bowen Yu, Dayiheng Liu, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. The lessons of developing process reward models in mathematical reasoning, 2025.
- [16] Jiacheng Liu, Andrew Cohen, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Yejin Choi, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Asli Celikyilmaz. Don’t throw away your value model! generating more preferable text with value-guided monte-carlo tree search decoding, 2024.
- [17] Qiyang Yu, Zheng Zhang, Ruofei Zhu, Yufeng Yuan, Xiaochen Zuo, Yu Yue, Tiantian Fan, Gaohong Liu, Lingjun Liu, Xin Liu, Haibin Lin, Zhiqi Lin, Bole Ma, Guangming Sheng, Yuxuan Tong, Chi Zhang, Mofan Zhang, Wang Zhang, Hang Zhu, Jinhua Zhu, Jiaze Chen, Jiangjie Chen, Chengyi Wang, Hongli Yu, Weinan Dai, Yuxuan Song, Xiangpeng Wei, Hao Zhou, Jingjing Liu, Wei-Ying Ma, Ya-Qin Zhang, Lin Yan, Mu Qiao, Yonghui Wu, and Mingxuan Wang. Dapo: An open-source llm reinforcement learning system at scale, 2025.
- [18] Jingyi Zhang, Jiaying Huang, Huanjin Yao, Shunyu Liu, Xikun Zhang, Shijian Lu, and Dacheng Tao. R1-vl: Learning to reason with multimodal large language models via step-wise group relative policy optimization, 2025.
- [19] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021.
- [20] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, Thomas Hubert, Peter Choy, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Igor Babuschkin, Xinyun Chen, Po-Sen Huang, Johannes Welbl, Sven Gowal, Alexey Cherepanov, James Molloy, Daniel J. Mankowitz, Esme Sutherland Robson, Pushmeet Kohli, Nando de Freitas, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Oriol Vinyals. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097, December 2022.
- [21] Qwen Team. Code with codeqwen1.5, April 2024.
- [22] Tianyu Zheng, Ge Zhang, Tianhao Shen, Xueling Liu, Bill Yuchen Lin, Jie Fu, Wenhui Chen, and Xiang Yue. Opencodeinterpreter: Integrating code generation with execution and refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14658*, 2024.

-
- [23] Shun Zhang, Zhenfang Chen, Yikang Shen, Mingyu Ding, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Chuang Gan. Planning with large language models for code generation, 2023.
- [24] Zhangir Azerbayev, Hailey Schoelkopf, Keiran Paster, Marco Dos Santos, Stephen McAleer, Albert Q. Jiang, Jia Deng, Stella Biderman, and Sean Welleck. Llemma: An open language model for mathematics, 2024.
- [25] Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah D. Goodman. Star: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning, 2022.
- [26] Jiawei Li, Xinyue Liang, Yizhe Yang, Chong Feng, and Yang Gao. Pspo*: An effective process-supervised policy optimization for reasoning alignment, 2024.
- [27] Hung Le, Yue Wang, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Coderl: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning, 2022.
- [28] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models, 2023.
- [29] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models, 2023.
- [30] Bin Xu, Yiguan Lin, Yinghao Li, and Yang Gao. Sra-mcts: Self-driven reasoning augmentation with monte carlo tree search for code generation, 2025.
- [31] Di Zhang, Xiaoshui Huang, Dongzhan Zhou, Yuqiang Li, and Wanli Ouyang. Accessing gpt-4 level mathematical olympiad solutions via monte carlo tree self-refine with llama-3 8b, 2024.
- [32] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, and Charles Sutton. Program synthesis with large language models, 2021.
- [33] Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Kai Dang, et al. Qwen2. 5-coder technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186*, 2024.
- [34] Meta. The llama 3 herd of models, 2024.
- [35] Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Scott Wen tau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. Ds-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation, 2022.
- [36] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation, 2023.
- [37] Lilian Weng. Reward hacking in reinforcement learning. *lilianweng.github.io*, Nov 2024.
- [38] Chris Yuhao Liu, Liang Zeng, Jiakai Liu, Rui Yan, Jujie He, Chaojie Wang, Shuicheng Yan, Yang Liu, and Yahui Zhou. Skywork-reward: Bag of tricks for reward modeling in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18451*, 2024.

A APPENDIX

A.1 MAIN ALGORITHMS

We present the training data collection process of VM in Algorithm 2 and the assisted decoding algorithm of VM-MCTS in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 2: The value model’s train data collection process.

Input: LLM policy π_θ , reward function (model) R , question (instruction) dataset Q , prompt dataset P_Q , max search iterations T , number of samples for each expansion n , exploration constant c , small constant that avoids zero-division ϵ , initial value v_0 ,

- 1: $D_{value} \leftarrow \emptyset$ // initialize value train set
- 2: **for** prompt p in P_Q **do**
- 3: Initialize the search tree T_p
- 4: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
- 5: $S \leftarrow S_{init}$
- 6: —————**Node Selection**—————
- 7: **while** S is expanded **do**
- 8: $S \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{S' \in \text{children}(S)} (v_{S'} + c\sqrt{\frac{\ln N_S + 1}{N_{S'} + \epsilon}})$ // select child node based on UCT
- 9: **end while**
- 10: $v, m \leftarrow 0$ // for value calculation in backpropagation process
- 11: **if** $S = (p, a_{1,2,\dots,j})$ is not an end state **then**
- 12: —————**Node Expansion**—————
- 13: Sample n traces $\{o_i = (a_{j+1,j+2,\dots}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^n \sim \pi_\theta(O|S)$ starting from S
- 14: Build child nodes by taking actions $\{a_{j+1}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$ // use the first action of sample traces to expand
- 15: **for** node S' in $\text{children}(S)$ **do**
- 16: $v_{S'} \leftarrow v_0$
- 17: $N_{S'}, U_{S'} \leftarrow 0$
- 18: **end for**
- 19: —————**MC Rollout**—————
- 20: Get rewards with reward function $\{r_i = R(p, a_{1,2,\dots,j}, o_i)\}_{i=1}^n$
- 21: $D_{value} \leftarrow \{((p, a_{1,2,\dots,j}, o_i), r_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ // add value targets for end states to train set
- 22: $v, m \leftarrow \operatorname{sum}(\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n), n$
- 23: **else**
- 24: $r \leftarrow R(S)$ // get the reward for current end state
- 25: $v, m \leftarrow r, 1$
- 26: **end if**
- 27: —————**Value Backpropagation**—————
- 28: **for** node S' from S to root **do**
- 29: $N_{S'} \leftarrow N_{S'} + m$ // update visit count
- 30: $U_{S'} \leftarrow U_{S'} + v$ // update sum of reward
- 31: $v_{S'} \leftarrow \frac{U_{S'}}{N_{S'}}$ // update value estimation
- 32: **end for**
- 33: **end for**
- 34: **for** node S in T_p **do**
- 35: **if** S is expanded **then**
- 36: $D_{value} \leftarrow (S, v_S)$ // add value targets for partial states to train set
- 37: **end if**
- 38: **end for**
- 39: **end for**
- 40: **Return** D_{value}

Output: D_{value}

Algorithm 3: The assisted decoding algorithm of VM-MCTS.

Input: LLM policy π_θ , Value model V_ϕ , original question (instruction) q , question prompt p_q , max search iterations T , number of samples for each expansion n , exploration constant c , small constant that avoids zero-division ϵ ,

- 1: Initialize the search tree T_{p_q}
- 2: $D_{sol} \leftarrow \emptyset$ // initialize solution set
- 3: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
- 4: $S \leftarrow S_{init}$
- 5: —————**Node Selection**—————
- 6: **while** S is expanded **do**
- 7: $S \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{S' \in \text{children}(S)} (v_{S'} + c\sqrt{\frac{\ln N_S + 1}{N_{S'} + \epsilon}})$ // select child node based on UCT
- 8: **end while**
- 9: $v, m \leftarrow 0$ // for value calculation in backpropagation process
- 10: **if** $S = (p, a_{1,2,\dots,j})$ is not an end state **then**
- 11: —————**Node Expansion**—————
- 12: Sample n traces $\{o_i = (a_{j+1,j+2,\dots}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^n \sim \pi_\theta(O|S)$ starting from S
- 13: $D_{sol} \leftarrow \{(a_{1,2,\dots,j}, o_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ // add sample solutions to solution set
- 14: Build child nodes by taking actions $\{a_{j+1}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$ // use the first action of sample traces to expand
- 15: —————**Value Based MC Rollout**—————
- 16: **for** node S' in $\text{children}(S)$ **do**
- 17: $v_{S'} \leftarrow V_\phi(S')$ // get value estimation
- 18: Set $N_{S'}$ to the number of times S' was visited during expansion phase
- 19: $U_{S'} \leftarrow N_{S'} v_{S'}$
- 20: $v \leftarrow v + U_{S'}$
- 21: **end for**
- 22: $m \leftarrow n$
- 23: **else**
- 24: $v, m \leftarrow v_S, 1$
- 25: **end if**
- 26: —————**Value Backpropagation**—————
- 27: **for** node S' from S to root **do**
- 28: $N_{S'} \leftarrow N_{S'} + m$ // update visit count
- 29: $U_{S'} \leftarrow U_{S'} + v$ // update sum of reward
- 30: $v_{S'} \leftarrow \frac{U_{S'}}{N_{S'}}$ // update value estimation
- 31: **end for**
- 32: **end for**
- 33: Get value (reward) estimation of every solution $A_i \in D_{sol}$: $\{r_i = V_\phi(p_q, A_i)\}_{i=1}^{|D_{sol}|}$
- 34: $A^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{A_i} (r_i)$ // Best-of-N
- 35: **Return** A^*

Output: A^*

A.2 DETAILS FOR COMPARED METHODS

We provide detailed descriptions and configurations of compared decoding and verification methods, i.e., VM-MCTS, ORM, PRM, and ORM-MCTS.

- **VM-MCTS:** For each base LLM policy, we train a corresponding VM based on Algorithm 2, using Q_{train} as the question set. We set $T = 30$, $n = 5$, $c = 0.4$, $\epsilon = 0.1$ and $v_0 = 0$ when collecting value train data. During training, the VM V_ϕ is initialized by adding a classifier head to the base policy network. As for test time decoding, we alter the parameter c to 0.1 and determine the number of verification samples by changing the value of T , with other parameters remaining the same.

Table 3: Policy training results when using greedy decoding in test.

Model	Training Method	HumanEval	HumanEval+	MBPP	MBPP+	APPS-500	BCB	Avg.	
Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct	Base (0th iter.)	0.909	0.841	0.828	0.714	0.302	0.419	0.592	
	Below are results for sequential training iterations								
	ReST-DPO (1st iter.)	0.909	0.841	0.831	0.714	0.340	0.416	0.601	
	GRPO (1st iter.)	0.896	0.835	0.833	0.714	0.384	0.425	0.612	
	ReST-GRPO (1st iter.)	0.896	0.848	0.860	0.730	0.436	0.468	0.643	
	ReST-DPO (2nd iter.)	0.909	0.848	0.825	0.714	0.356	0.422	0.607	
	GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.890	0.829	0.844	0.728	0.392	0.428	0.616	
	ReST-GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.909	0.860	0.854	0.725	0.416	0.492	0.646	
	Base (0th iter.)	0.854	0.787	0.831	0.706	0.163	0.374	0.532	
	Below are results for sequential training iterations								
ReST-DPO (1st iter.)	0.854	0.787	0.817	0.696	0.185	0.373	0.534		
GRPO (1st iter.)	0.866	0.799	0.817	0.698	0.272	0.401	0.566		
ReST-GRPO (1st iter.)	0.890	0.835	0.831	0.714	0.294	0.447	0.594		
ReST-DPO (2nd iter.)	0.860	0.787	0.836	0.709	0.211	0.362	0.542		
GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.866	0.799	0.828	0.701	0.296	0.401	0.574		
ReST-GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.902	0.835	0.836	0.725	0.308	0.479	0.609		
DS-Coder-6.7b-Instruct	Base (0th iter.)	0.768	0.695	0.751	0.659	0.242	0.346	0.506	
	Below are results for sequential training iterations								
	ReST-DPO (1st iter.)	0.780	0.707	0.746	0.661	0.245	0.348	0.510	
	GRPO (1st iter.)	0.780	0.713	0.765	0.677	0.277	0.350	0.524	
	ReST-GRPO (1st iter.)	0.787	0.707	0.767	0.685	0.287	0.366	0.532	
	ReST-DPO (2nd iter.)	0.780	0.707	0.746	0.659	0.254	0.350	0.513	
	GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.762	0.683	0.759	0.675	0.286	0.356	0.520	
	ReST-GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.780	0.701	0.767	0.672	0.323	0.390	0.543	
	Base (0th iter.)	0.787	0.713	0.738	0.648	0.210	0.365	0.505	
	Below are results for sequential training iterations								
ReST-DPO (1st iter.)	0.774	0.713	0.733	0.643	0.207	0.373	0.503		
GRPO (1st iter.)	0.780	0.713	0.735	0.656	0.312	0.365	0.530		
ReST-GRPO (1st iter.)	0.780	0.713	0.738	0.656	0.324	0.373	0.535		
ReST-DPO (2nd iter.)	0.768	0.701	0.738	0.646	0.218	0.360	0.501		
GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.78	0.72	0.728	0.643	0.308	0.361	0.526		
ReST-GRPO (2nd iter.)	0.774	0.713	0.749	0.664	0.324	0.387	0.540		

- **ORM:** We use the Skywork-Reward-Llama-3.1-8B-v0.2 ORM, which is trained on high-quality preference pairs sourced from publicly available data [38]. The output with the highest reward is returned.
- **PRM:** A Qwen2.5 PRM trained with an improved M-S method [15] is adopted to provide action-level reward. We use the minimum action-level reward for a single output as the final verification score. The output with the highest score is returned.
- **ORM-MCTS:** To assess the influence of MCTS on decoding accuracy, we include this baseline that also uses the Skywork ORM. We deploy a MCTS decoding algorithm similar to Algorithm 3, except that value estimation and final verification is based on the ORM.

A.3 ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Additional Results for Policy Training. Different from training results in Table 1, we provide policy training results when using greedy decoding in test in Table 3. In addition, we also provide the training results of Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct in Table 4.

Additional Results for Decoding and Verification. To further demonstrate the difference in performance of compared decoding and verification methods, we provide the results of four different base LLM policies when using ReST-RL and other methods on all benchmarks in Figure 4.

A.4 MATHEMATICAL PROOF FOR VALUE ESTIMATION

In this part we prove that our proposed value-based MC rollout tends to have more precise estimation of partial state’s value, in terms of variance. Suppose we are estimating the value of partial state $S_i = (q, a_{1,2,\dots,i})$ for a fixed policy π . We are allowed to use two verifier models, a value model V_ϕ and a reward model R_λ (which is allowed to be identical to V_ϕ), while the actual reward function R

Table 4: Policy training results for Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct.

Model	Training Method	HumanEval	HumanEval+	MBPP	MBPP+	APPS-500	BCB	Avg.	
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	Base	0.671	0.591	0.693	0.569	0.175	0.301	0.435	
	Base (greedy)	0.689	0.61	0.664	0.545	0.213	0.325	0.448	
	Below are results for the first training iteration								
	ReST-DPO	0.628	0.579	0.669	0.569	0.209	0.313	0.436	
	GRPO	0.652	0.573	0.675	0.566	0.271	0.324	0.457	
	ReST-GRPO	0.677	0.610	0.735	0.616	0.248	0.383	0.488	
	ReST-DPO (greedy)	0.677	0.616	0.701	0.574	0.259	0.321	0.466	
	GRPO (greedy)	0.683	0.634	0.706	0.579	0.329	0.329	0.490	
	ReST-GRPO (greedy)	0.707	0.646	0.725	0.608	0.312	0.407	0.516	
	Below are results for the second training iteration								
	ReST-DPO	0.671	0.598	0.672	0.556	0.249	0.299	0.449	
	GRPO	0.671	0.598	0.701	0.585	0.284	0.341	0.476	
	ReST-GRPO	0.665	0.598	0.693	0.587	0.235	0.418	0.481	
	ReST-DPO (greedy)	0.677	0.616	0.698	0.574	0.272	0.325	0.470	
	GRPO (greedy)	0.701	0.634	0.696	0.563	0.307	0.343	0.487	
	ReST-GRPO (greedy)	0.720	0.659	0.741	0.624	0.342	0.425	0.535	




Figure 4: Performance of different base LLM policies when using ReST-RL and verification methods on all benchmarks. All verification is based on 100 samples, with the sampling temperature set to 0.7.

and value function V are unknown (since it's test time). As a reasonable approximation, we assume that the two models can be regarded as two unbiased estimator variables that have the same variance when predicting, along with some conditions of independence:

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_\phi(S) &= V(S) + \epsilon_V, \\
 R_\lambda(S_{end}) &= R(S_{end}) + \epsilon_R, \\
 s.t. \mathbb{D}[\epsilon_V] &= \mathbb{D}[\epsilon_R], \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_V] = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_R] = 0, \\
 \epsilon_V &\text{ is independent of } S, \\
 \epsilon_R &\text{ is independent of } S_{end}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Now, we consider two approaches for value estimation, with a limit of n simulations. For value-based MC rollout, it does simulation with the random variable S_{i+1} , i.e. the state reached by π performing a single action. It estimates $V(S_i)$ by:

$$\hat{V}_v(S_i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n V_\phi(S_{i+1}^{(j)}), \quad (10)$$

$$s.t. S_{i+1}^{(1)}, S_{i+1}^{(2)}, \dots, S_{i+1}^{(n)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \pi(S_{i+1}|S_i).$$

On the other hand, regular complete rollout does simulation with the random variable S_{end} , i.e. the end state reached after a complete trace is generated. It estimates $V(S_i)$ by:

$$\hat{V}_r(S_i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n R_\lambda(S_{end}^{(j)}), \quad (11)$$

$$s.t. S_{end}^{(1)}, S_{end}^{(2)}, \dots, S_{end}^{(n)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \pi(S_{end}|S_i).$$

We now state the proposition to be proved:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_r(S_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_v(S_i)] = V(S_i), \quad (12)$$

and

$$\mathbb{D}[\hat{V}_r(S_i)] \geq \mathbb{D}[\hat{V}_v(S_i)]. \quad (13)$$

If the statements are true, we can conclude that $\hat{V}_v(S_i)$ is a better estimator than $\hat{V}_r(S_i)$ due to its smaller variance, which justifies our original claim. Now, we provide the proof for Equation 12.

Proof. First, we notice that by Equation 9:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_r(S_i) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n R_\lambda(S_{end}^{(j)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (R(S_{end}^{(j)}) + \epsilon_R) \\ &= \epsilon_R + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n R(S_{end}^{(j)}) \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above equation into the expression of expectation, we derive that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_r(S_i)] &= \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_R + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n R(S_{end}^{(j)})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_R] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[R(S_{end}^{(j)})] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[R(S_{end})|S_i] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[R(S_{end})|S_i] \\ &= V(S_i) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can know that:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_v(S_i) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n V_\phi(S_{i+1}^{(j)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (V(S_{i+1}^{(j)}) + \epsilon_V) \\ &= \epsilon_V + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n V(S_{i+1}^{(j)}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can finally derive the desired properties:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_v(S_i)] &= \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_V + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n V(S_{i+1}^{(j)})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_V] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[V(S_{i+1}^{(j)})] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[V(S_{i+1})|S_i] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[V(S_{i+1})|S_i] \\
&= V(S_i)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we provide proof for Equation 13 as follow.

Proof. Using the conclusions made by the proof above, we can derive the required property:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{D}[\hat{V}_r(S_i)] \geq \mathbb{D}[\hat{V}_v(S_i)] \\
\iff &\mathbb{D}[\epsilon_R + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n R(S_{end}^{(j)})] \geq \mathbb{D}[\epsilon_V + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n V(S_{i+1}^{(j)})] \\
\iff &\mathbb{D}[\epsilon_R] + \mathbb{D}[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n R(S_{end}^{(j)})] \geq \mathbb{D}[\epsilon_V] + \mathbb{D}[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n V(S_{i+1}^{(j)})] \\
\iff &\frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{D}[\sum_{j=1}^n R(S_{end}^{(j)})] \geq \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{D}[\sum_{j=1}^n V(S_{i+1}^{(j)})] \\
\iff &\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{D}[R(S_{end}^{(j)})] \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{D}[V(S_{i+1}^{(j)})] \\
\iff &\mathbb{D}[R(S_{end})|S_i] \geq \mathbb{D}[V(S_{i+1})|S_i] \\
\iff &\mathbb{E}[(R(S_{end}))^2|S_i] - (\mathbb{E}[R(S_{end})|S_i])^2 \geq \mathbb{E}[(V(S_{i+1}))^2|S_i] - (\mathbb{E}[V(S_{i+1})|S_i])^2 \\
\iff &\mathbb{E}[(R(S_{end}))^2|S_i] \geq \mathbb{E}_{S_{i+1} \sim \pi(S_{i+1}|S_i)}[(V(S_{i+1}))^2|S_i] \\
\iff &\mathbb{E}_{S_{i+1} \sim \pi(S_{i+1}|S_i)}[\mathbb{E}[(R(S_{end}))^2|S_{i+1}]|S_i] \geq \mathbb{E}_{S_{i+1} \sim \pi(S_{i+1}|S_i)}[(\mathbb{E}[R(S_{end})|S_{i+1}])^2|S_i] \\
\iff &\mathbb{E}_{S_{i+1} \sim \pi(S_{i+1}|S_i)}[\mathbb{E}[(R(S_{end}))^2|S_{i+1}] \geq \mathbb{E}_{S_{i+1} \sim \pi(S_{i+1}|S_i)}[(\mathbb{E}[R(S_{end})|S_{i+1}])^2] \\
\iff &\mathbb{E}_{S_{i+1} \sim \pi(S_{i+1}|S_i)}[\mathbb{E}[(R(S_{end}))^2|S_{i+1}] - (\mathbb{E}[R(S_{end})|S_{i+1}])^2] \geq 0 \\
\iff &\mathbb{E}_{S_{i+1} \sim \pi(S_{i+1}|S_i)}[\mathbb{D}[R(S_{end})|S_{i+1}]] \geq 0 \\
\iff &\mathbb{D}[R(S_{end})|S_{i+1}] \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.5 LIMITATIONS

Although various experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of ReST-RL, there still exist some limitations. Here, we point out two main limitations that may guide future research. First, we have not yet verified the methodology for tasks aside from code reasoning, such as mathematical and common sense reasoning. The overall framework of our approach is not limited to code reasoning, but validation on other tasks may require elaborate design of appropriate reward mechanisms with suitable experimental hyperparameters, which needs to be further explored. Second, the influence of some experimental settings on final results is not thoroughly investigated. For example, some hyperparameters used for train data collection (such as α , β) are determined empirically or based on resource limitations. More experiments could be conducted to explore the effect of these parameters

on training results. Moreover, our approach is mainly validated based on LLMs up to 10B, and it is unclear what degree of enhancement can be achieved by LLMs with larger scales. In summary, due to resource constraints, we cannot fully explore these aspects, thus we leave some of these work to subsequent research.