

Laying the Foundation First? Investigating the Generalization from Atomic Skills to Complex Reasoning Tasks

Yuncheng Huang[♣], Qianyu He[♣], Yipei Xu[♣], Jiaqing Liang^{♡*}, Yanghua Xiao^{♣◇*}

[♣]Shanghai Key Laboratory of Data Science, School of Computer Science, Fudan University

[♡]School of Data Science, Fudan University

[◇]Fudan-Aishu Cognitive Intelligence Joint Research Center

{yunchenghuang22, qyhe21, ypxu22}@m.fudan.edu.cn

{liangjiaqing, shawyh}@fudan.edu.cn

Abstract

Current language models have demonstrated their capability to develop basic reasoning, but struggle in more complicated reasoning tasks that require a combination of atomic skills, such as math word problem requiring skills like arithmetic and unit conversion. Previous methods either do not improve the inherent atomic skills of models or not attempt to generalize the atomic skills to complex reasoning tasks. In this paper, we first propose a probing framework to investigate whether the atomic skill can spontaneously generalize to complex reasoning tasks. Then, we introduce a hierarchical curriculum learning training strategy to achieve better skill generalization. In our experiments, we find that atomic skills can not spontaneously generalize to compositional tasks. By leveraging hierarchical curriculum learning, we successfully induce generalization, significantly improve the performance of open-source LMs on complex reasoning tasks. Promisingly, the skill generalization exhibit effective in cross-dataset and cross-domain scenarios. Complex reasoning can also help enhance atomic skills. Our findings offer valuable guidance for designing better training strategies for complex reasoning tasks.

1 Introduction

Current language models (LMs) have demonstrated their capability in a variety of reasoning tasks (Huang and Chang, 2023; Wei et al., 2022b). However, they struggle in more complex tasks that require the combination of various atomic skills, such as solving math word problem (MWP, Cobbe et al., 2021; Patel et al., 2021) requiring arithmetic (Liu and Low, 2023; Nogueira et al., 2021; Muffo et al., 2022) and unit conversion (Park et al., 2022) skills. Previous study argue that the inferior performance of current LMs in solving complex




Figure 1: An example of LMs’ deficiencies on atomic skills when solving complex reasoning tasks. While these atomic skills can be improved through skill training, it remains uncertain whether language models can apply enhanced skills to complex tasks.

reasoning tasks is primarily attributed to their deficiency in atomic skills. As shown in Fig. 1 (top), despite following a correct reasoning process, the models still yield incorrect solutions due to errors in arithmetic and unit conversion skills.

Recent studies attempt to address this issue through skill enhancement, but there are still limitations. Some approach involves introducing external tools (Imani et al., 2023; Schick et al., 2023), validators (Khalifa et al., 2023) or knowledge bases (Lewis et al., 2020) to assist atomic skills. These methods rely on external support but do not inherently improve the atomic skills of the model itself. Other studies promote the performance through multitask learning (Chen et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2023). They argue that skill improvement can be implicitly achieved through the transfer effect between tasks. However, they neither specify which skills are improved nor quantitatively assess the performance gains from skill improvements. The skill enhancement is implicit and unobservable, and the relationships between tasks

* Corresponding author.

are unexplainable. The most related studies individually improve particular skills by integrating specific knowledge (Park et al., 2022) or by fine-tuning with specialized crafted Chain-of-Thought (Liu and Low, 2023). However, these studies tend to train a specialized model that is proficient in atomic skills rather than enhance atomic skills while maintaining the original capabilities of the model. Moreover, they do not investigate whether the enhancement of skills can be generalized to complex tasks.

We argue that skill enhancement can *generalize* to complex tasks, as the response format for complex tasks is a *composition* of atomic skills. For instance, in Fig. 1, the response to the MWP composes arithmetic and unit conversion skills, which are respectively corresponding to the text segments “ $12 \times 37 = 448$ cm” and “448 decimeters”. The precision of complex reasoning tasks is significantly influenced by the mastery of skills. In this case, if both skills are improved, the response would turn out to be correct. Language models have been proved to individually improve their skills through specialized training (Fig. 1, middle). What we are particularly interested in is whether models can *apply* the enhanced skills to complex tasks (Fig. 1, bottom), referred to as **skill generalization** in this paper. It is crucial to highlight that our research objective is fundamentally different from multitasking as we explicitly define skills. Furthermore, due to the *composability* between skills and complex tasks, this generalization effect should be observable and explainable.

In this work, we investigate the mechanism of skill generalization through empirical experimentation on MWP. We aim to answer two key questions: *Can atomic skills spontaneously generalize to complex reasoning tasks? How can we maximize the skill generalization effectiveness?* First, we propose a probing framework to investigate the skill generalization mechanism on complex reasoning tasks. We select two essential atomic skills in MWP for probing: arithmetic and unit conversion. Then, we specifically design prerequisite tasks to enhance atomic skills and construct corresponding datasets through automated methods. Moreover, inspired by hierarchical curriculum design in pedagogy (White and Gagné, 1974; Scott, 2008), we propose a two-stage training strategy named hierarchical curriculum learning to maximize skill generalization. The first stage is skill training, which involves continuous learning on prerequisite tasks, enabling LMs to enhance atomic skills while main-

taining their original problem-solving abilities. The second stage is applied learning, where language models learn to apply skills to complex reasoning tasks. Finally, we carry out experiments across different models and perform detailed analyses.

In our experiments, we observe that (1) atomic skill can not spontaneously generalize to complex reasoning tasks, but can be induced to generalize through hierarchical curriculum learning. (2) A strong foundation laid in skill learning is crucial for effectiveness of LMs on complex reasoning tasks. (3) Skill enhancement exhibits a cross-dataset and cross-domain generalization effect. (4) Conversely, complex reasoning task can also help enhance the atomic skills. We attribute this to the *composability* between skills and complex tasks.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- To our best knowledge, we are the first to investigate the generalization from atomic skills to complex reasoning tasks.
- We propose a probing framework to investigate the spontaneity and effectiveness of skill generalization.
- We propose a hierarchical curriculum learning training strategy to induce skill generalization. Our experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of this strategy in achieving better skill generalization.

2 Related Work

Task Generalization Cross-task generalization refers to effectively apply previously learned knowledge and skills from source task to new target tasks (Talmor and Berant, 2019; Khashabi et al., 2020; Ye et al., 2021). Recent studies attain significant success in cross-task generalization by employing a multi-tasking approach (Sanh et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022a; Kim et al., 2023). Chen et al. (2023) argues that the effectiveness of generalization stems from the implicit skill transfer between tasks and seeks to find an optimal sequence to maximize the effect. Our research differs from the aforementioned studies in that we explicitly predefine source and target tasks that possess *composability* in format. Moreover, our research does not depend on massive tasks but emphasizes generalization from atomic skills to complex reasoning tasks.

Compositional Generalization Compositional generalization research primarily focuses in semantic parsing (Lake and Baroni, 2018; Keysers et al.,

2020; Kim and Linzen, 2020). They explore generalizing simple data to complex data through composition within an inter-dataset distribution. In contrast, our study explores cross-dataset generalization, especially skill generalization in complex reasoning tasks.

Atomic Skill Learning Numerous studies focus on individually enhancing specific skills. Liu and Low (2023) enhance arithmetic skill of LMs by specialized designed COT prompting. Huang et al. (2023) improve unit conversion skills through dimensional perception pretraining tasks. However, these studies do not investigate generalizing the enhanced skills to complex reasoning tasks.

Curriculum Learning Curriculum learning suggests that a structured and progressively challenging learning path can improve the learning effectiveness (Bengio et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2021). Previous work focus on ordinal training on a single task based on the difficulty of the data (Jiang et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2020; Elgaar and Amiri, 2023). Our research advances the field by applying hierarchical curriculum learning to multitasks guided by *composability* among these tasks and investigates their generalization effects.

3 Method

In this section, we first propose a probing framework to investigate generalization from atomic skills to complex reasoning tasks (§ 3.1). Then, we propose a hierarchical curriculum learning strategy to maximize the generalization effect (§ 3.2). The framework is shown in Fig. 2.

3.1 Skill Generalization Probing

3.1.1 Task Selection

We chose math word problem (MWP, Cobbe et al., 2021; Patel et al., 2021) as the investigated task, as it is a common-used benchmark for complex reasoning and the correctness can be objectively assessed. We select arithmetic and unit conversion as atomic skills because LMs display weaknesses in these skills when addressing MWP (Imani et al., 2023; Schick et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023). To obtain a model proficient in skills, we need to design prerequisite tasks and conduct skill training first (§ 3.1.2). After that, we can investigate the skill generalization on the enhanced model (§ 3.1.4)




Figure 2: Framework of our method. The right part is our probing approach. The left part describes the model training stages in hierarchical curriculum learning.

3.1.2 Probing Skills

Arithmetic Skill. Arithmetic skill refer to perform operations among numbers such as addition, subtract, multiplication and division. Most current LMs suffer from inaccurate arithmetic due to lacking specialized skill-oriented training (Liu and Low, 2023). We design a prerequisite task for arithmetic and construct the corresponding dataset. By training on prerequisite tasks, we can enhance the arithmetic skills. The arithmetic data encompasses a variety of difficulties, including different operation hops, operation types, value types and significant digits. For simple operations, we require the model to directly provide the arithmetic result. For complex operations, we design Chain-of-Thought responses, following Liu and Low (2023), due to the challenges in directly deriving the answers for these tasks. As shown in the example in Tab. 1, when answering “12 * 43.5”, we require the model to present the process of splitting, expansion, producing, and adding term by term before providing the final answer.

Unit Conversion Skill. Similar to arithmetic, unit conversion is necessary when dealing with values of different units in MWP. Current LMs lack sufficient knowledge of units, making it difficult to accurately perform unit conversions (Huang et al., 2023). Therefore, we also propose a prerequisite task and corresponding training data for unit conversion. We first extract all quantity types in MWP based on a comprehensive unit knowledge base DimUnitKB (Huang et al., 2023). As shown in Tab. 1, the units involved in MWP include seven quantity types such as length, time, speed, etc. Then we construct the unit conversion dataset for unit pair under the same quantity type. For example, “meters” and “centimeters” are both denote length, so it can be naturally stated as “1 meter is

	Task	Type	Example
Prerequisite Tasks	Arithmetic	AddSub	$5520.8 + 1.34 = 5522.14$; $5494 + 26.8 + 1.34 = 5520.8 + 1.34 = 5522.14$;
		S-Mu1	$12 * 40 = 480$; $12 * 3 = 36$; $12 * 0.5 = 6$; $12 * 0.01 = 0.12$
C-Mu1		$12 * 43.5 = 12 * 40 + 12 * 3 + 12 * 0.5 = 480 + 36 + 6 = 516 + 6 = 522$	
S-Div		$123 / 2 = 61.5$; $214 / 3 = 80.33$ $123 / 10 = 12.3$	
Prerequisite Tasks	Unit Conversion	Length	522 meter is equal to 0.522 kiloteters. Two inches is equal to 5.08 centimeters.
		Time	1 hour is equal to 60 minutes. 3 hours is equal to 10800 seconds.
		Speed	1 m/s is equal to 3.6 km/h. 72 kilometer per hour is equal to 20 meter per second.
Complex Tasks	Math Word Problem	-	Question: James decides to run 3 sprints 4 times a week. He runs 43 meters each sprint. How many total <u>meters</u> does he run a week? Response: He sprints $3 * 4 = 12$ times. So he runs $12 * 43 = 516$ meters a week.
	Applied Learning	Mixture	Question: James decides to run 3 sprints 4 times a week. He runs 43.5 meters each sprint. How many total <u>kilometers</u> does he run a week? Response: He sprints $3 * 4 = 12$ times. So he runs $12 * 43.5 = 12 * 40 + 12 * 3 + 12 * 0.5 = 480 + 36 + 6 = 516 + 6 = 522$ meters a week. 522 meters is equal to 0.522 kilometers. So the answer is 0.522.

Table 1: Examples for prerequisite tasks and complex reasoning tasks. The response for compositional tasks presents arithmetic and unit conversion skill and they are highlighted in orange and green respectively. S- refers to simple operation where the significant digit of the second number is 1. C- refers to complex operation.

equal to 100 centimeters". We detail the construction method in Appendix A.2.

3.1.3 Skill Training (ST)

Since the data for arithmetic and unit conversion are both automatically constructed, we can generate them in large quantities. It is straight-forward to enhance the atomic skills into language models through continuous training. However, continuous training may lead to catastrophic forgetting (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989). To address this, we employ the *replay strategy* (Ke and Liu, 2022) that is widely used in continuous training. We retain some training examples from MWP and mix them¹ with prerequisite task data to ensure the model retains its original problem-solving abilities in skill training. We conduct individual training for each skills as well as training with a mixture of skills.

3.1.4 How to determine whether skill generalization has been achieved?

Skill generalization refers to being able to *apply* skills learned from prerequisite tasks to complex reasoning tasks. Therefore, we can assess this by testing the skill-enhanced model in § 3.1.2 on MWP. We can consider the following aspects.

Metrics Improvement: Skills improvement can fix mistakes caused by the deficiency of atomic skills of language models when solving reasoning tasks. Therefore, ideally, skill generalization should be reflected in an improvement in metrics.

Response Integration: As seen in Tab. 1, the for-

mat we use for atomic skills in prerequisite tasks differs from how the original model performs these skills. Therefore, we can assess by determining whether there has been an implementation of response integration. For example, successful skill generalization should involve performing C-Mu1 in a Chain of Thought (COT) format rather than providing the answer directly.

3.2 Hierarchical Curriculum Learning (HCL)

Probing experiments show that atomic skills can not spontaneously generalize to complex tasks (results are detailed in § 5.1). Therefore, we propose hierarchical curriculum learning (HCL) to induce skill generalization.

Our approach is primarily inspired by hierarchical curriculum design in pedagogy (White and Gagné, 1974; Scott, 2008). In most of education system, student complete prerequisite course before enrolling in a more advanced course (Huang et al., 2005). Prerequisites are to ensure that students possess necessary foundational knowledge and skills and advanced courses enable students to learn how to apply these skills in complex scenarios (Rovick et al., 1999). Likewise, we design a two-stage hierarchical curriculum learning framework in our setting, shown in Fig. 2 left. The first stage is skill training, which has already been implemented (§ 3.1.3). We introduce the second phase of *applied learning* to enable LMs to apply their acquired skills to complex tasks.

¹We discuss the mixing ratio in Appendix C.1.




Figure 3: The distribution of data difficulty across four dimensions. Darker colors mean greater difficulty and larger areas mean more data.

3.2.1 Applied Learning (AL)

In this stage, we first construct compositional data (shown in Tab. 1 bottom) for applied learning. Next, we further train the model in the first stage with compositional data. In Tab. 1, the response of the original MWP directly provides the result when performing arithmetic. Moreover, the responses usually do not show the process of converting units. We incorporate the response format from prerequisite tasks into the problem-solving process for MWPs, aiming to induce the model to apply atomic skills to complex tasks. We detail the data construction method in Appendix A.3.

4 Experimental Settings

4.1 Evaluation Datasets.

We choose GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), a widely used benchmark for complex multi-step reasoning, requiring arithmetic and unit conversion skills. We compile statistics of arithmetic and unit conversion in the test set and observe that it lacks comprehensiveness in terms of difficulty and knowledge coverage. Therefore, we enhance the difficulty of GSM8K test set to demonstrate skill generalization more significantly. We denote the origin dataset as RAW and the augmented dataset as HARD.

Arithmetic Augmentation. The difficulty of arithmetic skills can be assessed from four dimensions: operation hops, operation type, value type, and significant digit. RAW has reasonable settings in the first three dimensions, but its inclusion of short significant digit resulting in lower demands on arithmetic skills. Therefore, we extend the significant digits in RAW without changing the logic of the original problems. In Tab. 2 we showcase the performance of LLaMA-2 (Touvron et al., 2023) on the test set before and after enhancement. The difficulty of these three operations increases progressively, but testing on RAW can not distinguish the difficulty. The enhanced test set aligns with this

Dataset	Operation	AddSub	MixMul	MixAll
GSM8K _{RAW}	2-Hop	43.10	44.24	34.88
	3-Hop	22.72	35.00	14.32
GSM8K _{HARD}	2-Hop	31.90	15.20	5.30
	3-Hop	21.50	8.04	2.63

Table 2: Arithmetic accuracy(%) of LLaMA-2 on RAW and HARD. AddSub involves only addition and subtraction operations, MixMul includes multiplication, and MixAll involves all operations.

difficulty gradient, demonstrating the effectiveness of the enhanced dataset.

Unit Conversion Augmentation. The main challenge in unit conversion lies in the diverse ways units are represented. Statistical analysis of the data in GSM8K shown in Appendix B shows that the representation of these units in GSM8K is quite uniform, leading to an incomplete evaluation of unit conversion skills. Without altering the original meaning of the questions, we have diversified the representations of units within the same quantity type. Tab. 8 demonstrates that the enhanced data better tests unit conversion skills.

4.2 Models and Baselines.

We investigate the skill generalization on two models from different families, namely LLaMa-2 (7B; Touvron et al., 2023) and Mistral (7B; Jiang et al., 2023). The baselines we compared include the following two types: (1) **Vanilla Model**, which is a model without any special modifications or enhancements. (2) **SFT Model**, which has been supervised fine-tuned on the training set of MWP. We test all the model with zero-shot and few-shot prompting. The few-shot examples are drawn from the training set in applied learning.

5 Experimental Analysis and Findings

5.1 RQ1: Can atomic skills generalize from prerequisite tasks to compositional tasks spontaneously?

Atomic skill CANNOT generalize to compositional tasks spontaneously. Tab. 3 illustrates the overall performance of different language models in compositional tasks. We observe that language models do not get noticeable gain on the MWP after skill training. LLaMA-2 only improve from 13.60% to 13.76% with zero-shot prompting in HARD, even experiencing a slight decrease on RAW. This phenomenon is model-independent, so

Model	Method	Arithmetic				Unit Conversion				Mixture			
		Zero-shot		Few-shot		Zero-shot		Few-shot		Zero-shot		Few-shot	
		RAW	HARD	RAW	HARD	RAW	HARD	RAW	HARD	ARITH	UNIT	ARITH	UNIT
LLaMa-2-7B	Vanilla	22.97	8.67	23.73	10.03	23.12	1.72	23.50	6.90	8.67	1.72	10.03	6.90
	SFT	38.67	13.60	37.23	12.76	38.67	6.03	36.77	6.90	13.60	6.03	12.76	6.90
	ST	35.78	13.76	33.51	13.61	37.22	8.62	37.91	8.62	13.79	14.45	12.41	6.90
	AL	41.77	24.66	39.42	23.30	37.30	18.86	36.39	15.52	23.13	20.69	23.64	23.27
	HCL	48.36	28.06	47.76	28.57	38.28	20.68	36.92	22.41	25.85	23.27	22.62	28.44
Mistral-7B	Vanilla	44.50	16.49	40.10	15.98	43.97	11.21	44.95	17.24	16.49	11.21	15.98	17.24
	SFT	55.72	20.41	54.89	21.60	55.72	21.55	56.71	20.67	20.41	21.55	21.60	20.67
	ST	55.72	22.45	55.34	22.11	57.16	25.00	54.97	28.45	22.28	25.00	22.62	18.97
	AL	56.63	32.65	55.95	32.31	57.69	37.93	54.97	28.49	34.01	38.79	33.33	33.62
	HCL	57.92	36.56	57.01	35.88	57.39	40.51	53.98	31.03	35.54	44.82	35.37	37.93

Table 3: Accuracy(%) of different LMs with different training strategies on MWP. ST, AL, HCL refer to skill training, applied learning and hierarchical curriculum learning respectively. RAW refers to testing on the origin GSM8k test set, HARD refers to testing on the augmented test set on specific atomic skill. In Mixture column, ARITH and UNIT refer to testing on the augmented test set on arithmetic and unit conversion skills respectively.

Method	Response	
ST	... The salesman sold 31 shoes for $31 * \$25 = 775$. Thus, the salesman made a profit of $775 - 340 = 435$. So the answer...	✗
AL	The salesman sold 31 sneakers for $31 * \$25 = 31 * 25 = 31 * 20 + 31 * 5 = 620 + 155 = 775$ throughout the rest of the...	✓
HCL	The salesman sold 31 shoes for \$25 each, so his profit was $31 * \$25 = 31 * 25 = 31 * 20 + 31 * 5 = 620 + 155 = 775$. In total ...	✓

Table 4: Example of LM’s response to MWP with different training strategies. The last column indicates whether the prerequisite task format has been integrated.

skill does not generalize from metrics perspective. Moreover, as shown in Tab. 4, ST model employs a format entirely distinct from that of the prerequisite task. This clearly indicates that atomic skills actually do not generalize from prerequisite tasks to complex tasks at all.

Atomic skills can be induced to generalize through applied learning. HCL introduce the second phase of applied learning to induce skill generalization in hierarchical curriculum learning. As seen in Tab. 3, LLaMA-2 significantly improve from 13.60% to 28.76% with zero-shot prompting in HARD, demonstrating the successful generalization of skills. Case studies from Tab. 4 further show that models after applied learning (AL and HCL) are capable of integrating data from prerequisites into their responses to MWP, thus performing accurate calculations. Therefore, although skills do not spontaneously generalize from prerequisite

tasks to compositional tasks, they can be induced through applied learning. Furthermore, we emphasize that this induced generalization needs to be achieved through training and cannot be replaced by few-shot prompting, as the metrics for few-shot learning do not surpass those for zero-shot learning.

The enhancement of compositional tasks stem from the improvement of atomic skills. We extract the atomic skill part from the responses on MWP and calculate their accuracy, shown in Fig. 4. Hierarchical curriculum learning results in significant improvements in arithmetic accuracy for all types of operations. The improvements are particularly striking for MixMul and MixAll, suggesting that current LMs are struggling to perform these arithmetic operations. These improvement is consistent with the gain in answer accuracy for compositional tasks, as detailed in Appendix D.1.

Furthermore, we conduct an error analysis of the responses, as seen in Fig. 5. We first determine if a response involves an atomic skill error, and subsequently categorize other mistakes. The majority of errors made by vanilla model stem from deficiencies in atomic skills. After applying HCL, a few of errors shift to be question misunderstood and reasoning errors, while most errors are fully corrected to the right answers. This demonstrates that the lack of atomic skills in a model *masks* its superior reasoning capabilities, and HCL can effectively address this.

Mixture training is also effective for skill generalization. As seen in the third column of Tab. 3,




Figure 4: Accuracy(%) of atomic skill on MWP of LLaMa-2. Left figure shows the results on RAW and right figure shows the results on HARD.




Figure 5: Error analysis on Vanilla model (left) and HCL model (right).

mixture training yields similar results to achieve skill generalization as individual training. On the LLaMA-2 model with zero-shot prompting, arithmetic performance increase from 13.60% to 25.85%, and unit conversion performance increase from 6.03% to 23.27%. Compared to individual training, mixture training leads to interactive effects, which depend on the intrinsic characteristics of the skills themselves. From the results, the improvement in arithmetic from mixed training is not as significant as individual training. However, improvement in unit conversion was higher, possibly because enhanced arithmetic skills positively affected unit conversion, as accurate calculations aid in better conversions.

Skill learning is indispensable in HCL. In Tab. 3, the performance of applied learning alone significantly lower than the full HCL. Fig. 6 left shows the accuracy of the applied learning and HCL with training increase and demonstrates that HCL reaches a better upper bound. We argue that this is because applied learning only teaches the formal application of the skills without imparting the associated knowledge.

Furthermore, we observe that applied learning requires much less data compared to skill training. In Fig. 6 right, applied learning converge before 200K tokens, whereas skill training necessitates over 600K tokens. This suggests that enhancing skills is more difficult than learning how to apply them. It underscores the educational principle that mastering prerequisite tasks is essential for solid-




Figure 6: Accuracy(%) of LLaMa-2 as training increases in different setting.

ifying atomic skills, while swift applied learning afterwards boosts the model’s practical application capabilities. In practical applications, it is often more challenging to obtain a large scale of heterogeneous compositional data than to acquire prerequisite data. The demand for data aligns with the challenges of data collection, which further demonstrates the feasibility of our approach.

5.2 RQ2: Do atomic skills exhibits cross dataset or cross domain generalization?

Given that the data in applied learning is sourced from GSM8k, we aim to ascertain whether skill generalization is also effective in out-of-distribution (OOD) data. We categorize the OOD data into two types: inter-domain and cross-domain. For inter-domain data, we use SVAMP (Patel et al., 2021) and MathQA (Amini et al., 2019), both of which comprise math word problems as well. As for cross-domain data, we use the MMLU-Physics (Hendrycks et al., 2021), as it is a physical task but also relies on arithmetic skill.

Skill generalization is effective in inter-domain data. As seen in Tab. 5, with applied learning, models generates responses using step-wise format, unlike the original model which answered directly. This demonstrates models can effectively utilize the skills even if the questions originating from a cross-dataset distribution.

Atomic skills can generalize across domains and show selective adaptability. In Tab. 5, the model perform arithmetic among physical quantities in the same format as in prerequisite tasks, indicating that skill generalization still exhibits effectiveness in cross-domain scenarios. LMs also exhibit selective adaptability when processing unseen data. For instance, when dealing with the exponential value “ 10^{-6} ” that is unseen in prerequisite tasks, LMs opt to answer in its original format. Our findings reveal that while we need to introduce some

Dataset	Response
SVAMP	SFT: They harvest 66 sacks per day and each sack contains 28 oranges so they harvest $66 * 28 = 1808$ oranges per day.
	HCL: They harvest 66 sacks per day, and each sack contains 28 oranges, so they harvest $66 * 28 = 66 * 20 + 66 * 8 = 1320 + 528 = 1848$ oranges per day.
MathQA	SFT: If selling an article for Rs. 1620 gives a 25% profit, then the percentage profit earned is $25/100 * 1620 = 405$.
	HCL: When the article is sold for Rs. 1620, the seller makes a profit of $25/100 * 1620 = 25 / 100 * 1620 = 0.25 * 1620 = 0.25 * 1000 + 0.25 * 600 + 0.25 * 20 + 0.25 * 0 = 250 + 150 + 5 + 0 = 400 + 5 + 0 = 405 + 0 = 405$. When the article is sold for Rs. 1280, the ...
MMLU -Physics	SFT: The stone’s speed in the air is $24 \text{ m/s} * 9.8 \text{ m/s}^2 = 24 * 9.8 = 22.8 = 22.8 \text{ m/s}$. The ...
	HCL: The horizontal component of the stone’s speed is $24 \text{ m/s} * 9.81 \text{ m/s}^2 = 24 * 9.81 = 24 * 9 + 24 * 0.8 + 24 * 0.01 = 216 + 19.2 + 0.24 = 235.2 + 0.24 = 235.44 = 235.44 \text{ m/s}$. The ...
	HCL: ... Thus, $R = PV/nT = (1.105 * 20 * 10^6) / (0.0451 * 273) = 8.314 \text{ J/mol} * K$. Since ...

Table 5: Example of response in cross-dataset and cross-domain scenarios.

compositional data during applied learning to induce skill generalization, it is not necessary to provide for every tasks. However, it is crucial to have well-designed prerequisite data that can be applied across a broad spectrum of scenarios.

5.3 RQ3: Can complex tasks help enhance atomic skills conversely?

Considering that applied learning data itself combines multiple atomic skills, it suggests that compositional data may also have a positive effect on atomic skills. We construct test dataset to assess the arithmetic skill, and then evaluate on the models with different training strategies.

Training with compositional data benefits the atomic skills, but the effect is limited. As shown in Tab. 6, applied learning achieve better performance in all operations compared to SFT, showing that compositional task have a positive effect on prerequisite data conversely. This lead to a promising conclusion that training on complex reasoning dataset not only improve the performance of the specific task but also benefits its prerequisite tasks, as long as they exhibit *composability* in response. We further discuss the improvement in

Method	AddSub	S-Mul	C-Mul	S-Div
<i>w/o Skill Training</i>				
Vanilla	76.84	51.65	22.91	70.67
AL	74.03 (-2.81)	52.32 (+0.67)	40.72 (+17.81)	78.94 (+8.27)
<i>w/ Skill Training</i>				
ST	97.54	95.75	93.45	78.19
HCL	98.59 (+1.05)	82.27 (-13.48)	93.82 (+0.37)	81.20 (+3.01)

Table 6: Accuracy(%) in prerequisite tasks of LMs with and without skill training.

Appendix D.2. Moreover, the gains brought by compositional tasks are minimal. Applied learning only results in an increase from 22.91% to 40.72% on C-Mul while skill training leads to a skyrocketing increase to 93.45%. We attribute this to the limited heterogeneous data for applied learning. The prerequisite tasks can automatically generate a large amount of heterogeneous data, but the compositional data is limited by the training set of the original training set for complex reasoning task. Therefore, applied learning alone can not sufficiently enhance atomic skills, further highlighting the importance of a skill training stage in hierarchical curriculum learning.

Continued training on compositional tasks does not lead to catastrophic forgetting on atomic skills. Models with skill learning already possess proficient atomic skills but there is a risk that training on heterogeneous data in applied learning may lead to catastrophic forgetting. However, as seen in Tab. 6, it striking is that HCL remains at a comparable level to skill training for most arithmetic operation. This illustrates that continuous training on a compositional tasks, can spontaneously prevent catastrophic forgetting of atomic skills. We suggest this due to the limited operations on compositional data in S-Mul, which may lead the model to be confused by other data within C-Mul. However, an anomaly is observed in S-Mul operation, which we further discuss in Appendix D.3.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we are the first to investigate the generalization from atomic tasks to complex reasoning tasks. We propose a probing framework, in which we select math word problems as research example and arithmetic and unit conversion as related atomic skills. By empirical experiments, we reveal that atomic skills can not spontaneously generalize to complex reasoning tasks. Furthermore, we propose a hierarchical curriculum learning strategy

to induce skill generalization and show effectiveness. Our experimental findings provide valuable guidance for designing better training strategies for complex reasoning tasks in future work.

Limitations

In this work, we choose math word problems as the research task, yet there are numerous more complicated reasoning tasks that rely on atomic skills, such as task planning, scenario modelling, decision making, and so on. Although we do not delve deeply into more complicated and pluralistic reasoning tasks, these areas emerge a particularly interesting direction for future research. Another limitation is that our proposed skill generalization depends on atomic skills that can be explicitly demonstrated in the response. It remains uncertain whether implicit atomic skills can also have a positive effect on complex reasoning tasks. Moreover, the definition of atomic skills and the method for prerequisite data generation are based on manual specification. It is worth exploring automated methodologies to design a complete framework for hierarchical curriculum learning in future work.

Ethical Considerations

All the data sources and language models used in this paper is available. In this paper, most of the data generation and evaluation are automated, except for the error analysis in § 5.1 where human evaluation is used. The details about human evaluation are provided in Appendix C.2. We protect the privacy rights of annotators. All annotators have been paid above the local minimum wage and consented to use the evaluation dataset for research purposes covered in our paper. Our work does not raise any ethical considerations regarding potential risks and does not involve the research of human subjects.

References

- Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. [MathQA: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2357–2367, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 41–48.
- Mayee F. Chen, Nicholas Roberts, Kush Bhatia, Jue Wang, Ce Zhang, Frederic Sala, and Christopher Ré. 2023. [Skill-it! a data-driven skills framework for understanding and training language models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2307.14430.
- 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Mohamed Elgaar and Hadi Amiri. 2023. [HuCurl: Human-induced curriculum discovery](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1862–1877, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. 2023. [Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1049–1065, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiunn Huang, John O’shaughnessy, and Robin Wagner. 2005. Prerequisite change and its effect on intermediate accounting performance. *Journal of Education for Business*, 80(5):283–288.
- Yuncheng Huang, Qianyu He, Jiaqing Liang, Sihang Jiang, Yanghua Xiao, and Yunwen Chen. 2023. Enhancing quantitative reasoning skills of large language models through dimension perception. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17532*.
- Shima Imani, Liang Du, and Harsh Shrivastava. 2023. [MathPrompter: Mathematical reasoning using large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 5: Industry Track)*, pages 37–42, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Lu Jiang, Deyu Meng, Qian Zhao, Shiguang Shan, and Alexander Hauptmann. 2015. Self-paced curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 29.

- Zixuan Ke and Bing Liu. 2022. Continual learning of natural language processing tasks: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12701*.
- Daniel Keysers, Nathanael Schärli, Nathan Scales, Hylke Buisman, Daniel Furrer, Sergii Kashubin, Nikola Momchev, Danila Sinopalnikov, Lukasz Stafiniak, Tibor Tihon, Dmitry Tsarkov, Xiao Wang, Marc van Zee, and Olivier Bousquet. 2020. [Measuring compositional generalization: A comprehensive method on realistic data](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.
- Muhammad Khalifa, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Moon-tae Lee, Honglak Lee, and Lu Wang. 2023. [Grace: Discriminator-guided chain-of-thought reasoning](#).
- Daniel Khashabi, Sewon Min, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Hananeh Hajishirzi. 2020. [UNIFIEDQA: Crossing format boundaries with a single QA system](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1896–1907, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joongwon Kim, Akari Asai, Gabriel Ilharco, and Hananeh Hajishirzi. 2023. [TaskWeb: Selecting better source tasks for multi-task NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11032–11052, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Najoung Kim and Tal Linzen. 2020. [COGS: A compositional generalization challenge based on semantic interpretation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9087–9105, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Brenden Lake and Marco Baroni. 2018. Generalization without systematicity: On the compositional skills of sequence-to-sequence recurrent networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2873–2882. PMLR.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Tiedong Liu and Bryan Kian Hsiang Low. 2023. Goat: Fine-tuned llama outperforms gpt-4 on arithmetic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14201*.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. 1989. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 24, pages 109–165. Elsevier.
- Matteo Muffo, Aldo Cocco, and Enrico Bertino. 2022. [Evaluating transformer language models on arithmetic operations using number decomposition](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 291–297, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Rodrigo Nogueira, Zhiying Jiang, and Jimmy Lin. 2021. Investigating the limitations of transformers with simple arithmetic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.13019*.
- Sungjin Park, Seungwoo Ryu, and Edward Choi. 2022. [Do language models understand measurements?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 1782–1792, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. 2021. [Are NLP models really able to solve simple math word problems?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2080–2094, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Allen A Rovick, Joel A Michael, Harold I Modell, David S Bruce, Barbara Horwitz, Thomas Adamson, Daniel R Richardson, Dee U Silverthorn, and Shirley A Whitescarver. 1999. How accurate are our assumptions about our students’ background knowledge? *Advances in Physiology Education*, 27(6):S93.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H. Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal V. Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Févry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Teven Le Scao, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M. Rush. 2022. [Multi-task prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04761*.
- Shaun Eric Scott. 2008. Student academic performance in skills-based technology courses delivered through different scheduling formats. *Dissertations & Theses - Gradworks*.

- Alon Talmor and Jonathan Berant. 2019. [MultiQA: An empirical investigation of generalization and transfer in reading comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4911–4921, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022a. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Richard T White and Robert M Gagné. 1974. Past and future research on learning hierarchies. *Educational psychologist*, 11(1):19–28.
- Xiaoxia Wu, Ethan Dyer, and Behnam Neyshabur. 2021. [When do curricula work?](#) In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Benfeng Xu, Licheng Zhang, Zhendong Mao, Quan Wang, Hongtao Xie, and Yongdong Zhang. 2020. [Curriculum learning for natural language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6095–6104, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qinyuan Ye, Bill Yuchen Lin, and Xiang Ren. 2021. [CrossFit: A few-shot learning challenge for cross-task generalization in NLP](#). pages 7163–7189.

A Detail for Training Data

A.1 Arithmetic Prerequisite Task

We construct data for arithmetic prerequisite task by a rule-based approach, seen in Algorithm 1. The difficulty of the data considers four aspects: the number of hops, the length of a significant digit, the type of value and the type of operation. The number of hops ranges from two to five, the more hops means the harder it is. The significant digit length ranges from one to eight. Longer length means the more complex and difficult for calculations. Value types include: all integers, all floating, and mixed data types, with increasing difficulty. Operation types include AddSub, W-Mul, C-Mul and S-Div. Among them, AddSub consists of only addition and subtraction, S-Mul involves simple multiplication operations (the second value with a significant figure of 1), C-Mul encompasses complex multiplication operations where we break down the second number and perform step-wise calculations, and S-Div represents simple division.

Algorithm 1: Arithmetic Data Generation

Data: Operation set O , Significant Digit set D , Value type set V , Hop set H
Result: Arithmetic Expression E , Response R

```
// Initialization
1  $h \leftarrow \text{Random}(H)$ ;  $o \leftarrow \text{Random}(O)$ ;
2  $d \leftarrow \text{Random}(D)$ ;  $v \leftarrow \text{Random}(V)$ ;
3  $num_0 \leftarrow \text{NumberGenerator}(d, v)$ ;  $E \leftarrow num_0$ ;
// Expression generation
4 for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $h$  do
5    $op \leftarrow \text{OperationGenerator}(o)$ ;
6    $n_{i+1} \leftarrow \text{NumberGenerator}(d, v, op)$ ;
7    $E \leftarrow E \circ op \circ n_{i+1}$ ;
8 end
9  $R \leftarrow \text{ResponseGeneration}(E)$ ;
10 return  $E, R$ ;
// Iterative response generation
11 Function  $\text{ResponseGeneration}(exp)$ :
12    $i \leftarrow idx$  if exists  $op_{idx}$  in  $MulDiv$  else 0;
13    $E_p \leftarrow (n_0, op_0, \dots, op_{i-1}, n_i)$ ;
14    $E_s \leftarrow (op_{i+1}, \dots, n_n)$ ;
15    $SR \leftarrow \text{OneHopResponse}(n_i, op_i, n_{i+1})$ ;
16    $n_{new} \leftarrow \text{eval}(n_i, op_i, n_{i+1})$ ;
17    $MR \leftarrow \text{MergeResponse}(E_p, SR, E_s)$ ;
18    $E \leftarrow E_p \circ n_{new} \circ E_s$ ;
19   return  $MR + \text{ResponseGeneration}(E)$ ;
// One Hop COT response generation
20 Function  $\text{OneHopResponse}(n_0, op, n_1)$ :
21   if  $op = \text{"C-MUL"}$  then
22      $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_m \leftarrow \text{SplitDigits}(n_1)$ ;
23      $SR \leftarrow \text{SplitCOT}(n_0, w_0, w_1, \dots, w_m)$ ;
24      $SR += \text{MulCOT}(n_0, w_0, w_1, \dots, w_m)$ ;
25      $SR += \text{AddCOT}(n_0 * w_0, \dots, n_0 * w_m)$ ;
26   else
27      $SR \leftarrow \text{Eval}(n_0, op, n_1)$ ;
28   end
29   return  $SR$ ;
```

In Algorithm 1, reponse demonstrates a step-wise arithmetic process based on hop. For C-Mul operation, the second value is split and then perform bit-wise multiplication and results addition. SplitCOT, MulCOT and AddCOT represent the process of digits splitting, bit-wise multiplication and results addition respectively.

A.2 Unit Conversion Prerequisite Task

We construct data for unit conversion prerequisite task based on DimUnitKB (Huang et al., 2023). We first extract the quantity types of units contained in the MWP, including seven type in total: length, time, speed, mass, volume, area and power. We construct pair-wise conversion data for units representing the same quantity types, detailed in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: UnitConv. Data Generation

Data: Quantity Type Set Q , DimUnitKB K
Result: Unit Conversion Text Data T

```
// Select random quantity type and units
1  $q \leftarrow \text{Random}(S)$ ;
2  $U_q \leftarrow \{u \in K \mid u.type = q\}$ ;
3  $u_0, u_1 \leftarrow \text{Random}(U_q, 2)$ ;
// Calculate conversion ratio
4  $conv \leftarrow u_0.conv / u_1.conv$ ;
// Generate conversion text
5  $T \leftarrow \text{TextGeneration}(u_0, u_1, conv)$ ;
6 return  $T$ ;
```

A.3 Compositional Data

In applied learning, we need to construct data that integrates atomic skills into compositional tasks. The construction of compositional data consists of the following steps:

1. Sample data items from the train set of complex reasoning tasks.
2. Extract all segments related to atomic skills from the response of the item.
3. Use the ResponseGeneration function and TextGeneration function in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 to generate the new format of response for atomic skill.
4. Replace all segments related to atomic skills with the new answer response to construct compositional data.

For example, in arithmetic, we extract the arithmetic segments “12 * 37 = 448” from the response “the total length of the ribbon is: 12 * 37 = 448 cm” and then replace it with “12 * 37 = 12 * (30 + 7)

Dataset	# w/ unit conv.	# Length	# Mass	# Power
GSM8k _{RAW}	61	3	5	2
GSM8k _{HARD}	116	10	13	4

Table 7: Partial statistic of RAW and HARD set.

Algorithm 3: Augmenting MWP on Arith.

Input: Original math problem (Q_{RAW}, A_{RAW})
Output: Enhanced math problem (Q_{HARD}, A_{HARD})

- 1 $N \leftarrow \text{ExtractNumber}(Q_{RAW});$
- 2 $I \leftarrow \text{ExtractNumber}(A_{RAW}) \setminus N;$
// Determine the computational relationship for I
- 3 $f \leftarrow \text{ExtractMapping}(A_{RAW});$
- 4 $D \leftarrow \text{Random a maximum significant digit length};$
// Generate new numbers for N with length $\leq D$
- 5 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** $\text{Length}(N)$ **do**
- 6 $N[i] \leftarrow \text{RandomNumber}(D);$
- 7 **end**
// Compute new values for I based on f and updated N
- 8 $I \leftarrow f(N, I);$
// Substitute the new numbers into the original problem
- 9 $Q_{HARD}, A_{HARD} \leftarrow \text{Substitute}(Q_{RAW}, A_{RAW}, N, I);$
- 10 **return** $Q_{HARD}, A_{HARD};$

= $12 * 30 + 12 * 7 = 360 + 84 = 444$ ” to get the compositional data “the total length of the ribbon is: $12 * 37 = 12 * (30 + 7) = 12 * 30 + 12 * 7 = 360 + 84 = 444$ cm”.

B Detail for Evaluation Data

B.1 Deficiency of GSM8K in Skill Assessment

GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) is the current widely used evaluation benchmark for math word problem. However, it does not comprehensively cover the application of atomic skills across various difficulty levels. We analyze the difficulty coverage of GSM8k on arithmetic, taking into account four aspects mentioned in Section A.1, as depicted in Fig. 3 (left). Darker colours indicate more difficult, and a greater area signifies a larger volume of data. It shows that the GSM8k test set comprehensively covers various operation hops, operation types, and value types. However, the significant digits involved are primarily focused on simple data. GSM8k dataset also lacks comprehensiveness on unit conversion skills. The statistic is shown in Tab. 7. It covers only a few unit expressions in various types.

B.2 Method for Data Augmenting

As for arithmetic, we augment the evaluation data through increasing the significant digit lengths

Model	GSM8k _{RAW}		GSM8k _{HARD}	
	overall	w/ unit conv.	overall	w/ unit conv.
LLaMa-2-7B	27.16	21.31	14.44	1.72
Mistral-7B	45.10	47.54	29.46	13.79

Table 8: Performance of LLaMa-2 on RAW and HARD dataset in unit conversion skill.

Algorithm 4: Augmenting MWP on Unit Conversion.

Input: Original math problem (Q_{RAW}, A_{RAW}), DimUnitKB K
Output: Augmented problem (Q_{HARD}, A_{HARD})

- 1 $u_0 \leftarrow \text{ExtractTargetUnit}(Q_{RAW}, K);$
- 2 $q \leftarrow \text{GetQuantityKind}(u_0, K);$
// Randomly select a new unit with the same quantity type
- 3 $U_1 \leftarrow \text{RandomSelect}(\{u \in K \mid u.\text{type} = q\});$
- 4 $conv \leftarrow u_0.\text{conv} / u_1.\text{conv};$
- 5 $(Q_{HARD}, A_{HARD}) \leftarrow \text{Substitute}(Q_{RAW}, A_{RAW}, u_0, u_1, conv);$
- 6 **return** $Q_{HARD}, A_{HARD};$

without changing the logic of the original problems and denote as HARD set. The algorithm is outlined in Algorithm 3. Initially, we extract the numbers in the question, along with the intermediate numbers in the answer, and the computation relationships between them. Subsequently, we randomly get new numbers based on the maximum significant value length, and compute new intermediate numbers accordingly. These updated numbers are then integrated into the original question and answer, resulting in an enhanced question-answer pairs. As shown in Fig. 3 (right), the HARD set covers a broader range of significant digits. The new data distribution is reasonable with the proportion decreasing appropriately as the difficulty increases.

As for unit conversion, we augment the test data by including a wider variety of unit representations. The algorithm is outlined in Algorithm 3. We evaluate LLAMA-2 on both RAW and HARD. As shown in Table 8, the results suggest that the HARD set provides greater differentiation.

C Experimental Details

The implementations of all the LMs in our paper are based on the HuggingFace Transformers² and DeepSpeed³. We set the learning rate in $1e-5$, $1e-6$ with a WarmupLR scheduler, batch size of 32, max sequence length of 1024 and train for 8 epochs. All of our experiments are conducted on the worksta-

²<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers/>

³<https://github.com/microsoft/DeepSpeed>

tions of NVIDIA A800 PCIe with 80GB memory and the environment of Ubuntu 20.04.6 LTS and torch 2.0.1. In the evaluation, we employ vllm⁴ for inference. All the result are generate with a greedy decoding strategy.

We do not utilize additional prompts for prerequisite data but employ the prompt from Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023) for training and testing on MWP.

C.1 The Ratio Selection for Replay Strategy

We retain some training examples from MWP and mix them with prerequisite task data to ensure the model retains its original problem-solving abilities in skill training. Fig. 7 shows the performance of the model at different mixing ratios on prerequisite tasks (atomic skills) and complex reasoning tasks.




Figure 7: Accuracy of LMs on prerequisite tasks and complex reasoning tasks with different mixing ratio.

Overall, as the proportion of prerequisite data increases, the model become better in atomic skills and worse in solving MWP. The balanced mixing ratios vary for different skills. Arithmetic requires more prerequisite data than unit conversion. Ultimately, we chose to set the mixing ratio for arithmetic to 10 and for unit conversion to 1 in skill training, to achieve a relatively effective continual learning.

C.2 Human Evaluation for Error Analysis

We recruite human evaluators to do error analysis on math word problem. All evaluators possess sufficient knowledge of mathematics and are provided with the necessary background for the evaluation criteria. Each item is annotated by at least three evaluators and inconsistencies will lead to a re-assessment.

The evaluation of the response is divided into four types: 1.Atomic skill error: an error occurs within the atomic skill segment, e.g., an error in performing complex multiplication; 2.Question Misunderstood: the wrong value is used due to a misunderstanding of the question; and 3.Reason error:

incorrect representation due to an error in the reasoning process. 4.Correct: indicating that both the reasoning process and the answer are completely correct; The priority of these four types of classifications decreases in order.

D Additional Results

D.1 The correlation of atomic skills

Fig. 8 illustrates the correlation between the accuracy gains in prerequisite tasks and compositional tasks. A higher performance on prerequisite tasks indicates a stronger atomic skill of the model, revealing a positive correlation between the model’s atomic skills and its capability to solve compositional tasks. This supports our conclusion that the gains brought by our method are attributable to the enhancement of atomic skills.




Figure 8: Accuracy gain (%) on prerequisite tasks and composisiton tasks.

D.2 Compositional task is not enough to enhanced atomic skills

We mention in Section 5.3 that the compositional task improves atomic skills, but the effect is limited. It can be seen from Tab. 9 that although the AL method learn the COT form to answer, it has not acquired complete knowledge, hence it cannot result in a completely correct answer.

D.3 Abnormal Results in S-Mu1

We mention in Section 5.3 that HCL exhibit abnormal decline in S-Mu1 compared to ST. We observe that most of the error comes from the incorrect of magnitude. For example, HCL model reponse in “0.00261” when calculating “2.61 * 0.01” while the correct answer is “0.0261”. We argue that this is primarily because the special operation S-Mu1 rarely occurs in compositional data, as we sample all values uniformly. Whereas in the skill learning phase,

⁴<https://github.com/vllm-project/vllm>

we construct a large amount of training data for the S-Mul operation. It indicates that the property of avoiding catastrophic forgetting mentioned in Section 5.3 is conditional. The distribution of atomic skills in compositional data being the same as in the prerequisite task. The distribution of atomic skills within composite data needs to be consistent with the distribution in the prerequisite task, otherwise the phenomenon of catastrophic forgetting may still occur.

D.4 Additional Examples on MWP

We supplement § 5.1 with more complete examples, as shown in Tab. 10.

#	Method	Response	COT	CORRECT
1	AL	$495.3 + 996.8 = 1491.1$	-	✗
	HCL	$495.3 + 996.8 = 1492.1$	-	✓
2	AL	$6.8 \cdot 0.1 = 68.33$	-	✗
	HCL	$68 \cdot 0.1 = 68$	-	✓
3	AL	$18.4 * 9.945 = 18.4 * 9 + 18.4 * 0.9 + 18.4 * 0.04 + 18.4 * 0.005 = 166.6 + 16.66 + 0.736 + 0.092 = 183.26 + 0.736 + 0.092 = 183.996 + 0.092 = 184.088$	✓	✗
	HCL	$18.4 * 9.945 = 18.4 * 9 + 18.4 * 0.9 + 18.4 * 0.04 + 18.4 * 0.005 = 165.6 + 16.56 + 0.736 + 0.092 = 182.16 + 0.736 + 0.092 = 182.896 + 0.092 = 182.988$	✓	✓
4	AL	$69.4 * 81.8 = 69.4 * 80 + 69.4 * 1 + 69.4 * 0.8 = 5552 + 6.94 + 55.52 = 5618.94 + 55.52 = 5674.462$	✓	✗
	HCL	$69.4 * 81.8 = 69.4 * 80 + 69.4 * 1 + 69.4 * 0.8 = 5552 + 69.4 + 55.52 = 5621.4 + 55.52 = 5676.92$	✓	✓
5	AL	$2.94 * 8.21 = 2.94 * 8 + 2.94 * 0.2 + 2.94 * 0.01 = 23.48 + 0.588 + 0.0294 = 24.068 + 0.0294 = 24.0974$	✓	✗
	HCL	$2.94 * 8.21 = 2.94 * 8 + 2.94 * 0.2 + 2.94 * 0.01 = 23.52 + 0.588 + 0.0294 = 24.108 + 0.0294 = 24.1374$	✓	✓
6	AL	$539.25 - 418.4 = 120.8$	-	✗
	HCL	$539.25 - 418.4 = 120.85$	-	✓

Table 9: Example of the response in prerequisite task of different training strategies. COT indicates whether the model answer with a COT format and CORRECT indicates whether the final answer is correct. We mark the areas that led to errors in red.

Method	Response	SKILL	CORRECT
Question	Jill gets paid \$631 per hour to teach and \$30 to be a cheerleading coach. If she works 38 weeks a year, 32 hours a week as a teacher and 15 hours a week as a coach, what's her annual salary?		
ST	Jill works 38 weeks a year * 32 hours a week = 1304 hours a year as a teacher. She earns 1304 hours a year * \$631 a hour = \$800800 a year as a teacher. As a coach, Jill works 15 hours a week * 38 weeks a year = 570 hours a year. She earns 570 hours a year * \$30 a hour = \$17100 a year as a coach. Therefore, Jill's annual salary is \$17100 + \$800800 = \$802900.	X	X
AL	As a teacher, Jill works 38*32 = 38 * 30 + 38 * 2 = 1140 + 76 = 1216 weeks. She earns 1216*\$631 = 1216 * 600 + 1216 * 30 + 1216 * 1 = 731600 + 36480 + 1216 = 768080 + 1216 = 769296. As a coach, Jill works 38*15 = 38 * 10 + 38 * 5 = 380 + 190 = 570 weeks. She earns 570*\$30 = 570 * 30 + 570 * 0 = 17100 + 0 = 17100. Annually, she earns \$769296+\$17100 = \$786396	X	X
HCL	Jill earns 38 weeks * 32 hours/week = 38 * 30 + 38 * 2 = 1140 + 76 = 1216 hours a year as a teacher. She earns 1216 hours/year * \$631/hour = 1216 * 600 + 1216 * 30 + 1216 * 1 = 729600 + 36480 + 1216 = 766080 + 1216 = 767296 a year as a teacher. She earns 15 hours/week * \$30/hour = 15 * 30 = 15 * 30 + 15 * 0 = 450 + 0 = 450 a week as a coach. In a year, she earns \$450/week * 38 weeks/year = 450 * 38 = 450 * 30 + 450 * 8 = 13500 + 3600 = 17100 as a coach. Her total salary is \$767296 + \$17100 = 784396.	✓	✓
Question	A raspberry bush has 911 clusters of 637 fruit each and 797 individual fruit scattered across the bush. How many raspberries are there total?		
ST	There are 911 clusters of raspberries, each with 637 fruit, so there are 911 * 637 = 545702 raspberries in the clusters. There are also 797 individual raspberries, so there are a total of 545702 + 797 = 553699 raspberries on the bush.	X	X
AL	There are 911 clusters of raspberries on the bush, so there are 911 * 637 = 911 * 600 + 911 * 30 + 911 * 7 = 546600 + 27330 + 6377 = 573930 + 6377 = 580307 raspberries in the clusters. There are also 797 individual raspberries scattered across the bush, so there are a total of 580307 + 797 = 581104 raspberries.	✓	✓
HCL	First find the total number of fruit in the clusters: 911 clusters * 637 fruit/cluster = 911 * 600 + 911 * 30 + 911 * 7 = 546600 + 27330 + 6377 = 573930 + 6377 = 580307 fruit. Then add the number of individual fruit to find the total number of fruit: 580307 fruit + 797 fruit = 581104 fruit.	✓	✓
Question	A glass of milk is 668 ounces of milk. John drinks 671 glasses of milk. If milk has 949 calories per ounce how many calories did he consume?		
ST	He drank 671*668= 405508 ounces of milk. That means he consumed 405508*949=36545720 calories.	X	X
AL	He drank 668*671= 668 * 600 + 668 * 70 + 668 * 1 = 400800 + 46760 + 668 = 447560 + 668 = 448228 ounces of milk. That means he consumed 448228*949 = 448228 * 900 + 448228 * 40 + 448228 * 9 = 393405200 + 17929120 + 3934052 = 411334320 + 3934052 = 415268372 calories.	X	X
HCL	He drank 671*668 = 671 * 600 + 671 * 60 + 671 * 8 = 402600 + 40260 + 5368 = 442860 + 5368 = 448228 ounces of milk. So he consumed 448228*949= 448228 * 900 + 448228 * 40 + 448228 * 9 = 403405200 + 17929120 + 4034052 = 421334320 + 4034052 = 425368372 calories.	✓	✓

Table 10: Example of the response in complex reasoning task of different training strategies. SKILL indicates whether the model fail in atomic skills (arithmetic). CORRECT indicates whether the final answer is correct. We mark the areas that led to errors in red.