

Generalized Preference Optimization: A Unified Approach to Offline Alignment

Yunhao Tang^β, Zhaohan Daniel Guo^β, Zeyu Zheng^β, Daniele Calandriello^β, Rémi Munos^β, Mark Rowland^β, Pierre Harvey Richemond^β, Michal Valko^β, Bernardo Ávila Pires^β and Bilal Piot^β

^βGoogle DeepMind

Offline preference optimization allows fine-tuning large models directly from offline data, and has proved effective in recent alignment practices. We propose generalized preference optimization (GPO), a family of offline losses parameterized by a general class of convex functions. GPO enables a unified view over preference optimization, encompassing existing algorithms such as DPO, IPO and SLiC as special cases, while naturally introducing new variants. The GPO framework also sheds light on how offline algorithms enforce regularization, through the design of the convex function that defines the loss. Our analysis and experiments reveal the connections and subtle differences between the offline regularization and the KL divergence regularization intended by the canonical RLHF formulation. In all, our results present new algorithmic toolkits and empirical insights to alignment practitioners.

1. Introduction

Reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) has been a canonical paradigm for aligning powerful AI systems along human values (Christiano et al., 2017; Ouyang et al., 2022), as demonstrated by recent advances in large language models (LLMs) (Achiam et al., 2023; Team et al., 2023). RLHF consists of two steps: reward modeling, which trains a reward model r_ϕ to capture human preferences from a dataset of pair-wise comparison; and regularized policy optimization, which aligns the AI systems against the learned reward model, more formally as below

$$\max_{\theta} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta} [r_\phi(y)]}_{\text{reward maximization}} - \beta \underbrace{\text{KL}(\pi_\theta, \pi_{\text{ref}})}_{\text{regularization}}.$$

Lately, directly aligning AI systems from pair-wise comparison datasets has become increasingly common (e.g., Azar et al., 2023; Rafailov et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023), as evidenced by progress in open source models (e.g., Jiang et al., 2024). Compared to canonical RL algorithms, such methods are more computationally efficient as they do not require expensive sampling from the models. They also avoid learning reward models altogether, and effectively replace RLHF with a supervised learning problem, which is convenient from various practical perspectives. We refer to such methods as *offline preference optimization*, as they seek to optimize human preferences using offline datasets. Here, *offline* stresses the fact that such datasets are not generated by interactive data collections from the learned model.

Our first contribution is to provide a unifying view over notable existing offline preference optimization algorithms, such as DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023), IPO (Azar et al., 2023) and SLiC (Zhao et al., 2023). To this end, we propose GPO (Generalized Preference Optimization), which parameterizes preference optimization losses via a family of convex functions f , with DPO, IPO, and SLiC as special cases (see Figure 1 for a preview of the instantiations). The central insight to our derivation is that one can interpret the problem of reward modeling as a supervised binary classification problem (Hastie et al., 2009). The rich literature on supervised binary classification paves the way to unifying existing offline preference optimization algorithms, and naturally introduces new algorithms not yet in the current




Figure 1 | Illustration of offline preference optimization losses $\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [f(\rho_\theta)]$ as a function of the difference of log ratio $\rho_\theta = \log \pi_\theta(y_w) / \pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w) - \log \pi_\theta(y_l) / \pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l)$. DPO applies the (scaled) logistic loss $\frac{1}{\log 2} \log(1 + \exp(-\rho_\theta))$, SLiC applies the hinge loss $\max(0, 1 - \rho_\theta)$, while IPO applies the square loss $(\rho_\theta - 1)^2$. All losses can be understood as convex approximations to the 0-1 loss that measures the binary classification accuracy. Any other convex loss alternatives to the above examples provide offline preference optimization losses not in the existing literature, as we show in Table 1.

literature. The GPO formulation also helps better understand the algorithmic trade-offs between different variants, particularly, the strength of regularization, which we further dive into.

With a unifying view over offline preference optimization algorithms, our second contribution is to dive into the regularization mechanism induced by offline losses. We see that the tail behavior of the convex function f , governs the effective strength of regularization induced between π_θ and π_{ref} , which offers insight on the choice of hyper-parameters such as β . We identify the offline regularization, computed based on the offline dataset, and show how it generally differs from the KL divergence intended in the initial formulation. Our analysis and empirical results hint at some challenges to enforcing the KL divergence constraints with offline losses, revealing some of the subtleties of the ‘equivalence’ arguments adopted in prior work to derive offline losses (see also Theorem 1 for a more general version of the equivalence argument).

The paper is organized as follows:

- In Section 2, we present GPO, generalized policy optimization, which parameterizes offline preference optimization algorithms through a convex function. This recovers a few popular algorithms as special cases and offers insights to offline alignment algorithms in general.
- In Section 3, we expand on the derivation of reward modeling as a binary classification problem. Our insight allows for connecting a rich literature on supervised classification to the designs of offline alignment, which paves the way to the GPO formulation.
- In Section 4, we dive into how offline preference optimization induces regularization between π_θ and π_{ref} during optimization. We identify an offline regularization loss, the effective regularization that offline algorithms enforce, and show how it differs from the KL divergence through analysis and experimental study. We also show how the design of f introduces different strength of regularization, and how hyper-parameters should be chosen adaptive to f .

- In Section 5, we show how GPO variants perform relative to one another on a LLM summarization task. In this particular case, we find that choosing the right value for β is more important than which GPO variant to apply.

2. A general family of offline preference optimization losses

In the case of language model alignment, we optimize a policy π_θ that outputs response $y \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x)$ given prompt x . Given two responses $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$, a human rater provides feedback by picking out the preferred response. This allows relabeling the two responses as (y_w, y_l) corresponding to the win-loss responses. Such pair-wise preference data is usually collected offline and can come from a variety of sources in practice, which we denote as a behavior policy μ . Henceforth, when the context is clear we remove the dependency on the prompt x for simplicity.

Importantly, we do not make any assumption on the preference structure $p(y > y')$, e.g., it may not come from a Bradley-Terry (BT) model (Bradley and Terry, 1952), a common assumption made in prior work (Rafailov et al., 2023). Below, we unify ways to derive various existing offline preference optimization losses for learning from pair-wise human feedback.

2.1. A recipe to derive preference optimization losses

Assuming access to a reward function r_ϕ , the regularized policy optimization objective is (Ouyang et al., 2022)

$$\max_{\pi_\theta} \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta} [r_\phi(y)] - \beta \mathbb{KL}(\pi_\theta, \pi_{\text{ref}}). \quad (1)$$

To be clear about the KL definition, we have for any two distributions π, π' : $\mathbb{KL}(\pi, \pi') := \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi} \left[\log \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi'(y)} \right]$. The solution to the regularized objective above writes analytically as $\pi_\theta^*(y) \propto \pi_{\text{ref}}(y) \exp(\beta^{-1} r_\phi(y))$.

Given a pair of responses (y_w, y_l) , we can train the reward model r_ϕ through supervised learning. A convenient class of loss function is defined through the difference $r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l)$: we can think of $r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l)$ as predicting how likely y_w is preferred to y_l . From the discussion above, we see that this difference is equivalent to the log ratio difference of the optimal policy to Eqn (1)

$$r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l) = \beta \left(\log \frac{\pi_\theta^*(y_w)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w)} - \log \frac{\pi_\theta^*(y_l)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l)} \right). \quad (2)$$

Hence intuitively, any loss defined through the reward difference $r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l)$ can introduce a loss over π_θ .

A central insight of this work is framing reward learning as a supervised binary classification problem. We leave a more detailed derivation to Section 3, which provides additional insights. Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a scalar function, in general the reward learning loss (to be *minimized*) writes as

$$\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [f(r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l))]. \quad (3)$$

Before moving on, note that the difference $r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l)$ is reminiscent of the BT model assumption. However, we argue that it is more sensible to relate this parametric form to the fact that the RLHF formulation (Eqn 1) is a maximization problem, and hence imply that each response can be characterized as a single scalar $r_\phi(y)$. We provide a more detailed discussion in Section 3.

All existing offline preference optimization losses can be cast in this general form by replacing the reward difference by the log ratio difference,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} \left[f \left(\beta \cdot \left(\log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_w)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w)} - \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_l)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l)} \right) \right) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Table 1 | Side-by-side correspondence between existing offline preference optimization losses and convex supervised learning losses. Among a rich variety of convex supervised learning losses developed in the literature, logistic log loss (Hastie et al., 2009), hinge loss (Cortes and Vapnik, 1995) and square loss (Rosasco et al., 2004) have offline preference optimization algorithmic counterparts. Other notable losses, such as the exponential loss (Freund and Schapire, 1995), truncated quadratic loss (Bartlett et al., 2006) and Savage loss (Masnadi-Shirazi and Vasconcelos, 2008) can form novel offline preference optimization algorithms.

SUPERVISED LEARNING LOSSES	$f(\beta\rho_\theta)$	OFFLINE PREFERENCE OPTIMIZATION
LOGISTIC LOG LOSS	$\log(1 + \exp(-\beta\rho_\theta))$	DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023)
HINGE LOSS	$\max(0, 1 - \beta\rho_\theta)$	SLiC (Zhao et al., 2023)
SQUARE LOSS	$(\beta\rho_\theta - 1)^2$	IPO (Azar et al., 2023)
EXPONENTIAL LOSS	$\exp(-\beta\rho_\theta)$	N/A
TRUNCATED QUADRATIC LOSS	$(\max(0, 1 - \beta\rho_\theta))^2$	N/A
SAVAGE LOSS	$1/(1 + \exp(\beta\rho_\theta))^2$	N/A

Henceforth, we denote the log ratio difference as $\rho_\theta := \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_w)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_w)} - \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_l)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_l)}$ and the above loss rewrites as $\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [f(\beta\rho_\theta)]$. A general recipe to derive offline preference optimization losses, is to start with a supervised learning loss function f for reward learning, and replace the reward difference by ρ_θ (see, e.g., Hastie et al., 2009 for a nice overview of such loss functions). We can identify the specific functions f for the most common choices, see illustrations of the losses in Figure 1 with $\beta = 1$.

- DPO: $f(\beta\rho_\theta) = -\log \sigma(\beta\rho_\theta)$ with σ being the sigmoid function, applies the logistic loss (Hastie et al., 2009). The loss can also be written as $\log(1 + \exp(-\beta\rho_\theta))$.
- IPO: $f(\beta\rho_\theta) = (\beta\rho_\theta - 1)^2$, the squared function (Rosasco et al., 2004), can be understood as applying linear regression to the probability that y_w is preferred (Hastie et al., 2009).
- SLiC: $f(\beta\rho_\theta) = \max(0, 1 - \beta\rho_\theta)$ is the hinge loss function, stemming from the max-margin (support vector machine) paradigm (Boser et al., 1992; Cortes and Vapnik, 1995).

2.2. GPO: A generalized family of offline preference optimization algorithms

Building on the discussion above, in general, any properly defined supervised learning loss f for reward modeling can translate into a preference optimization objective $\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [f(\beta\rho_\theta)]$. We provide a table of a few notable supervised learning losses developed in the decades-old literature, each loss mapping into an offline preference optimization algorithm.

As discussed above, some of them have already translated into existing methods. We note a few examples without offline preference optimization counterparts:

- Exponential loss: $f(\beta\rho_\theta) = \exp(-\beta\rho_\theta)$, the loss function for the AdaBoost algorithm (Freund and Schapire, 1995).
- Truncated quadratic: $f(\beta\rho_\theta) = (\max(0, 1 - \beta\rho_\theta))^2$ (Bartlett et al., 2006), a truncated variant of the square loss, is also a smooth approximation to the hinge loss.
- Savage loss: $f(\beta\rho_\theta) = 1/(1 + \exp(\beta\rho_\theta))^2$ (Masnadi-Shirazi and Vasconcelos, 2008) which have proved robust to outliers in data and found applications in boosting algorithms.

Bartlett et al. (2006); Rosasco et al. (2004) give a more exhaustive list of convex supervised learning losses and their discussions.




Figure 2 | Illustration of notable examples of binary classification loss functions, including both examples (logistic, squared and hinge) that have led to existing offline preference optimization algorithms, as well as others (exponential, truncated squared, savage) that produce novel losses.

A key motivating argument for the offline preference optimization algorithms (Azar et al., 2023; Rafailov et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023) is that minimizing the offline losses for the policy π_θ is equivalent to obtaining the optimal regularized policy against a loss minimizing reward model. We can extend the conclusion to this general family of offline preference optimization algorithms.

Theorem 1. (Equivalence of optimal solutions) Let π_θ^* be the global minimizer of the offline preference optimization loss in Eqn (4). π_θ^* is the same as the optimal regularized policy (according to Eqn (1)) for a reward function that globally minimizes the loss Eqn (3).

3. Reward modeling viewed as a binary classification problem

Here, we take a step back and dive into the derivation that converts reward modeling into a supervised binary classification problem. We provide a brief background on the basic setup, and how it relates to reward modeling (see, e.g., (Hastie et al., 2009) for a more comprehensive introduction).

In binary classification, given a pair of feature and label (z, l) with $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $l \in \{-1, 1\}$, the aim is to predict $\hat{\ell}(z) \in \mathbb{R}$ as a function of the feature, and use $\text{sign}(\hat{\ell}(z))$ as the classifier, in the hope that it can match the ground truth label y . The classification accuracy can be written as $\mathbb{E} \left[\text{sign}(\hat{\ell}(z) \cdot l) \right]$ and an equivalent loss function is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[1 - \text{sign}(\hat{\ell}(z) \cdot l) \right]. \quad (5)$$

The above loss, known as the 0-1 loss (see the dotted dark curve in Figure 1) is non-convex. Instead of directly optimizing it, we can take smooth convex functions $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and approximate the loss as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f(\hat{\ell}(z) \cdot l) \right].$$

Taking this back to the case of reward modeling, given a pair of responses (y_1, y_2) , we construct a sample for binary classification by setting the label $\ell = 1$ if $y_1 > y_2$ and $\ell = -1$ otherwise.

Thinking of (y_1, y_2) as the feature from which to make prediction, in general the prediction would be a bi-variate function $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2)$ that can depend on both y_1 and y_2 in an arbitrary form. For a point-wise reward model that depends on a single response $r_\phi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, an intuitive parameterization would be to take the difference of two rewards $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2) = r_\phi(y_1) - r_\phi(y_2)$. The corresponding binary classification loss is

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{y_1 \sim \mu, y_2 \sim \mu} \left[\mathbb{I}[y_1 > y_2] f(r_\phi(y_1) - r_\phi(y_2)) \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E}_{y_1 \sim \mu, y_2 \sim \mu} \left[\mathbb{I}[y_2 > y_1] f(r_\phi(y_2) - r_\phi(y_1)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, we can write the loss as in Eqn (3)

$$\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} \left[f(r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l)) \right].$$

The above result offers a number of interesting implications.

3.1. Characterizing what the reward model learns

Drawing inspiration from the supervised learning literature, we can reason about properties of the reward models obtained by minimizing the convex loss function f . This can translate into effects on the downstream optimized policies due to the equivalence in Eqn (2). We provide some discussion below.

The Bradley-Terry assumption and analytic forms of reward models. As alluded to earlier, the design of the reward modeling loss as a function of the reward difference $r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l)$ should be interpreted as a result of the reward maximization formulation of RLHF. Implicitly, the maximization formulation assumes that there is a total order on all the responses (i.e., they can be ranked in a monotonic order), which intuitively is captured by the BT assumption to a large extent. Meanwhile when there is no total order, the formulation Eqn (1) would not be perfect, and one might need to resort to alternative solution concepts such as Nash equilibrium (Munos et al., 2023; Swamy et al., 2024).

In general, one should train a pair-wise preference model $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2) = r_\phi(y_1, y_2)$ rather than point-wise reward models, for which there could be characterizations on the properties of the learned model that we discuss below. For point-wise models the analytic forms are only available in a few special cases drawn from prior work. We discuss two notable examples: (1) the logistic loss, under the assumption that the ground truth preference satisfies a BT model $p(y_1 > y_2) = \sigma(r^*(y_1) - r^*(y_2))$, then the optimal reward obtained by minimizing Eqn (3) is a constant shift from r^* (Rafailov et al., 2023); (2) For the square loss, where the optimal reward is a constant away from $p(y > \mu) = \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim \mu} [p(y > y')]$ without further assumptions on the ground truth preference. For interested readers, note that the discussion here also provides an alternative way to derive the IPO algorithm distinct from the original derivation in Azar et al. (2023).

A case study of logistic loss vs. hinge loss. Consider the special case when the preferred and non-preferred samples are separable, the hinge loss will find the optimal separating hyper-plane that maximizes the margin between the two sets of samples. Drawing inspiration from the classic comparison between logistic regression and support vector machine (Hastie et al., 2009), we note that the logistic loss will find a similar decision boundary (i.e., sign of the prediction), but it will try to increase the magnitude of the prediction $\hat{\ell}(y_w, y_l)$ to infinity. Such behavior is alluded to in the IPO work (Azar et al., 2023) as a failure case of DPO. In general, convex loss functions with a fast-decaying tail (e.g., hinge loss for SLiC) or upwards tail (e.g., square loss for IPO) will alleviate such issues. In Section 4, we will illustrate such insights in combination with policy optimization.




Figure 3 | Bandit example (Azar et al., 2023) to illustrate the regularization effect of different GPO variants. Convex loss functions with a fast decaying tail or upwards tail (hinge, truncated quadratic and square loss) will penalize response-level deviations from π_θ to π_{ref} , effectively enforcing a stronger regularization. Other convex losses we exhibit here generally have a slower decaying tail, and will more likely converge to deterministic policies in pathological cases (e.g., deterministic preference).

General requirement on the convex function f . Not all convex functions f can lead to valid loss functions for binary classification. For our study, we further assume $f'(0) < 0$, i.e., f locally decreases at $\rho_\theta = 0$. This means that the minimizer of f is obtained at some $\rho_\theta > 0$, and intuitively would push the reward difference $r_\phi(y_w) - r_\phi(y_l)$ in the right direction. Intriguingly, this condition is related to Bayes consistency (Bartlett et al., 2006; Rosasco et al., 2004), i.e., under which condition can the prediction function $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2)$ recover the same sign as the preference probability sign $(2p(y_1 > y_2) - 1)$. We provide discussions to interested readers in Appendix C.

4. Understanding regularization in offline preference optimization

In this section, we seek to gain a better understanding of the regularization implicitly enforced by the offline preference optimization algorithms.

Though in general it is challenging to characterize the full learning dynamics of the offline algorithms, we provide analysis from a few angles, which might shed light on how the regularization works. Recall that in the RLHF formulation (Eqn 1), the KL regularization is a key element; we will see its connections to the offline regularization.

4.1. How do offline losses enforce regularization

As hinted at before, henceforth we will consider the class of convex loss functions that are locally decreasing at $\rho_\theta = 0$, i.e., $f'(0) < 0$. All the examples in Table 1 satisfy this property.

To shed light on how such loss functions entail preference optimization while enforcing regularizers, we consider the Taylor expansion around $\rho_\theta = 0$, which is a valid approximation when ρ_θ is small, i.e., π_θ does not deviate much from π_{ref} .

$$\underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [f(\beta \rho_\theta)]}_{\text{offline loss}} \approx \underbrace{f(0) + f'(0)\beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [\rho_\theta]}_{\text{preference optimization}} + \underbrace{\frac{f''(0)\beta^2}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [\rho_\theta^2]}_{\text{offline regularization}},$$

The expansion implies that when the approximation is valid, the offline algorithms all resemble the

case where f is the square loss (i.e., the IPO loss (Azar et al., 2023)). We provide more discussion in Appendix B. Minimizing the Taylor expanded objective achieves two purposes: preference optimization and regularization towards the reference policy. Indeed, minimizing the first-order term

$$f'(0)\beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [\rho_\theta]$$

encourages π_θ to place more weight on the preferred response y_w over y_l , hence maximizing pair-wise human preference.

To see the effect of the regularization, when $f''(0) > 0$ observe that the second-order term

$$f''(0)\beta^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} \left[\frac{1}{2} \rho_\theta^2 \right] \quad (6)$$

is minimized at $\rho_\theta = 0$, in which case $\pi_\theta(y) = \pi_{\text{ref}}(y)$ for all y in the support of μ . In general, this loss will encourage π_θ to stay close to π_{ref} . We call the above μ -**weighted square loss**. Importantly, the global minimizer of the KL divergence between π_θ and π_{ref} is also a minimizer of the μ -weighted square loss (i.e., both minimized when $\pi_\theta = \pi_{\text{ref}}$).

When the approximation is valid, the GPO problem with a regularizer β corresponds to the IPO problem with regularizer $|f''(0)/f'(0)| \cdot \beta$, and this quantity determines the relative strength of the regularization. The coefficient $|f''(0)/f'(0)|$ interestingly relates to how convex loss functions are theoretically built-in to be regularized for better generalization (Masnadi-Shirazi and Vasconcelos, 2015). This may inform the design of offline preference optimization algorithms with another theoretical perspective.

Intuition about the full gradient update. The Taylor expansion is only valid near $\rho_\theta = 0$ and except for the special case of square loss (IPO), drops higher order terms. For example, the expansion does not work natively for SLiC, which employs a non-smooth convex function. Though understanding the full learning dynamics is challenging, we can provide some intuitions about how the full gradient update enforces π_θ to stay close to π_{ref} : consider the gradient update for when $\beta = 1$,

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [f'(\rho_\theta) \nabla_{\theta} \rho_\theta]. \quad (7)$$

Starting from 0, suppose ρ_θ takes a very high value. This means potentially π_θ places many more weights on certain responses than π_{ref} , which is what the KL divergence regularization seeks to prevent. For the offline update, since f is convex, a few cases are possible: case I: $f'(\rho_\theta) < 0$ (for logistic, exponential and savage loss), ρ_θ will continue to increase but with a vanishing gradient; hence the regularization is still in place. Meanwhile for case II: $f'(\rho_\theta) \leq 0$ (for hinge, smoothed quadratic and square loss), ρ_θ will stop updating or be pushed downwards. As a result, in case II the gradient update explicitly does not allow $\pi_\theta(y)$ to deviate from $\pi_{\text{ref}}(y)$ for individual responses y , effectively enforcing a stronger regularization with a fixed value of β .

In Figure 3, we illustrate the effect of strong regularization using the 3-action bandit example presented in (Azar et al., 2023), where a simple offline dataset with three pairs of examples are used for training softmax parameterized policies: (y_1, y_2) , (y_2, y_3) , (y_1, y_3) . Examples are uniformly sampled from the distribution. Since y_1 is the strongest response, we expect the algorithms to assign high weights to $\pi_\theta(y_1)$, causing deviation from π_{ref} which is uniform. The example is meant to illustrate the undesirable behavior of DPO, which tends to push up the probability of y_1 , despite the intended regularization. See Appendix A for more details on the setup.

We generalize their observations by noting that for any given values of β , case I losses will keep pushing up the probability of a winning action y_1 , whereas case II losses enforce the constraint much more conservatively, preventing deterministic policies. In practice where preferences over responses are almost never deterministic, we will see that case I losses are also reasonably well behaved.




Figure 4 | An example of μ -weighted square loss and KL divergence for mixture of Gaussians. The square loss has local minimizers different from the KL divergence. This means locally descending on the square loss may not lead to decreases in the KL divergence, and may not find the global minimizer of the KL divergence. See Appendix A for the pdf of π_{ref} and μ .

Choosing the right value for β . if we understand the tail behavior of the convex function as determining the *natural* regularization strength of the offline algorithm, the hyper-parameter β needs to be chosen accordingly, if one desires a fixed level of regularization. For example, the logistic loss (i.e., DPO) requires a higher value of β to enforce the same level of regularization as the square loss (i.e., IPO) and the hinge loss (i.e., SLiC), as also exemplified in Figure 3.

4.2. Offline regularization vs. KL regularization

Henceforth we will resort back to the offline regularization: μ -weighted square loss, and understand its difference against the KL divergence regularization. We start with the gradient of the μ -weighted square loss

$$\mathbb{E}_{y \sim \mu} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \frac{1}{2} \rho_{\theta}^2 \right]$$

which seeks to decrease the squared error that measures the discrepancy between π_{θ} and π_{ref} , at samples generated by μ . For the KL divergence, we can show that its gradient is equivalent to the μ -weighted square loss with $\mu = \pi_{\theta}$

$$\nabla_{\theta} \text{KL}(\pi_{\theta}, \pi_{\text{ref}}) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\theta}} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \frac{1}{2} \rho_{\theta}^2 \right]. \quad (8)$$

In other words, we can understand the gradient to the KL divergence as minimizing the discrepancy with *on-policy* samples under π_{θ} , rather than offline samples from μ . We detail the derivation in Appendix B; note a highly similar result was also derived in (Richter et al., 2020).

In summary, both losses enforce the squared penalty on samples from μ vs. online samples from π_{θ} . We can envision cases when the μ -weighted square loss is being minimized, the KL divergence might not decrease as desired.




Figure 5 | Tracing out KL divergence vs. μ -weighted square loss during offline preference optimization. (Left) With f being the squared function, we show the trajectories for a range of β s. Importantly, the initial data point for which $\pi_\theta = \pi_{\text{ref}}$ is dropped for better visualization, see Appendix A for the complete plot. Note that as β increases, the algorithm maintains a better constraint on the μ -weighted square loss, which also induces a constraint on the KL divergence. (Right) We pool over different β s and show trajectories for different GPO variants. See Appendix A for individual plots for each variant. Overall, all algorithmic variants enjoy similar constraint properties, with most variants being slightly more stable than the logistic variant.

A mixture of Gaussians counterexample.

To show the fact that, during minimization of the square loss, we may not necessarily observe global minimization of the KL divergence, we provide a low-dimensional toy counterexample using mixture of Gaussians. We set up an example where both π_{ref} and μ are mixtures of three Gaussians. The optimized policy π_θ is just a constant shift away from π_{ref} with the shift being parameterized by a trainable parameter c . When $c = 0$, we have $\pi_{\text{ref}} = \pi_\theta$ and both the square loss and KL divergence are minimized to 0.

In Figure 4, we show the KL divergence and the μ -weighted square loss, both in log scales, as a function of $c \in [-1, 1]$. The square loss has a few minima, with some of them being remote from $c = 0$. This means gradient descent on the square loss may not lead to smaller KL in general, though they are both globally minimized at $\pi_\theta = \pi_{\text{ref}}$ for $c = 0$. See Appendix A for the plot of the pdfs of μ and π .

This example is meant to illustrate that the arguments used in prior work on offline preference optimization (Rafailov et al., 2023), which heavily rely on the global minimization of objectives, may not always be true in practice: locally minimizing the μ -weighted square loss might not lead to decrease in the KL divergence. However, the silver lining is that near $\pi_\theta = \pi_{\text{ref}}$, the two losses are highly correlated; we will validate the observations on such a low-dimensional example with a language modeling study.

4.3. Analyzing a language modeling example

In the case of language modeling, where $\pi_\theta, \pi_{\text{ref}}, \mu$ are sequential categorical distributions, we measure the correlation between the KL divergence $\mathbb{K}\mathbb{L}(\pi_\theta, \pi_{\text{ref}})$ and the μ -weighted square loss $E_{y \sim \mu} \left[\frac{1}{2} \rho_\theta^2 \right]$ during offline training. We consider the summarization task similar to (Roit et al., 2023), where the offline dataset is an open source summarization dataset collected with human feedback labels (Stiennon et al., 2020). We give more details in Appendix A.

For each experiment, we choose a fixed value of regularization β . Then, we initialize π_θ from π_{ref} and minimize the offline preference losses over the dataset. As the training progresses, we record sample-based estimates of the KL divergence and μ -weighted square loss over time, and trace them out in Figure 5 left plot for when f is a squared function. We show both loss functions in the log scale.

Importantly, we have dropped from the plot the initial data point for which $\pi_\theta = \pi_{\text{ref}}$ and both losses are zero, otherwise the whole plot will look unbalanced (since $\log 0 \approx -\text{inf}$). See the full plot in Appendix A. We make a few comments regarding the current plot.

Correlation between the two losses. There appears to be two phases in Figure 5 left plot. When β is large, and when the μ -weighted square loss is maintained at a lower level, we see a better correlation between the two losses. Meanwhile, when β is small and the μ -weighted square loss grows quickly during optimization, its correlation with KL divergence becomes more elusive (see purple and blue dots on the left plot). Such observations echo the mixture of Gaussian examples, where in the vicinity of $\pi_\theta = \pi_{\text{ref}}$, the two losses have similar trends; the misalignment happens when we deviate too much from the origin.

Though the correlation between the two losses seem to break when π_θ is too far away from π_{ref} , the silver lining is that for offline algorithms, the optimization always starts with the origin $\pi_\theta = \pi_{\text{ref}}$, and one may expect a better control over the KL divergence through the μ -weighted square loss.

More variations in KL compared to μ -weighted loss. For Figure 5 left plot, in the regime where the KL divergence and μ -weighted square loss are better correlated (areas inside the grey bounding box), we see an order of magnitude more drastic variations in the KL divergence ($10^{-0.5} \rightarrow 10^{1.5}$) than the μ -weighted square loss ($10^{-1.5} \rightarrow 10^{0.5}$).

This hints at the challenge of maintaining the KL divergence constraint by controlling the μ -weighted square loss. Indeed, since the offline preference optimization algorithms directly optimize for the μ -weighted square loss in the vicinity of the origin $\pi_\theta = \pi_{\text{ref}}$, even small changes in the μ -weighted square loss can induce much bigger changes in the KL divergence. This might become a source of instability during optimization. However, the degree to which such instability can be mitigated by other hyper-parameter choices such as learning rate, might vary case-by-case.

Comparison across different GPO variants. In Figure 5 right plot we compare the constraint contours across different GPO variants listed in Table 1. For each variant we sweep the β s but for visualization we pool across results from all β s, see Appendix A for individual plots.

Overall, different variants follow a similar pattern, with most variants being slightly more robust compared to the logistic loss, which seems to induce slightly bigger variations in the KL divergence compared to other alternatives.

5. Empirical comparison of GPO variants

We use the summarization task introduced above to carry out an empirical comparison between different GPO algorithms. For each fixed convex loss function, we sweep over values regularization coefficient $\beta \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 5 \cdot 10^{-1}, 1, 5, 10, 100\}$. For each β , we train the model for $2 \cdot 10^4$ steps with a constant learning rate, and we examine the performance of the last checkpoint.

We consider the side-by-side comparison metric used by Munos et al. (2023), where we compare the checkpoint performance against a fixed opponent π_{ref} . The comparison is made by a prompted PALM-2 model (Anil et al., 2023) over an evaluation set of 2000 summary samples. The prompted model judges which response is of higher quality. See Appendix A for evaluation details.

Examining the performance across β s, we see that when β is small, the optimization tends to be more effective, achieving the best performance at about $\beta \in [0.1, 1]$ across the board, with similar peak performance. The performance experiences a bigger drop when β becomes large. When making pair-wise comparison across different GPO variants, we see that their performance is generally on par with one another; choosing the right β appears more critical. Due to space limits, we present these comparisons in Appendix A.

6. Discussions and conclusion

We have presented GPO, a generalized approach to deriving offline preference optimization losses for LLM alignment. GPO presents a continuous spectrum of loss functions, encompassing DPO, IPO and SLiC as special instances. By deriving GPO through the rich literature on binary classification, we have presented a more unified way to reason about the strength of regularization and what the optimized policy seeks to capture.

We have also shown the connections between the offline regularization and the KL regularization, which the RLHF formulation seeks to enforce. The two types of regularization are different in general. However, optimizing from the origin, we see empirical evidence that the two losses are correlated, alluding to the fact that enforcing KL divergence through offline optimization is possible though maybe more challenging.

Our results have a number of limitations and provide avenues for future work. Our framework is based on the reward maximization formulation of RLHF, and hence still encounters theoretical issues when the ground truth preference structure is complex. A future direction would be to connect GPO with alternative solution concepts for alignment such as Nash equilibrium (Munos et al., 2023).

Acknowledgements. We thank Ivo Danihelka for providing very valuable feedback to an earlier draft of the paper. We are thankful to the DeepMind teams that build the infrastructure which facilitates the research in this work.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*, 2023.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Bilal Piot, Daniel Guo, Daniele Calandriello, Michal Valko, and Rémi Munos. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12036*, 2023.
- Peter L Bartlett, Michael I Jordan, and Jon D McAuliffe. Convexity, classification, and risk bounds. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(473):138–156, 2006.
- Bernhard E Boser, Isabelle M Guyon, and Vladimir N Vapnik. A training algorithm for optimal margin classifiers. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on Computational learning theory*, pages 144–152, 1992.
- Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.

- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Corinna Cortes and Vladimir Vapnik. Support-vector networks. *Machine learning*, 20:273–297, 1995.
- Yoav Freund and Robert E Schapire. A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. In *European conference on computational learning theory*, pages 23–37. Springer, 1995.
- Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, Jerome H Friedman, and Jerome H Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, volume 2. Springer, 2009.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- Hamed Masnadi-Shirazi and Nuno Vasconcelos. On the design of loss functions for classification: theory, robustness to outliers, and savageboost. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 21, 2008.
- Hamed Masnadi-Shirazi and Nuno Vasconcelos. A view of margin losses as regularizers of probability estimates. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):2751–2795, 2015.
- Rémi Munos, Michal Valko, Daniele Calandriello, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Daniel Guo, Yunhao Tang, Matthieu Geist, Thomas Mesnard, Andrea Michi, Marco Selvi, Sertan Girgin, Nikola Momchev, Olivier Bachem, Daniel J. Mankowitz, Doina Precup, and Bilal Piot. Nash learning from human feedback. *arXiv*, 2023.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18290*, 2023.
- Lorenz Richter, Ayman Boustati, Nikolas Nüsken, Francisco Ruiz, and Omer Deniz Akyildiz. Vargrad: a low-variance gradient estimator for variational inference. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:13481–13492, 2020.
- Adam Roberts, Hyung Won Chung, Anselm Levskaya, Gaurav Mishra, James Bradbury, Daniel Andor, Sharan Narang, Brian Lester, Colin Gaffney, Afroz Mohiuddin, Curtis Hawthorne, Aitor Lewkowycz, Alex Salcianu, Marc van Zee, Jacob Austin, Sebastian Goodman, Livio Baldini Soares, Haitang Hu, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Jasmijn Bastings, Jannis Bulian, Xavier Garcia, Jianmo Ni, Andrew Chen, Kathleen Kenealy, Jonathan H. Clark, Stephan Lee, Dan Garrette, James Lee-Thorp, Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Marvin Ritter, Maarten Bosma, Alexandre Passos, Jeremy Maitin-Shepard, Noah Fiedel, Mark Omernick, Brennan Saeta, Ryan Sepassi, Alexander Spiridonov, Joshua Newlan, and Andrea Gesmundo. Scaling up models and data with t5x and seqio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.17189*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.17189>.
- Paul Roit, Johan Ferret, Lior Shani, Roei Aharoni, Geoffrey Cideron, Robert Dadashi, Matthieu Geist, Sertan Girgin, Léonard Hussenot, Orgad Keller, et al. Factually consistent summarization via reinforcement learning with textual entailment feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00186*, 2023.

- Lorenzo Rosasco, Ernesto De Vito, Andrea Caponnetto, Michele Piana, and Alessandro Verri. Are loss functions all the same? *Neural computation*, 16(5):1063–1076, 2004.
- Noam Shazeer and Mitchell Stern. Adafactor: Adaptive learning rates with sublinear memory cost. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4596–4604. PMLR, 2018.
- Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. Learning to summarize with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3008–3021, 2020.
- Gokul Swamy, Christoph Dann, Rahul Kidambi, Zhiwei Steven Wu, and Alekh Agarwal. A minimaximalist approach to reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04056*, 2024.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J Liu. Slic-hf: Sequence likelihood calibration with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10425*, 2023.

A. Experiment details and additional results

We provide further details and additional results on experiments across the paper.

A.1. Bandit experiment

To illustrate the regularization properties of various GPO variants, we have employed the bandit experiment introduced in (Azar et al., 2023). We consider a 3-action bandit problem where the dataset consists of three possibilities

$$(y_1, y_2), (y_2, y_3), (y_1, y_3).$$

Sampling from the offline dataset consists in uniformly sampling from the pairs. We then train softmax parameterized policies with exactly the same setup as (Azar et al., 2023). Note that with logistic, exponential and savage loss, because the tail does not vanish fast enough, the policy converges to the greedy action y_1 even with regularization at $\beta = 1$. While for the other three losses, thanks to stronger regularization, $\pi_\theta(y_1)$ maintains closer distance to $\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_1)$.

A.2. A mixture of Gaussian counterexample

We find the counterexample by parameterizing all related distributions as mixtures of Gaussians with 3 modes. It is not difficult to construct numerical counterexamples as shown in the paper, with ≤ 5 simulations.

The offline distribution μ is parameterized as $\mu = \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{N}(u_1, 0.05^2) + \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{N}(u_2, 0.05^2) + \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{N}(u_3, 0.05^2)$ where u_1, u_2, u_3 are i.i.d. uniform between -1 and 1 . The reference policy is fixed as $\pi_{\text{ref}} = \frac{3}{10}\mathcal{N}(-0.8, 0.1^2) + \frac{4}{10}\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1^2) + \frac{3}{10}\mathcal{N}(0.8, 0.1^2)$. The optimized policy π_θ is a constant shift away from π_{ref} . The particular choice of the parameters are fairly ad-hoc and other choices of hyper-parameters should lead to clear counterexamples as well.

Since for mixtures of Gaussians, both the KL divergence and the μ -weighted square loss do not yield analytic forms. Instead, we draw 2000 samples to estimate both losses as unbiased estimates.

Figure 6 (left) shows the probability density function (pdf) for π_{ref} and μ , in the counterexample that we presented.

A.3. Language modeling experiments

We consider the summarization task similar to (Roit et al., 2023), where the offline dataset is an open source summarization dataset collected with human feedback labels (Stiennon et al., 2020). The base model is T5X (Roberts et al., 2022), a family of LLMs based on encoder-decoder transformer architecture. Throughout, we train large-sized models with 700M parameters. During training, we apply a constant learning rate of 10^{-5} with batch size $b = 32$. We use the Adafactor optimizer (Shazeer and Stern, 2018) with a decay rate of 0.8. Each model is trained for 2×10^5 steps in total.

The evaluation follows from (Munos et al., 2023) where they consider the side-by-side comparison metric between two models. A default baseline model is the supervised fine-tuned baseline π_{ref} . The comparison is made by a prompted PALM-2 model (Anil et al., 2023), where the model judges which response is of higher quality. The evaluation set consists of 2000 examples, each containing a paragraph to summarize. The prompted model is given the paragraph, as well as the two summaries generated by the two compared models, to deliver a final verdict.

Tracing KL divergence and μ -weighted square loss. For each experiment (with a fixed convex function f and fixed β), we evaluate intermittently the μ -weighted square loss on the learner and the KL divergence on the evaluator. The evaluator is carried out every 2000 steps where we train for a




Figure 6 | Full results for the mixture of Gaussian counterexample. (Left) The probability density function (pdf) for μ and π_{ref} , both are designed to be mixtures of Gaussian with 3 modes; (Right) The same plot as Figure 4.

total of 20000 steps. We also evaluate every 200 steps for the first 2000 steps since the initial stage during training presents the most salient changes in the μ -weighted square losses.

The tracing plot for individual GPO variant is shown in Figure 7 for better visualization.

Win rate results. In Figure 8, we show the win rate of various algorithmic variants in a side-by-side comparison against the supervised fine-tuned checkpoint π_{ref} . For two identical models, the win rate should be 0.5. We observe that the best performance is usually obtained at $\beta \in [0.1, 1]$, with similar performance across different f s. Interestingly, when β becomes too large, the win rate drops more quickly across all methods.

In Figure 9, we show the side by side comparison across GPO variants. For each variant, we take the checkpoint with $\beta = 0.1$ since this appears to be a value where all algorithms work reasonably, according to the win rate against the supervised fine-tuned checkpoint. The win rate comparison across GPO variants suggests that they perform mostly similar.

B. Proof and derivations of theoretical results

We provide more detailed proof to a few important theoretical results in the paper.

Theorem 2. (Equivalence of optimal solutions) Let π_θ^* be the global minimizer of the offline preference optimization loss in Eqn (4). π_θ^* is the same as the optimal regularized policy (according to Eqn (1)) for a reward function that globally minimizes the loss Eqn (3).

Proof. The proof is straightforward. Indeed, note that if we seek to minimize Eqn (3) with r_ϕ , we can reparameterize the reward function as $r_\phi(y) = \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y)}{\pi_{ref}(y)} + z$ with normalizing constant z that depends on π_θ . Then if r_ϕ^* is the global minimizer to Eqn (3), the corresponding $\pi_\theta(y) \propto \pi_{ref}(y) \exp(\beta^{-1} r_\phi^*(y))$ must be the global minimizer to Eqn (4).




Figure 7 | Tracing out KL divergence vs. μ -weighted square loss during offline preference optimization, for individual GPO variants. This plot separates the data from Figure 5 for better visualization.

B.1. Derivation of the gradient of KL divergence and μ -weighted square loss

By definition we have $\mathbb{KL}(\pi_\theta, \pi_{ref}) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta} \left[\log \frac{\pi_\theta(y)}{\pi_{ref}(y)} \right]$, its gradient contains two terms

$$\nabla_\theta \mathbb{KL}(\pi_\theta, \pi_{ref}) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta} \left[\log \frac{\pi_\theta(y)}{\pi_{ref}(y)} \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y) \right] + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y)]}_{=0}$$

The second term vanishes because it is the expectation of a score function with respect to the distribution itself. Meanwhile, for the μ -weighted square loss, we rewrite the original definition as

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [\rho_\theta^2] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{(y_1, y_2) \sim \mu} \left[\left(\log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_1)}{\pi_{ref}(y_1)} - \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_2)}{\pi_{ref}(y_2)} \right)^2 \right],$$

where the equality is based on the fact that the order of (y_w, y_l) does not impact the expectation. Now, taking the gradient of the above loss with $\mu = \pi_\theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(y_1, y_2) \sim \pi_\theta} \left[\nabla_\theta \frac{1}{2} \rho_\theta^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{(y_1, y_2) \sim \mu} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_1)}{\pi_{ref}(y_1)} - \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_2)}{\pi_{ref}(y_2)} \right) (\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y_1) - \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y_2)) \right], \\ &=_{(a)} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{(y_1, y_2) \sim \pi_\theta} \left[\log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_1)}{\pi_{ref}(y_1)} \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y_1) + \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_2)}{\pi_{ref}(y_2)} \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y_2) \right] \\ &=_{(b)} \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta} \left[\log \frac{\pi_\theta(y)}{\pi_{ref}(y)} \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, (a) follows from the fact the cross term vanishes because y_1, y_2 are independent; (b) follows from the fact that y_1, y_2 are identically distributed. This proves the desired equality in Eqn (8).




Figure 8 | Win rate of various GPO methods against the supervised fine-tuned baseline π_{ref} , as a function of β . Almost all algorithmic variants obtain the best performance at $\beta \in [0.1, 1]$, with similar peak performance.

Relation to results from (Richter et al., 2020). A highly related result has been derived in (Richter et al., 2020), relating the gradient of the KL divergence to the gradient of the variance of the log ratio. We provide a simple derivation here. Note that when $\mu = \pi_{\theta}$, the μ -weighted square loss indeed evaluates to a variance

$$\mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} \left[\frac{1}{2} \rho_{\theta}^2 \right] = \mathbb{V} \left[\log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y)} \right].$$

To see this note that if Y, Y' are i.i.d. samples then $\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [(Y - Y')^2] = \mathbb{V} [Y]$. \square

B.2. Discussion on Taylor expansions of the GPO losses

Assume that f is smoothly differentiable and convex, and $f'(0) < 0$, then the GPO problem with the second order Taylor expansion recovers the square loss with $\beta' = \frac{f''(0)\beta}{|f'(0)|}$. Note that the square loss is effectively the IPO loss.

To see this, by the second order Taylor approximation to f around $\rho_{\theta} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [f(\beta \rho_{\theta})] &\approx f(0) + f'(0)\beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [\rho_{\theta}] + \frac{f''(0)\beta^2}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [\rho_{\theta}^2] \\ &= f(0) + \frac{f'(0)^2}{2f''(0)} \left(\frac{f''(0)}{|f'(0)|} \beta \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} [\rho_{\theta}] - 1 \right)^2 - \frac{f'(0)^2}{2f''(0)} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{(y_w, y_l) \sim \mu} \left[\left(\frac{f''(0)\beta}{|f'(0)|} \rho_{\theta} - 1 \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where for (a) we have rearranged terms and the equivalence is up to constants. Indeed, we see that the Taylor expanded GPO loss is equivalent to the IPO loss with β' as defined above.




Figure 9 | Win rate of various GPO methods against one another. We take all checkpoints at $\beta = 0.1$ since this is a value where all variants have reasonable performance. We show the color coded win rates in a matrix.

C. Discussion on Bayes consistency for the learned reward model

Here we provide a brief background on Bayes consistency. Using the notation from Section 3, we consider binary classification loss of the following form with a convex function f

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\hat{\ell}(z) \cdot \ell \right) \right]$$

where $\ell \in \{-1, 1\}$ is the ground-truth label and $\hat{\ell}(z)$ is the prediction. The Bayes optimal classifier, which minimizes the 0-1 classification error, depends on the probability $p(\ell = 1|z)$, which is $\hat{\ell}^*(z) = \text{sign}(2p(\ell = 1|z) - 1)$. The Bayes consistency result (Bartlett et al., 2006; Rosasco et al., 2004) state the following

Theorem 2. (Bayes consistency) Assume f is convex, and continuously differentiable and $f'(0) < 0$. Then let $\hat{\ell}(z)$ be the global minimizer to the binary classification loss, then $\text{sign}(\hat{\ell}(z)) = \hat{\ell}^*(z)$.

We refer readers to Rosasco et al. (2004) for the easy-to-follow proof. The high level idea is to show that at the global minimizer, assuming $p(\ell = 1|z) > 1/2$, we should expect $\hat{\ell}(z) > 0$. Intuitively, this should be the case since $f'(0) < 0$ and is convex, so the minimizer should be at the right hand side of the origin.

C.1. Discussion of pair-wise preference model

We now discuss properties of the pair-wise preference model, where the prediction $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2)$ is parameterized as a general bi-variate function $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2) = r_\phi(y_1, y_2)$ of y_1, y_2 rather than the difference of two univariate functions $r_\phi(y_1) - r_\phi(y_2)$. We conjecture that some of the results will transfer to point-wise reward models in practice, e.g., when the BT assumption approximately makes sense. Making precise of such approximations is left to future work.

An intuitive requirement for the prediction $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2)$ is that it gets the sign of the preference correct,

which is defined through $p(y_1 > y_2)$. More concretely, one might seek the follow property

$$\text{sign} \left(\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2) \right) = \text{sign} \left(p(y_1 > y_2) - 1/2 \right) \quad (9)$$

Interestingly, the RHS of Eqn (9) corresponds to the Bayes optimal classifier, which minimizes the classification loss in Eqn (5). The convex loss functions we consider in this work (e.g., all examples in Table 1) all satisfy the property that if $l(y_1, y_2)$ is parameterized as a general preference model (rather than a point-wise reward model, see e.g., (Munos et al., 2023)), then by minimizing the loss we find $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2)$ that satisfies Eqn (9), a result stemming from Bayes consistency (Bartlett et al., 2006; Rosasco et al., 2004).

However, even if different loss functions produce the same sign, the predictions $\hat{\ell}(y_1, y_2)$ can differ drastically depending on f . In the main paper we have provided a case study example of logistic loss vs. hinge loss, borrowing inspirations from the study in Hastie et al. (2009).