
Interactive Evolution: A Neural-Symbolic Self-Training Framework For Large Language Models

Fangzhi Xu^{◇♡,*}, Qiushi Sun^{☆♡}, Kanzhi Cheng[♣], Jun Liu[◇], Yu Qiao[♡], Zhiyong Wu^{♡†}
[◇]Xi'an Jiaotong University [♡]Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory
[☆]The University of Hong Kong [♣]Nanjing University
fangzhixu98@gmail.com, wuzhiyong@pjlab.org.cn

Abstract

One of the primary driving forces contributing to the superior performance of Large Language Models (LLMs) is the extensive availability of human-annotated natural language data, which is used for alignment fine-tuning. This inspired researchers to investigate self-training methods to mitigate the extensive reliance on human annotations. However, the current success of self-training has been primarily observed in natural language scenarios, rather than in the increasingly important neural-symbolic scenarios. To this end, we propose an environment-guided neural-symbolic self-training framework named *ENVISIONS*. It aims to overcome two main challenges: (1) the scarcity of symbolic data, and (2) the limited proficiency of LLMs in processing symbolic language. Extensive evaluations conducted on three distinct domains demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach. Additionally, we have conducted a comprehensive analysis to uncover the factors contributing to *ENVISIONS*'s success, thereby offering valuable insights for future research in this area. Code will be available at <https://github.com/xufangzhi/ENVISIONS>.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) [1, 2] have undergone extensive training using massive data, enabling them to possess remarkable capabilities across diverse domains. One of the main recipes of LLMs' success is the post-pretraining effort to achieve alignment with downstream tasks [3, 4]. The effective alignment primarily relies on *the accessibility of a substantial volume of expensive human-annotated data*, employing techniques such as Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) [5] or Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) [6]. Recently, there has been a growing interest in developing self-training methods that enable fine-tuning of LLMs without human annotations, thereby reducing cost and streamlining the training process [7].

Notable progress has been made in self-training techniques for natural language (NL) scenarios [8, 9], where researchers focus on improving LLMs by synthesizing their own natural language input-output pairs. However, in recent years, there has been a growing emphasis on delegating tasks to external tools/environments to expand the capability boundaries of LLMs. The shift in focus necessitates the generation of a symbolic intermediate representation a that can be executed in the environment to faithfully produce the desired output y . This neural-symbolic framework [10] has achieved significant success in complex planning [11], mathematical reasoning [12], robotic planning [13], and agentic tasks [14, 15]. In contrast to the abundance of NL annotation data $(x-y)$, curating symbolic annotation $(x-a-y)$ is significantly more challenging and costly due to the scarcity and inherent complexity of symbolic language (SL). In this paper, we delve into the exploration of effective self-training methods for LLMs within complex neural-symbolic scenarios, all without human-annotated symbolic data.

* Work done during internship at Shanghai AI Lab.

† Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: Weak-to-strong paradigm comparison. (a) Distill-then-Finetune paradigm. (b) Reinforced Self-Training methods. (c) Env-guided Self-Training paradigm.

Current self-training approaches in empowering LLMs in SL-centric scenarios fall into two categories, each with its own drawbacks. *Distill-then-Finetune* [5, 16], shown in Fig. 1(a), entails fine-tuning a less powerful LLM using distilled data obtained from a teacher LLM, such as GPT-4 [1]. Although this method is simple yet effective, its application is constrained by the requirement of an already existing stronger LLM and the associated high costs. Furthermore, the performance of the student LLM is upper-bounded by the capabilities of the teacher LLM. *Reinforced Self-Training* [17, 18], as shown in Fig. 1 (b), iteratively improves a weak LLM by leveraging reinforcement learning algorithms [19], guided by customized reward models. Nevertheless, reinforced methods are constrained by their inefficiency in training and/or reliance on human annotations for reward model training.

To address the limitations of previous approaches, this work focuses on two key challenges: enhancing the proficiency of LLMs in processing SL and eliminating the requirement for human-annotated data. Illustrated in Figure 1 (c), the proposed approach, called *Environment-guided (Env-guided) self-training*, involves iterative training of LLMs through interactions with an embodied environment. Built upon the approach, we propose an **ENV-guIded Self-traIning framework fOr Neural Symbolic scenarios**, named *ENVISIONS*. As an example, consider the training of LLMs for web browsing tasks, i.e., training a web agent. Given a web manipulation task x , the agent generates multiple candidate actions $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and executes these actions within the web browser, resulting in both correct and incorrect outcomes. A self-rewarding algorithm is designed to post-process the agent’s trajectories and create contrastive training pairs. These correct-incorrect trajectory pairs, along with a self-refining loss, are utilized to empower the LLMs to self-correct and improve their performance.

Through the Env-guided self-training approach, the LLMs leverage the interactive nature of the embodied environment to generate trajectories and learn symbolic language processing abilities, mitigating the need for human annotations. Through extensive evaluation, we found that *ENVISIONS* can consistently convert an existing LLM to a stronger one without reliance on existing stronger models or reward models. It’s also worth noting that *ENVISIONS* and previous methods are not mutually exclusive, but we leave it as a future work to explore their synergy.

We highlight our contributions as follows:

- (1) **A neural-symbolic self-training framework:** We propose a novel framework *ENVISIONS* for neural-symbolic self-training. The proposed framework can eliminate the need for human annotation or a stronger teacher model during self-training.
- (2) **Comprehensive evaluations and analysis:** We perform extensive evaluation across three different domains to demonstrate the effectiveness of *ENVISIONS* over previous state-of-the-art self-training methods. Additionally, we conducted an in-depth analysis to uncover the underlying reasons for the remarkable performance of *ENVISIONS* and to highlight its potential as a new paradigm for neural-symbolic self-training.
- (3) **Insights on Env-guided neural-symbolic self-training:** Our research provides valuable insights, supported by evidence, into the training process of Env-guided neural-symbolic self-training. These findings pave the way for future developments in this area of research.

2 Related Work

Self-Training Methods. Self-training, particularly when integrated with RL [20, 6], offers a promising avenue for models to learn from their own outputs, minimizing the need for extensive




Figure 2: The neural-symbolic self-training framework *ENVISIONS*. \rightarrow denotes *self-exploration* process (Step ①-③), \rightarrow indicates *self-refinement* (Step ④-⑥), and \rightarrow is *self-rewarding* (Step ⑦).

human annotations. Typically, recent advances [17] leverage well-trained reward models to filter better training samples, and further decouples the data collection and policy optimization steps for reinforced self-training [18, 21]. However, these approaches heavily rely on a strong reward model, which limits its applicability and training efficiency. Following the success of DPO [19], self-play frameworks have emerged as a new path that implicitly models the preferences among unlabeled rationales in iterative DPO styles [8, 9]. More recently, [7] incorporates the self-rewarding strategy into the DPO step, which reduces the reliance on external models. Nevertheless, such methods still face efficiency issues [22]. Beyond RL, previous works [23, 24] optimize policy models within iterative SFT frameworks, yet neglecting the value of negative samples. Moreover, current approaches solely integrate the neural model into self-training, constraining the faithfulness and generalization to executable symbolic environments.

Data Synthesis with LLMs. Obtaining high-quality human-annotated reasoning traces to optimize LLMs has been a long-standing challenge [25]. Beyond well-established approaches utilizing data augmentation strategies to obtain diversified training data [26, 27]. Recent efforts [28, 29, 30] primarily distill strong LLMs [1, 31] to generate novel samples in the given format. They either generate more diverse samples from seed data through self-instruct [32] or enhance diversity through sample rephrasing and rewriting [33]. Combining environments, learning from the trajectory of LLMs for behavior cloning has also emerged as a promising approach [34, 35]. However, current works mainly employ close-sourced LLMs (e.g., GPT-4) for data synthesis, which is a cost. We propose to achieve data bootstrapping from weak LLMs without relying on external models.

Neural-Symbolic Integration for LLMs. Neural-symbolic methods synergize the powerful generation capacity of LLMs with the reliability and interpretability of symbolic systems. Typically, PAL/PoT [36, 37] synthesize executable programs as intermediate reasoning steps to solve numerical problems. This strategy of delegating problems to external solvers (e.g., Python interpreter), has gained significant traction [38]. ToRA [12] and Logic-LM [39] apply neural code generation and symbolic execution on math and logical reasoning respectively, enhanced with necessary refinement. Moreover, Symbol-LLM [10] unifies neural-symbolic applications under a *Symbol+Delegation* setting. Beyond reasoning, recent endeavors have extended the application into agent scenarios [40, 41] and leverage external feedback from the environment [14, 42] for refinement. However, these approaches mainly optimize LLM usage rather than providing autonomous self-improvement.

3 Methodology

3.1 Preliminaries

In neural-symbolic scenarios, based on the NL input x , LLMs are required to produce symbolic solution a to obtain the desired output y through the execution in the environment *ENV*. To adapt the weak LLMs to such complex settings and curate extensive (x, a, y) pairs, we propose to iteratively interact with *ENV*, thus boosting LLMs through self-training. For each iteration i , the LLM π_{θ_i} will be provided with the task data set $\{(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})\}$, with J input-output pairs. Without loss of generality, we assume the samples keep static between iterations.

Figure 2 presents the iterative self-training framework, named *ENVISIONS*. Our framework is specifically designed to address two key challenges: (1) the scarcity of SL data and (2) the limited proficiency of LLMs in SL. Data scarcity limitation is addressed by the online exploration stage (Step ①-⑦). To convert LLMs from weak to strong in addressing SL, we employ LLM training using a carefully designed loss function and filtered data (Step ⑧-⑩). To simplify the expression, we omit the indicator of iteration i in the symbols. The overall procedure of *ENVISIONS* is also concluded in the pseudocode of Appendix B.

3.2 Mitigating SL Data Scarcity with Online Exploration

With the lack of well-annotated SL data for training, *ENVISIONS* empowers policy LLM to produce candidate symbolic solutions through autonomous interaction with the environment **ENV**. This process is named *Online Exploration*, which includes three main aspects 1) self-exploration (Step ①-③); 2) self-refinement (Step ④-⑥); and 3) self-rewarding (Step ⑦).

Self-exploration Given the NL input x , the policy model π_θ first generates K diverse symbolic outputs (Step ①), formulated as $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^K \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x)$. These intermediate outputs will be executed in **ENV** (Step ②) to obtain the binary feedback $\{b_k\}_{k=1}^K$ based on y (Step ③). The above procedure allows π_θ to explore the environment autonomously and search for diverse symbolic solutions.

Self-refinement. Considering the complexity of SL, solutions generated by the LLM may contain mistakes in symbolic format, which significantly impair the efficiency of exploration. To address this, we utilize the above self-explored solutions $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^K$ as references to regenerate new refined symbolic solutions (Step ④), formulated as $\{\tilde{a}_k\}_{k=1}^K \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x; a_k)$. Similarly, these outputs will be executed in **ENV** (Step ⑤) and receive the corresponding binary reward $\{\tilde{b}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ (Step ⑥).

Self-rewarding. Feedback from **ENV** merely gives the binary rewards. However, it remains challenging to discern preferences among various positive solutions or obtain valuable feedback from negative solutions. Motivated by it, we propose a soft reward score through sequence output probabilities with the following calculation:

$$r = \bar{p}_\theta(a|x) = \frac{\sum_t \log p_\theta(a_t|x; a_{<t})}{||a||}, \quad (1)$$

where $||a||$ is the length of the symbolic solution a . Based on this definition, the soft self-rewards of a_k and \tilde{a}_k are derived respectively as r_k and \tilde{r}_k . Considering that no extra reward model is involved, we name it *self-rewarding*³ (Step ⑦).

3.3 Data Selection and Training Strategies

After the online exploration stage, the candidate trajectories are constructed as $T_k = (x, y, a_k, b_k, r_k)$ and $\tilde{T}_k = (x, y, \tilde{a}_k, \tilde{b}_k, \tilde{r}_k)$, which are sourced from *self-exploration* and *self-refinement* respectively. Next, we select premium trajectories for training the LLM π_{θ_i} .

Trajectory filtering and candidate pool updating. To control the candidate number to maintain trajectories with high quality, we select the superior one from T_k and \tilde{T}_k to update the candidate trajectory pool (Step ⑧). To facilitate automatic selection, we incorporate binary rewards and self-rewards for assessment. Following the principle of prioritizing execution correctness, we derive the filtered trajectory T_k^* :

$$T_k^* = (x, y, a_k^*, b_k^*, r_k^*) = \begin{cases} (x, y, a_k, b_k, r_k), & \text{if } b_k = 1 \text{ and } \tilde{b}_k = 0, \\ (x, y, a_k, b_k, r_k), & \text{if } b_k = \tilde{b}_k \text{ and } r_k > \tilde{r}_k, \\ (x, y, \tilde{a}_k, \tilde{b}_k, \tilde{r}_k), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Notably, our filter strategy still maintains some trajectories with incorrect solutions but relatively higher rewards. These trajectories will serve as hard negative samples for the subsequent steps.

³*Self-rewarding* step in *ENVISIONS* is different from [7], though they share the same name.

Supervised fine-tuning on positive solutions. As we have explored diverse trajectories in ENV, an intuitive way to bootstrap the performance of LLMs is fine-tuning with the positive solutions. Therefore, for each input x , we can retrieve the positive trajectories (i.e., $b = 1$) from the candidate pool. Giving priority to more valuable solutions, we rank the trajectories in descending order based on self-rewards, resulting in the positive set S^+ . To mitigate overfitting, we enforce a maximum of N_1 positive-only solutions sampled for each input x :

$$U_1 = \{(x, a_m^+) \mid m \leq \min(N_1, |S^+|) \text{ and } T_m^+ \in S^+\} \quad (3)$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ means the index in the ranked set and $|\cdot|$ returns the number of trajectories in the given set. $T_m^+ = (x, y, a_m^+, b_m^+, r_m^+)$ denotes the trajectories in S^+ . Following the principle of MLE, the optimized loss function can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = - \sum_{(x, a^+) \sim U_1} \log p_\theta(a^+ | x) \quad (4)$$

RL-free loss to learn from mistakes. Under the neural-symbolic setting, negative solutions may comprise a substantial portion of exploration trajectories, while also offering valuable insights for model enhancement. ENVISIONS explores motivating the policy LLM to learn from mistakes during the weak-to-strong process. We can obtain the ranked negative set S^- from the candidate pool. For each input x , at most N_2 positive-negative pairs will be constructed from S^+ and S^- :

$$U_2 = \{(x, a_m^+, a_m^-) \mid m \leq \min(N_2, |S^+| - N_1, |S^-|) \text{ and } T_{m+|U_1|}^+ \in S^+ \text{ and } T_m^- \in S^-\} \quad (5)$$

where $T_m^- = (x, y, a_m^-, b_m^-, r_m^-)$ denotes the trajectories in S^- . Limited by the difficulty and complexity of optimizing models in an RL manner (e.g., DPO [19] and PPO [20]), it is challenging for reinforced-based methods such as SPIN [8] and DNO [9] to quickly adapt to the SL scenarios. Therefore, we design the following RL-free loss function in a contrastive manner:

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = - \sum_{(x, a^+, a^-) \sim U_2} \log p_\theta(a^+ | x; a^-) \quad (6)$$

It brings two main advantages: (1) the ability of self-refinement is acquired, which benefits the scalability to complex cases; (2) compared to reinforced losses, superior training efficiency is achieved. Finally, the overall loss function of each iteration is simply designed as $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2$. We leave the discussion of the weighted one in the future.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We evaluate the proposed framework on three distinct domains, each with its own environment: web agents (Chrome browser), math reasoning (Python compiler), and logical reasoning (Pyke engine). For agentic tasks, we select the widely-used web navigation benchmark MiniWob++ [43]. For the math reasoning domain, we include 5 tasks: GSM8K [44], MATH [45], GSM-Hard [36], SVAMP [46], and AsDiv [47]. ProofWriter [48] and RuleTaker [49] are used to evaluate logic reasoning performance. To evaluate the generalization capability of our method, we reserve some datasets for out-of-distribution evaluation as shown in Table 1. Please refer to Appendix A.2 for more details.

4.2 Baselines and Training Details

Following the categorization of Figure 1, we consider the respective three lines of baselines. All baselines are reproduced under the same codebase for a fair comparison.

Distill-then-Finetune. GPT-4 and Claude-2 are selected as strong teacher LLMs in this approach. By prompting teacher LLMs, we obtain the symbolic trajectories with correct answers to fine-tune

| Domains | Held-in Tasks | Held-out Tasks | #Samples | Static ? | Env. |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Web Agent | MiniWob++ | - | 2,200 | No | Chrome browser |
| Math Reasoning | GSM8K, MATH | GSM-H, SVAMP, AsDiv | 13,492 | Yes | Python compiler |
| Logic Reasoning | ProofWriter | RuleTaker | 3,600 | Yes | Pyke engine |

Table 1: Details and statistics of evaluated domains. *#Samples* denotes the number of input samples per iteration. *Static?* indicates whether the input data remains the same across all iterations. *Env.* column presents the external solver for execution.

the LLM. In light of the high time and financial cost of calling API, each input will be prompted only once.

Reinforced Self-Training. We implement two RL-based self-training baselines: *Self-Rewarding* [7] and *iterative SFT+DPO*. For the former, we follow the official implementation to first warm up the weak LLM using human annotation from OpenAssistant [50]. The latter is a simple variation of *ENVISIONS* that mainly separates the training into two stages, with positive solutions for SFT and positive-negative pairs for DPO.

Env-guided Self-Training. Since there are no existing baselines for this approach, we consider extending the NL-centric self-training method STaR [23] to support neural-symbolic scenarios. It is worth noting that STaR only uses positive samples for behavior cloning. For the methods under this paradigm (including *ENVISIONS*) we optimize LLM from scratch in each iteration with the updated training samples.

Except for *Distill-then-Finetune* baselines, all other methods, ours included, utilize few-shot prompting to acquire training samples as a cold start. The few-shot numbers for the web agent, math reasoning, and logic reasoning domains are set to 1, 3, and 1 respectively. We also include few-shot results on weak LLM for comparison. For a fair evaluation, all baselines are optimized to generate symbolic outputs (e.g., Python code) rather than natural language outputs, following PoT style [37]. Please refer to Appendix A for other details.

We use LLaMA2-Chat 7B/13B models for the evaluation. At each generation step (i.e., Step ①,④), the candidate size K is set to 5. The total iteration number for web agent, math, and logic tasks is set to 5, 10, and 8 respectively, unless otherwise stated. For each input, N_1 and N_2 are fixed to 10 and 2 respectively. All the self-training experiments are implemented on 8*A100 of 80GB VRAM. Please refer to Appendix A.1 for other details.

4.3 Main Results

Table 2 presents the evaluation results. We include an LLaMA2-Chat (few-shot) baseline for reference purposes, all other methods are tested under the zero-shot setting.

ENVISIONS presents consistent superiority over strong baselines. Evolving from LLaMA2-Chat, *ENVISIONS* significantly enhances average performances by 30.00% and 24.95% for the 7B and 13B variants, respectively. Compared with *Distill-then-Finetune* methods, 5.66%-7.13% improvements are obtained. In addition to its superior performance, *ENVISIONS* offers greater scalability compared with the significant costs associated with using strong LLMs (e.g., GPT-4). Besides it, the obvious advantages over *Reinforced Self-Training* and other *Env-guided Self-Training* methods are observed, with 2.78%-14.47% average gains. The combination of the performance as well as the training efficiency makes *ENVISIONS* stand out among these strong baselines.

Env-guided Self-Training exhibits strong scalability to neural-symbolic scenarios. Compared to the other two approaches, *Env-guided Self-Training* is more applicable to complex neural-symbolic scenarios, especially in agentic tasks where NL-centric methods inherently exhibit limitations. Besides the great performances of *ENVISIONS*, previous methods *STaR* can also benefit from the supervision signals acquired in *ENV*, which helps the evolution progress.

4.4 Evolution Progress for Self-Training Frameworks

In Figure 3, we present the iterative evolution curves of the self-training frameworks with LLaMA2-Chat (13B) as the LLM, which clearly shows the procedure of weak-to-strong transformation. Limited

| Models | Agent | Math Reasoning | | | | | Logical Reasoning | | Avg. |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | MiniWob++ | GSM8K | MATH | GSM-H | SVAMP | ASDiv | ProofWriter | RuleTaker | |
| Is Held-out ? | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✓ | |
| LLaMA2-Chat (7B) | | | | | | | | | |
| LLaMA2-Chat (few-shot) | 51.14 | 12.21 | 1.32 | 10.69 | 22.00 | 25.86 | 34.83 | 47.44 | 25.69 |
| Distill-then-Finetune | | | | | | | | | |
| GPT-4 + LLaMA2-Chat | 81.14 | 53.07 | 18.84 | 47.84 | 66.80 | 68.75 | 34.33 | 48.88 | 52.46 |
| Claude-2 + LLaMA2-Chat | 82.80 | 52.69 | 18.17 | 44.88 | 70.50 | 69.85 | 36.17 | 49.17 | 53.03 |
| Reinforced Self-Training | | | | | | | | | |
| Self-Rewarding | 69.39 | 40.03 | 10.70 | 31.69 | 58.20 | 61.55 | 32.17 | 50.04 | 44.22 |
| Iterative SFT+DPO | 77.05 | 54.81 | 14.75 | 47.08 | 70.10 | 66.22 | 49.00 | 58.82 | 54.73 |
| Env-guided Self-Training | | | | | | | | | |
| STaR + Env. | 83.71 | 58.23 | 15.97 | 46.63 | 67.50 | 68.46 | 50.17 | 58.60 | 55.91 |
| ENVISIONS | 85.38 | 58.98 | 19.00 | 48.52 | 72.40 | 69.80 | 52.83 | 62.63 | 58.69 |
| LLaMA2-Chat (13B) | | | | | | | | | |
| LLaMA2-Chat (few-shot) | 60.00 | 34.87 | 6.07 | 28.96 | 45.00 | 46.61 | 35.83 | 51.50 | 38.61 |
| Distill-then-Finetune | | | | | | | | | |
| GPT-4 + LLaMA2-Chat | 80.15 | 62.85 | 23.64 | 53.98 | 73.00 | 73.52 | 34.17 | 50.61 | 56.49 |
| Claude-2 + LLaMA2-Chat | 84.77 | 62.24 | 23.47 | 52.08 | 76.30 | 74.05 | 36.00 | 48.45 | 57.17 |
| Reinforced Self-Training | | | | | | | | | |
| Self-Rewarding | 74.55 | 50.80 | 13.97 | 41.24 | 74.10 | 71.37 | 37.33 | 56.66 | 52.50 |
| Iterative SFT+DPO | 82.73 | 63.84 | 22.32 | 50.57 | 77.30 | 70.94 | 51.00 | 59.47 | 59.77 |
| Env-guided Self-Training | | | | | | | | | |
| STaR + Env. | 85.15 | 63.61 | 20.57 | 53.37 | 74.70 | 74.76 | 52.33 | 60.33 | 60.60 |
| ENVISIONS | 87.12 | 68.31 | 26.04 | 57.54 | 78.30 | 75.52 | 54.83 | 60.84 | 63.56 |

Table 2: Main Results on Agent, Math Reasoning and Logical Reasoning domain. Notably, we report the average performance across extensive tasks in MiniWob++ benchmark (refer to Appendix D.3 for details). *Is Held-out?* row distinguishes the held-in and held-out tasks. *Avg.* column reports the averaged performances on all tasks.




Figure 3: Performance evolution of self-training methods on LLaMA2-Chat 13B model. *Reinforced Self-Training* approaches are represented by dashed lines, while *Env-guided* ones are in solid lines.

by space, we leave the discussion on the evolution of both performance and explored sample numbers with the 7B version in Appendix D.1.

ENVISIONS combines high evolutionary efficiency and sustainability. In the initial iterations, *ENVISIONS* demonstrates swift adaptability to different scenarios. This indicates that exceptional performance can be achieved with minimal time for data collection in *ENVISIONS*. Additionally, *ENVISIONS* stands out as a more sustainable option when compared to other baselines. For instance, in math reasoning tasks of Fig. 3(b), all baseline methods achieve saturated performance levels by 6th iteration. However, our framework continues to exhibit evolutionary progress.

Reinforced baselines are largely flawed during iterations. The incorporation of reinforced loss (e.g., DPO) brings difficulty in optimization and greatly restricts the evolutionary scales of the LLM to adapt to the neural-symbolic scenarios. *Self-Rewarding* exhibits largely reduced benefits during iterations, in contrast to its impressive performance in NL-centric tasks. For *Iterative SFT+DPO*, the SFT stage boosts the ability in effective exploration. However, the subsequent DPO stage imposes a slight improvement while significantly reduce the training efficiency.

| Models | Agent MiniWob++ | Math Reasoning | | | | | Logical Reasoning | | Avg. |
|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | GSM8K | MATH | GSM-H | SVAMP | ASDiv | ProofWriter | RuleTaker | |
| LLaMA-2-Chat (7B) | | | | | | | | | |
| ENVISIONS | 85.38 | 58.98 | 19.00 | 48.52 | 72.40 | 69.80 | 52.83 | 62.63 | 58.69 |
| w/o self-refine | 84.92 | 56.86 | 18.20 | 48.14 | 68.70 | 67.89 | 42.00 | 58.60 | 55.66 |
| w/o self-reward | 84.47 | 58.61 | 18.75 | 47.92 | 71.10 | 68.46 | 47.33 | 59.61 | 57.03 |
| w/o candidate pool | 83.86 | 57.77 | 17.55 | 47.16 | 70.90 | 68.03 | 49.17 | 59.18 | 56.70 |
| w/o \mathcal{L}_2 loss | 81.89 | 55.88 | 18.90 | 47.16 | 67.60 | 67.75 | 47.67 | 57.88 | 55.59 |
| LLaMA-2-Chat (13B) | | | | | | | | | |
| ENVISIONS | 87.12 | 68.31 | 26.04 | 57.54 | 78.30 | 75.52 | 54.83 | 60.84 | 63.56 |
| w/o self-refine | 84.24 | 65.96 | 24.95 | 55.34 | 77.70 | 73.90 | 51.00 | 57.59 | 61.34 |
| w/o self-reward | 85.45 | 67.02 | 25.59 | 55.57 | 77.80 | 74.05 | 51.50 | 60.69 | 62.21 |
| w/o candidate pool | 85.61 | 66.89 | 24.19 | 53.07 | 77.20 | 72.90 | 51.33 | 58.96 | 61.27 |
| w/o \mathcal{L}_2 loss | 81.59 | 63.08 | 20.00 | 51.18 | 74.30 | 71.23 | 50.33 | 60.19 | 58.99 |

Table 3: Ablation studies on key components.

4.5 Generalization to Various Backbones

To demonstrate the generalizability, we apply *ENVISIONS* to enhance two additional base LLMs on mathematical reasoning tasks: (1) DeepSeek-Chat [51] model of 7B size, which is a foundational LLM and (2) Llemma [52], a competent domain-specific LLM optimized for math reasoning. Figure 4 shows the comparisons with *Few-shot Prompting* and *Distill GPT4-then-Finetune*. It is observed that our framework still works for strong foundation LLMs, with 9.20% and 14.78% performance boosts for DeepSeek-Chat and Llemma respectively. This demonstrates that our framework can not only convert LLMs from weak to strong, but also elevate LLMs from strong to stronger.




Figure 4: Generalization to different LLMs. The performances on math reasoning tasks are reported.

5 Analysis

This section will make an in-depth analysis of the underlying reason behind *ENVISIONS*'s success.

5.1 What is the Impact of Key Components in *ENVISIONS*?

Some key components are ablated independently to verify their effectiveness in Table 3. *w/o self-refine* ablates both the self-refinement process (i.e., Step ④-⑥) and \mathcal{L}_2 . *w/o self-rewards* replaces the trajectory ranking on the self-rewarding strategy with random sampling. *w/o long-term memory* only utilizes the generated trajectories from the current iteration for training. *w/o \mathcal{L}_2 loss* ablates the optimization with positive-negative trajectory pairs.

Of these components, self-refine-oriented optimizations (i.e., self-refinement and \mathcal{L}_2 loss) play key roles in boosting the performances. As one of the key contributions, the design of \mathcal{L}_2 loss leads to 3.10%-4.57% improvements in *ENVISIONS*. It makes full use of negative trajectories while maintaining training efficiency in an RL-free style. Especially in agent tasks, *ENVISIONS* benefits a lot from \mathcal{L}_2 loss, with 3.49%-5.53% performance gains.

5.2 What is Behind the Superiority of *ENVISIONS*?

We provide in-depth evidence and analysis on the superiority of *ENVISIONS* from three distinctive views: (1) exploratory ability and stability; (2) log probability margin between positive and negative solutions; and (3) diversity of synthetic samples.

Balanced exploratory ability and stability are key to success in weak-to-strong. To effectively navigate the environment and acquire new skills autonomously, two factors are crucial: 1) promptly resolving extensive samples to collect correct trajectories, and 2) minimizing the potential loss




Figure 5: In-depth analysis from three perspectives. The first row (i.e., (a),(b),(c)) and the second row (i.e., (d),(e),(f)) represent the results on LLaMA2-Chat (7B) and LLaMA2-Chat (13B) respectively. Plots in fig.(b),(e) correspond to the methods represented by the same colors in fig.(a),(d).

of knowledge from previously-solved samples. We employ two metrics *exploratory ability* and *stability* to evaluate the LLM (both of them are the higher, the better). Refer to Appendix C for definition details. In Figure 5(a)(d), *ENVISIONS* demonstrates remarkable performance in achieving a balance between exploratory ability and stability. By leveraging the candidate trajectory pool and self-rewards, *ENVISIONS* effectively retains high-quality positive solutions during training, significantly mitigating the issue of forgetting previous trajectories. Additionally, the RL-free loss \mathcal{L}_2 enables flexible updates of the LLM, enhancing its exploration capabilities.

Clearly distinguishing positive and negative solutions can help the LLM optimization. During the optimization process, it is inevitable for the log probability of both positive and negative trajectories to increase simultaneously [53]. However, clearly keeping the probability margins ($\Delta\log p$) between positive-negative pairs is crucial to facilitate the optimization. Fig. 5(b)(e) shows the analysis of $\Delta\log p$ during iterations. It is observed *ENVISIONS* keeps the margin within a reasonable range, while reinforced methods exhibit a rapid decrease in $\Delta\log p$. It indicates the unsuitability of DPO to the exploration setting and the importance of feedback from *ENV*. Notably, *STaR+Env.* fails to keep the stable margins in the math domain, since it merely utilizes positive data for training, which fails to distinguish negative ones and leads to overfitting on the limited number of solutions. Such finding corresponds to the lack of exploratory ability in Fig. 5(a)(d).

Diverse trajectories are what you need for self-training. In Fig. 5(c)(f), we compare the number of correct and unique trajectories by the last iteration. It demonstrates the huge strengths of *ENVISIONS* in synthesizing diverse trajectories. It largely surpasses *Reinforced Self-Training* approaches, which is one of the underlying reasons for our superiority. In fact, the LLM updates in RL methods are restricted by *KL* constraints, which ultimately impact the diversity of the generated trajectories. Moreover, *Distill GPT-4* and *Distill Claude2* lead to 10,831 and 8,561 diverse trajectories with one iteration. Since repeatedly calling strong LLMs involves extremely high cost and cumbersome prompt optimizations, they are far from sustainable compared with *ENVISIONS*.

5.3 How does the Training Recipe Matter in Iterative Self-Exploration?

In each iteration of *ENVISIONS*, we optimize the policy LLM from scratch (e.g., LLaMA2-Chat) with the updated training trajectories. Such a training recipe is expected to bring stability to the training process, compared with the strategy of continuous training based on previous checkpoints. Table. 4 presents the performance comparisons. Obvious superiority of *ENVISIONS* is observed across these three domains, with an average improvement of 5.37%. Training from previous checkpoints does affect the exploration. For the RL-based self-training method, the training of the policy LLM is constrained within the range of the reference model by the KL term. In order to enable continuous evolution, the policy LLM is required to be updated from the checkpoint of the previous iteration. It is also one of the main causes of their sub-optimal performances.

| Tasks | Cont. | <i>ENVISIONS</i> | Δ |
|-------------------|-------|------------------|----------|
| LLaMA-2-Chat (7B) | | | |
| Agent | 78.18 | 85.38 | +7.20 |
| Math Reasoning | 51.20 | 53.74 | +2.54 |
| Logic Reasoning | 46.20 | 57.73 | +11.53 |
| Average | 53.32 | 58.69 | +5.37 |

Table 4: Comparisons between training strategies. *Cont.* column denotes the performances of *ENVISIONS* under the continual training setting.

6 Conclusion

This paper focuses on converting LLMs from weak to strong in increasingly promising neural-symbolic scenarios, without human-annotated symbolic training data. In view of two key challenges, i.e., 1) the scarcity of symbolic training data, and 2) the inherent weakness of LLMs in addressing SL, we conclude the env-guided self-training approach. Built on it, we propose a novel neural-symbolic self-training framework *ENVISIONS*. Extensive experiments across three domains verify the remarkable performances. In-depth analysis on the superiority of *ENVISIONS* from three distinctive views provide novel insights for future researches.

References

- [1] 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.
- [2] 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.
- [3] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca, 2023.
- [4] Zhangyue Yin, Qiushi Sun, Qipeng Guo, Jiawen Wu, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. Do large language models know what they don’t know? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 8653–8665, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.551. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.551>.
- [5] Hamish Ivison, Yizhong Wang, Valentina Pyatkin, Nathan Lambert, Matthew Peters, Pradeep Dasigi, Joel Jang, David Wadden, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Camels in a changing climate: Enhancing lm adaptation with tulu 2, 2023.
- [6] 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.
- [7] Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. Self-rewarding language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10020*, 2024.

- [8] Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01335*, 2024.
- [9] Corby Rosset, Ching-An Cheng, Arindam Mitra, Michael Santacrose, Ahmed Awadallah, and Tengyang Xie. Direct nash optimization: Teaching language models to self-improve with general preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03715*, 2024.
- [10] Fangzhi Xu, Zhiyong Wu, Qiushi Sun, Siyu Ren, Fei Yuan, Shuai Yuan, Qika Lin, Yu Qiao, and Jun Liu. Symbol-llm: Towards foundational symbol-centric interface for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09278*, 2023.
- [11] Bo Liu, Yuqian Jiang, Xiaohan Zhang, Qiang Liu, Shiqi Zhang, Joydeep Biswas, and Peter Stone. Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*, 2023.
- [12] Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yujiu Yang, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, Weizhu Chen, et al. Tora: A tool-integrated reasoning agent for mathematical problem solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17452*, 2023.
- [13] Hanxu Hu, Hongyuan Lu, Huajian Zhang, Yun-Ze Song, Wai Lam, and Yue Zhang. Chain-of-symbol prompting elicits planning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10276*, 2023.
- [14] Longtao Zheng, Rundong Wang, and Bo An. Synapse: Leveraging few-shot exemplars for human-level computer control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.07863*, 2023.
- [15] Zhiyong Wu, Chengcheng Han, Zichen Ding, Zhenmin Weng, Zhoumianze Liu, Shunyu Yao, Tao Yu, and Lingpeng Kong. Os-copilot: Towards generalist computer agents with self-improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07456*, 2024.
- [16] Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*, 2023.
- [17] Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Ksenia Konyushkova, Lotte Weerts, Abhishek Sharma, Aditya Siddhant, Alex Ahern, Miaosen Wang, Chenjie Gu, et al. Reinforced self-training (rest) for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08998*, 2023.
- [18] Avi Singh, John D Co-Reyes, Rishabh Agarwal, Ankesh Anand, Piyush Patil, Peter J Liu, James Harrison, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, Aaron Parisi, et al. Beyond human data: Scaling self-training for problem-solving with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06585*, 2023.
- [19] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [20] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms, 2017.
- [21] Tianqi Liu, Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, Peter J Liu, and Jialu Liu. Statistical rejection sampling improves preference optimization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [22] Jianing Wang, Qiushi Sun, Nuo Chen, Chengyu Wang, Jun Huang, Ming Gao, and Xiang Li. Uncertainty-aware parameter-efficient self-training for semi-supervised language understanding. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 7873–7884, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.528. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.528>.
- [23] Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah Goodman. Star: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15476–15488, 2022.

- [24] Ansong Ni, Jeevana Priya Inala, Chenglong Wang, Alex Polozov, Christopher Meek, Dragomir Radev, and Jianfeng Gao. Learning math reasoning from self-sampled correct and partially-correct solutions. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [25] Subhabrata (Subho) Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4. *arXiv: Computation and Language*, June 2023. URL <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/orca-progressive-learning-from-complex-explanation-traces-of-gpt-4/>.
- [26] Yihe Deng, Weitong Zhang, Zixiang Chen, and Quanquan Gu. Rephrase and respond: Let large language models ask better questions for themselves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04205*, 2023.
- [27] Nicholas Lee, Thanakul Wattanawong, Sehoon Kim, Karttikeya Mangalam, Sheng Shen, Gopala Anumanchipali, Michael W Mahoney, Kurt Keutzer, and Amir Gholami. Llm2llm: Boosting llms with novel iterative data enhancement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15042*, 2024.
- [28] Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhao Chen. Mammoth: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05653*, 2023.
- [29] Aohan Zeng, Mingdao Liu, Rui Lu, Bowen Wang, Xiao Liu, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Agenttuning: Enabling generalized agent abilities for llms, 2023.
- [30] Kanzhi Cheng, Qiushi Sun, Yougang Chu, Fangzhi Xu, Yantao Li, Jianbing Zhang, and Zhiyong Wu. Seeclck: Harnessing gui grounding for advanced visual gui agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10935*, 2024.
- [31] 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.
- [32] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13484–13508, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.754. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.754>.
- [33] Jerry Wei, Le Hou, Andrew Lampinen, Xiangning Chen, Da Huang, Yi Tay, Xinyun Chen, Yifeng Lu, Denny Zhou, Tengyu Ma, and Quoc Le. Symbol tuning improves in-context learning in language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 968–979, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.61. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.61>.
- [34] Shalev Lifshitz, Keiran Paster, Harris Chan, Jimmy Ba, and Sheila McIlraith. STEVE-1: A generative model for text-to-behavior in minecraft. In *NeurIPS 2023 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Q02f1XqgiR>.
- [35] Zhonghan Zhao, Ke Ma, Wenhao Chai, Xuan Wang, Kewei Chen, Dongxu Guo, Yanting Zhang, Hongwei Wang, and Gaoang Wang. Do we really need a complex agent system? distill embodied agent into a single model, 2024.
- [36] Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. PAL: Program-aided language models. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10764–10799. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/gao23f.html>.

- [37] Wenhui Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W. Cohen. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YfZ4ZPt8zd>.
- [38] Qiushi Sun, Zhirui Chen, Fangzhi Xu, Kanzhi Cheng, Chang Ma, Zhangyue Yin, Jianing Wang, Chengcheng Han, Renyu Zhu, Shuai Yuan, et al. A survey of neural code intelligence: Paradigms, advances and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14734*, 2024.
- [39] Liangming Pan, Alon Albalak, Xinyi Wang, and William Wang. Logic-lm: Empowering large language models with symbolic solvers for faithful logical reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 3806–3824, 2023.
- [40] Qiantong Xu, Fenglu Hong, Bo Li, Changran Hu, Zhengyu Chen, and Jian Zhang. On the tool manipulation capability of open-sourced large language models. In *NeurIPS 2023 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*, 2023.
- [41] Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, et al. Toolllm: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world apis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16789*, 2023.
- [42] Zonghan Yang, Peng Li, Ming Yan, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Yang Liu. React meets actre: Autonomous annotations of agent trajectories for contrastive self-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14589*, 2024.
- [43] Evan Zheran Liu, Kelvin Guu, Panupong Pasupat, Tianlin Shi, and Percy Liang. Reinforcement learning on web interfaces using workflow-guided exploration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08802>.
- [44] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [45] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.
- [46] Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. 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*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021.
- [47] Shen-Yun Miao, Chao-Chun Liang, and Keh-Yih Su. A diverse corpus for evaluating and developing english math word problem solvers. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 975–984, 2020.
- [48] Oyvind Tafjord, Bhavana Dalvi, and Peter Clark. Proofwriter: Generating implications, proofs, and abductive statements over natural language. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 3621–3634, 2021.
- [49] Peter Clark, Oyvind Tafjord, and Kyle Richardson. Transformers as soft reasoners over language. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3882–3890, 2021.
- [50] Andreas Köpf, Yannic Kilcher, Dimitri von Rütte, Sotiris Anagnostidis, Zhi Rui Tam, Keith Stevens, Abdullah Barhoum, Duc Nguyen, Oliver Stanley, Richárd Nagyfi, et al. Openassistant conversations-democratizing large language model alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [51] DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02954*, 2024. URL <https://github.com/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-LLM>.

- [52] Zhangir Azerbayev, Hailey Schoelkopf, Keiran Paster, Marco Dos Santos, Stephen Marcus McAleer, Albert Q Jiang, Jia Deng, Stella Biderman, and Sean Welleck. Llemma: An open language model for mathematics. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [53] Jiwoo Hong, Noah Lee, and James Thorne. Reference-free monolithic preference optimization with odds ratio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07691*, 2024.
- [54] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017.

A Implementation Details

In this section, we provide some details of the implementation.

A.1 Training Details

The SFT training in both our framework and baselines is conducted on 8*A100 with a maximum length of 2,048. They are optimized and accelerated with DeepSpeed Zero3 and FlashAttention2. The AdamW optimizer [54] is leveraged with a *Linear* learning rate of 2e-5. The SFT training epoch number of each iteration is set to 2, 1, 2 for agent, math reasoning, and logic reasoning tasks respectively.

For the DPO training stage in baseline methods, it is also conducted on 8*A100 with a maximum length of 2,048. The *Linear* learning rate is 5e-7 with a warm-up ratio of 0.1. The epoch number for each domain is the same as the SFT stage.

A.2 Test Tasks and Benchmark

The experiments in the main paper primarily cover three domains: web agent, math reasoning, and logic reasoning. We have concluded some key details in Table 1. In Table 5, we attach extra information on the test tasks and benchmark.

| Domains | Task name | Is Held-out? | #Test Samples | Beam Size | Max. Length | Sources |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Web Agent | MiniWob++ | | 30 (\times 44 tasks) | 1 | 2,048 | Liu et al. [43] |
| Math Reasoning | GSM8K | | 1,319 | 2 | 2,048 | Cobbe et al. [44] |
| | MATH | | 4,001 | 2 | 2,048 | Hendrycks et al. [45] |
| | GSM-Hard | ✓ | 1,319 | 2 | 2,048 | Gao et al. [36] |
| | SVAMP | ✓ | 1,000 | 2 | 2,048 | Patel et al. [46] |
| | AsDiv | ✓ | 2,096 | 2 | 2,048 | Miao et al. [47] |
| Logic Reasoning | ProofWriter | | 600 | 1 | 4,096 | Tafjord et al. [48] |
| | RuleTaker | ✓ | 1,389 | 1 | 4,096 | Clark et al. [49] |

Table 5: Details of test tasks and benchmarks.

Unless otherwise stated, all these test tasks are evaluated under the zero-shot setting. For MiniWob++ benchmark, we select 44 tasks for the test [30], each with 30 randomly generated samples. All the above settings are consistent among all baseline methods.

B Pseudocode of *ENVISIONS*

The self-training framework *ENVISIONS* can be expressed through the following pseudocode.

C Definition of *Exploratory Ability* and *Stability*

(1) Whether the policy LLM can rapidly explore large amounts of correct samples, and (2) whether it can mitigate the issue of forgetting previously-solved samples are two key factors to evaluate LLMs in interacting with the environment. We define *Exploratory Ability* (EA) and *Stability* (STB) respectively as the metrics. The calculation of the metrics is defined as follows:

Suppose that we have the input set M . In the i^{th} iteration, the solved sample (with correct trajectories) constitute of set M_i . $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j$ contains all the previously-solved samples from the iteration 1 to $i - 1$. And $M_i \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j$ comprises the overlapped successful samples between the current iteration and preceding iterations. $M_i \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j$ denotes the sample set that are newly solved in the current iteration i . Based on the definition, we accumulate to obtain the overall EA and STB of the entire process:

$$EA = \sum_{i=2}^T \frac{|M_i \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j|}{|\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j|}, \quad STB = \sum_{i=2}^T \frac{|M_i \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j|}{|\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j|} \quad (7)$$

Algorithm 1: A Neural-Symbolic Self-Training Framework *ENVISIONS*

Input: Data pair $\{(x, y)\}$, environment **ENV**, candidate trajectory pool **POOL**, weak LLM π_{θ_0} , number of generated samples K , number of iteration T .

Output: Strong LLM π_{θ}^* .

// Initialize

$\pi_{\theta} \leftarrow \pi_{\theta_0}$

// Start the Loop

for $i = 1$ **to** T **do**

for each x **in the input do**

 // 1-Online Exploration

 Generate K symbolic solutions with self-rewards: $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^K, \{r_k\}_{k=1}^K \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot|x)$.

 Get binary rewards by executing in **ENV**: $\{b_k\}_{k=1}^K \leftarrow \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{ENV}(a_k) == y]$.

 Generate self-refined solutions with self-rewards: $\{\tilde{a}_k\}_{k=1}^K, \{\tilde{r}_k\}_{k=1}^K \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot|x; a_k)$.

 Get binary rewards by executing in **ENV**: $\{\tilde{b}_k\}_{k=1}^K \leftarrow \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{ENV}(\tilde{a}_k) == y]$.

 Let $T_k = (x, y, a_k, b_k, r_k), \tilde{T}_k = (x, y, \tilde{a}_k, \tilde{b}_k, \tilde{r}_k)$ denote the collected trajectories.

 // 2-Traj. Filtering and Candidate Pool Updating

 Filter the superior trajectory T_k^* from T_k and \tilde{T}_k with binary rewards and self-rewards.

 Update the candidate pool with T_k^* .

end

 // 3-Training

 Rank and retrieve positive-only training set U_1 and positive-negative pairs U_2 from **POOL**.

 Optimize π_{θ_0} to π_{θ}^* with $\mathcal{L} = - \sum_{(x, a^+) \sim U_1} \log p_{\theta_0}(a^+|x) - \sum_{(x, a^+, a^-) \sim U_2} \log p_{\theta_0}(a^+|x; a^-)$.

 Update the policy LLM for the next iteration: $\pi_{\theta} \leftarrow \pi_{\theta}^*$

end

// Output the enhanced LLM

Return π_{θ}^* ;

where $|\cdot|$ is the number of samples in the given set. T is the total number of iterations.

Take the process of 2 iterations as an example, suppose the iteration 1 explores 1,000 correct samples. Iteration 2 obtains 1200 correct samples, including 800 previously-solved samples and 400 newly-solved samples. Then, $EA = 400/1000$ and $STB = 800/1000$.

D Supplementary Results


D.1 Evolution Progress

Apart from the performance evolution curves with the LLaMA2-Chat 13B model presented in Figure 3, we expand the discussion on the 7B version. In Figure 6, we visualize the evolution progress of self-training methods on both the model performance and the number of explored samples. The explored sample denotes that one input x is solved by at least one generated symbolic solution a_k (i.e., $b_k = 1$). We count the number of explored samples at each iteration to make the figure.


From the results, the performances of the frameworks are positively correlated with the ability to continuously explore correct trajectories. *ENVISIONS* presents great superiority, especially in the logic reasoning tasks. Compared with our proposed *Env-guided Self-Training* approach, *Reinforced Self-Training* approach appears to be weaker at exploring new samples. This finding is consistent with Figure 5 in the main paper.

D.2 Scaling of K

The hyper-parameter K controls the number of generated candidate symbolic solutions at each generation step. In the main results, we only implement $K = 5$ for illustration.



(a) Evolution of performance.



(b) Evolution of explored sample numbers.

Figure 6: Evolution curves on LLaMA2-Chat 7B version across agent, math, and logic reasoning domains. (a) is the performance evolution progress. (b) denotes the evolution of explored sample numbers.

| Models | Agent | | Math Reasoning | | | | Logical Reasoning | | Avg. |
|------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | MiniWob++ | GSM8K | MATH | GSM-H | SVAMP | ASDiv | ProofWriter | RuleTaker | |
| K=2 | 78.56 | 53.60 | 17.37 | 44.96 | 67.20 | 66.84 | 35.17 | 49.82 | 51.69 |
| K=5 | 85.38 | 58.98 | 19.00 | 48.52 | 72.40 | 69.80 | 52.83 | 62.63 | 58.69 |
| K=10 | 79.24 | 58.30 | 21.89 | 48.29 | 67.90 | 69.75 | 53.50 | 61.99 | 57.61 |
| K=15 | 79.55 | 57.47 | 23.72 | 46.63 | 69.80 | 70.28 | 54.83 | 59.54 | 57.73 |

Table 6: Scaling of K with LLaMA2-Chat (7B) as the base LLM. In the main results, we implement $K = 5$ for illustration.

In Table 6, we present performances under various choices of K , including 2, 5, 10, and 15. Considering the training cost, we only include LLaMA2-Chat (7B) as the base LLM. From the results, we conclude the following takeaways:

Moderate value of K leads to the optimal performances. When $K = 5$, *ENVISIONS* demonstrates superior performances, especially on agentic tasks (i.e., MiniWob++ benchmark). However, when reducing the value of K (i.e., $K = 2$), the overall performances of *ENVISIONS* drop a lot. It indicates that keeping a moderate number of candidate solutions in each generation step benefits the self-training process.

Scaling of K does not bring significant improvements. Scaling K from 5 to 10 and 15 does bring improvements on some challenging tasks (e.g., MATH). However, this observation is not consistent across various tasks. Generally, the average performances remain stable with K increasing.

D.3 MiniWob++ Results Per Tasks

Table 7 shows the performance of *ENVISIONS* on each of the 44 MiniWob++ tasks.

| | 1-shot | Distill GPT4 | Distill Claude2 | STAR+Env. | Self-Rewarding | iter. SFT+DPO | Ours |
|---------------------------|--------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| LLaMA-2-Chat (7B) | | | | | | | |
| choose-date | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| choose-list | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-button | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 |
| click-button-sequence | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 |
| click-checkboxes | 20.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-checkboxes-large | 20.00 | 86.67 | 96.67 | 86.67 | 66.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-checkboxes-soft | 0.00 | 6.67 | 30.00 | 50.00 | 0.00 | 63.33 | 76.67 |
| click-checkboxes-transfer | 56.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-collapsible | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-color | 53.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-dialog | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-dialog-2 | 0.00 | 26.67 | 73.33 | 100.00 | 73.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-link | 73.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 |
| click-option | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-scroll-list | 56.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-shades | 93.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-shape | 0.00 | 70.00 | 53.33 | 63.33 | 16.67 | 50.00 | 70.00 |
| click-tab | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 26.67 | 56.67 | 100.00 |
| click-test | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-test-2 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-widget | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| copy-paste | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| copy-paste-2 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-date | 3.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-password | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-text | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-text-dynamic | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-time | 0.00 | 30.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 43.33 |
| focus-text | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| focus-text-2 | 33.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| guess-number | 6.67 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 10.00 | 6.67 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| identify-shape | 0.00 | 56.67 | 80.00 | 100.00 | 56.67 | 50.00 | 100.00 |
| multi-layouts | 3.33 | 96.67 | 86.67 | 100.00 | 76.67 | 96.67 | 100.00 |
| multi-orderings | 0.00 | 93.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 80.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| navigate-tree | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 |
| read-table | 70.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| search-engine | 3.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 43.33 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| simple-algebra | 6.67 | 50.00 | 63.33 | 80.00 | 6.67 | 3.33 | 73.33 |
| simple-arithmetic | 0.00 | 86.67 | 90.00 | 100.00 | 40.00 | 73.33 | 96.67 |
| social-media-all | 30.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 30.00 | 0.00 | 30.00 | 30.00 |
| text-transform | 66.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| unicode-test | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| use-slider | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 |
| use-spinner | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Average | 51.14 | 81.14 | 82.80 | 83.71 | 69.47 | 77.05 | 85.38 |
| LLaMA-2-Chat (13B) | | | | | | | |
| choose-date | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| choose-list | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-button | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 |
| click-button-sequence | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-checkboxes | 30.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-checkboxes-large | 26.67 | 86.67 | 96.67 | 90.00 | 43.33 | 90.00 | 93.33 |
| click-checkboxes-soft | 0.00 | 3.33 | 46.67 | 90.00 | 20.00 | 60.00 | 90.00 |
| click-checkboxes-transfer | 10.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-collapsible | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-color | 56.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-dialog | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-dialog-2 | 0.00 | 26.67 | 73.33 | 100.00 | 73.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-link | 70.00 | 93.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 | 93.33 |
| click-option | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-scroll-list | 63.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-shades | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-shape | 10.00 | 76.67 | 56.67 | 86.67 | 10.00 | 66.67 | 73.33 |
| click-tab | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-test | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-test-2 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| click-widget | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| copy-paste | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| copy-paste-2 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 |
| enter-date | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-password | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-text | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-text-dynamic | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| enter-time | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 93.33 |
| focus-text | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| focus-text-2 | 63.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| guess-number | 6.67 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 3.33 | 6.67 | 10.00 | 6.67 |
| identify-shape | 0.00 | 10.00 | 90.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 | 90.00 | 100.00 |
| multi-layouts | 66.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 86.67 | 96.67 | 100.00 |
| multi-orderings | 56.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| navigate-tree | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 60.00 | 56.67 |
| read-table | 76.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| search-engine | 90.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| simple-algebra | 23.33 | 76.67 | 80.00 | 80.00 | 43.33 | 36.67 | 83.33 |
| simple-arithmetic | 56.67 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 96.67 | 100.00 |
| social-media-all | 93.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 30.00 | 0.00 | 30.00 | 30.00 |
| text-transform | 96.67 | 83.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| unicode-test | 93.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| use-slider | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 10.00 |
| use-spinner | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 |
| Average | 60.00 | 80.15 | 84.77 | 85.15 | 74.24 | 82.73 | 87.12 |

Table 7: Detailed performances on 44 MiniWob++ tasks.