

REAL: Response Embedding-based Alignment for LLMs

Honggen Zhang¹, Igor Molybog¹, June Zhang^{1*}, Xufeng Zhao²,

¹University of Hawaii at Manoa, ²University of Hamburg,

Email: {honggen,molybog,zjz}@hawaii.edu{xufeng.zhao}@uni-hamburg.de

Abstract

Aligning large language models (LLMs) to human preferences is a crucial step in building helpful and safe AI tools, which usually involve training on supervised datasets. Popular algorithms such as Direct Preference Optimization rely on pairs of AI-generated responses ranked according to human feedback. The labeling process is the most labor-intensive and costly part of the alignment pipeline, and improving its efficiency would have a meaningful impact on AI development. We propose a strategy for sampling a high-quality training dataset that focuses on acquiring the most informative response pairs for labeling out of a set of AI-generated responses. Experimental results on synthetic HH-RLHF benchmarks indicate that choosing dissimilar response pairs enhances the direct alignment of LLMs while reducing inherited labeling errors. We also applied our method to the real-world dataset SHP2, selecting optimal pairs from multiple responses. The model aligned on dissimilar response pairs obtained the best win rate on the dialogue task. Our findings suggest that focusing on less similar pairs can improve the efficiency of LLM alignment, saving up to 65% of annotators' work. The code of the work can be found <https://github.com/honggen-zhang/REAL-Alignment>

1 Introduction

Large Language models (LLMs), empowered by the enormous pre-trained dataset from the Internet, show the power to generate the answers to various questions and solutions to challenging tasks. However, they might generate undesirable content that is useless or even harmful to humans (Wang et al., 2024). Additional training steps are required to optimize LLMs and, thus, align their responses with human preferences. For that purpose, Christiano et al. (2017) proposed Reinforcement learning

from human feedback (RLHF). It consists of estimating the human preference reward model (RM) from response preference data (Ouyang et al., 2022) and steering LLM parameters using a popular reinforcement learning algorithm of proximal policy optimization (PPO). RLHF requires extensive computational resources and is prone to training instabilities.

Recently, direct alignment from preference (DAP) approach, which does not explicitly learn the reward model, has emerged as an alternative to RLHF (Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023; Rafailov et al., 2024). Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2024; Azar et al., 2023) is a milestone DAP method. It formulates the problem of learning human preferences through finetuning LLM with implicit reward model using a training set $\mathcal{D} = \{x_i, y_i^+, y_i^-\}_{i=1}^N$, where x_i is the i th prompt, y_i^+, y_i^- are the corresponding preferred and not-preferred responses.

DPO requires the explicit preference signal from an annotator within the dataset. Some DPO variations such as Contrastive Post-training (Xu et al., 2023), RPO (Song et al., 2023) were proposed to augment \mathcal{D} using AI but might generate low-quality pairs. The labeling rough estimate is \$0.1 - \$1 per prompt; with 100,000-1,000,000 prompts, it would cost approximately \$100,000 to augment the dataset. Some other DPO variation methods (Guo et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2024) actively choose better samples using additional annotators at the cost of increased computations.

In this paper, we propose a novel method for enhancing DPO learning with efficient data selection (see Fig. 1). We should only train DPO on the most informative subset of samples in \mathcal{D} . Inspired by works in contrastive learning (Chen et al., 2020), we connect the usefulness of response pair (y_i, y_j) to the cosine similarity between their representations in the embedding space. Sampling similar pairs

*Corresponding Author

(large cosine similarity) will bring a harder problem for learning, which is usually encouraged in contrastive learning. However, they are more prone to erroneous labeling (i.e., non-preferred responses being labeled as preferred and vice versa) which might damp this effect (Zhang et al., 2024; Chuang et al., 2020). On the other hand, dissimilar pairs can be preferred for the DPO owing to smaller noise in the labels. We select similar and dissimilar response pairs from HH-RLHF dataset and show that dissimilar pairs empirically form the best dataset for alignment when compared on several metrics to randomly selected or similar pairs.

We extended this methodology to a real-world dataset SHP2, which contains multiple responses per prompt. We want to extract a high-quality pair (y_i, y_j) to label from $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$. In addition to considering the most similar and most dissimilar pairs of responses, we implemented an approach that splits the responses into two clusters and selects centroids of the clusters as the training pairs. Although more difficult to implement, this method demonstrates the best performance according to our experimental results, with dissimilar pairs being the close second compared to similar or random pairs.

1. We highlight the overlooked importance of sentence embeddings in LLM training: The model learning can be enhanced by investigating the sentence embeddings and integrating this information into the fine-tuning process.
2. We introduce efficient response pair selection strategies to acquire high-quality data, maintaining an offline dataset throughout the training to conserve sampling resources.
3. Our experiments demonstrate that pairs dissimilar in the embedding space align better with human preferences than random or similar pairs, owing to reduced errors in the label.

2 Related work

Direct Alignment of Language Models: Despite RLHF’s effectiveness in aligning language models (LMs) with human values, its complexity and resource demands have spurred the exploration of alternatives. Sequence Likelihood Calibration (SLiC)(Zhao et al., 2022) is a DAP method to directly encourage the LLMs to output the positive response and penalize the negative response.

Chain of Hindsight (CoH) (Liu et al., 2023) is equivalent to learning a conditional policy. DPO (Rafailov et al., 2024) directly optimizes LMs using a preference-based loss function to enhance training stability in comparison to traditional RLHF. DPO with Dynamic β (Wu et al., 2024) introduced a framework that dynamically calibrates β at the batch level, informed by the underlying preference data. Existing work(Azar et al., 2023) identified that DPO were susceptible to overfitting and introduced Identity Preference Optimization (IPO) as a solution to this issue. The generative diversity of LLM deteriorated and the KL divergence grew faster for less preferred responses compared with preferred responses, and they proposed token-level DPO (TDPO)(Zeng et al., 2024) to enhance the regulation of KL divergence.

Data Quality in Direct Alignment Due to the large data needed for the Direct Alignment, PRO(Song et al., 2023) proposed preference ranking with listwise preference datasets, which could directly implement alignment in the fine-tuning process. However, fine-tuning was constrained by the limitations of available data and the imperfections inherent in human-generated data. Contrastive Post-training (Xu et al., 2023) tries to build more datasets using other LLMs to advance the training process of DPO without considering the mistakes. Recently, similar to active learning to select samples based on current models (Settles, 2009), (Guo et al., 2024; Morimura et al., 2024) use the AI as an annotator to monitor the quantity of data pairs for each training step but it will be expensive. (Yu et al., 2024) use LLMs to design a refinement function, which estimates the quality of positive and negative responses. LESS (Xia et al., 2024) is an optimizer-aware and practically efficient algorithm to estimate data influences on gradient Similarity Search for instruction data selection. However, this data selection is online so needs more computation.

3 Background

LLM alignment refers to the process of training a language model to assign a higher probability to a response y with a higher human preference reward R_{xy} . An estimation r of the reward is used in practice. It is imperative to ensure that for a given prompt x the estimated reward $r(x, y)$ is close to the true reward R_{xy} for each response. The problem of learning the best estimator for the reward




Figure 1: The diagram of our data selecting for DPO alignment. We extract the embeddings of the responses from the base model. Selecting a sub-set of dissimilar pairs (easy) to label. The easy pairs will be used to directly align the LLMs.

function can be formulated as

$$r = \arg \min_{r'} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y,R_{xy}) \sim \mathcal{R}} [(r'(x,y) - R_{xy})^2] \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{R} is the dataset consisting of the prompt x , responses y , and true reward values R_{xy} .

3.1 LLM Alignment to Human Feedback

The human feedback rarely comes in the form of the true reward samples (y, R_{xy}) . Ranking or pairwise comparison of responses is more common. There are two sample responses (y^+, y^-) that correspond to a single prompt x in the pairwise comparison case. Human subjects provide a preference to label them as $R_{xy^+} > R_{xy^-} | x$ where y^+ and y^- are the preferred and non-preferred responses, respectively. This method of labeling does not explicitly provide the true reward signal. However, alignment can still be performed by applying the Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) algorithm using binary human preference data. The Bradley-Terry (Bradley and Terry, 1952) model defines the log-odds

$$\log \frac{p^*}{1 - p^*} = r(x, y^+) - r(x, y^-) \quad (2)$$

Where p is the preference probability. Modeling the margins of the response pair can also be viewed in the perspective of estimating the true reward in Eq. 1. Assume the ground truth reward for $r(x, y^+)$ and $r(x, y^-)$ is 1 and 0 respectively. The difference between the estimated reward and the truth is $\mathbb{E}_{q(y^+)} [r(x, y^+) - 1] + \mathbb{E}_{q(y^-)} [r(x, y^+) - 0] = \mathbb{E}[r(x, y^+) - r(x, y^-) - 1]$.

We, therefore, have the preference model.

$$p(y^+ > y^- | x) = \frac{\exp(r(x, y^+))}{\exp(r(x, y^+)) + \exp(r(x, y^-))} \quad (3)$$

where $r(\cdot)$ is the reward model. In practice, we will learn the parametrized reward model given the human-labeled preference data. The reward model learned from the human preference responses can be used to score LLM-generated content. It provides feedback to the language model π_θ by maximizing the objective function

$$\max_{\pi_\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, y \sim \pi_\theta(y|x)} [r(x, y)] - \beta \mathbb{D}_{KL}[\pi_\theta(y|x) || \pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)] \quad (4)$$

where π_{ref} is the reference model after the supervised fine-tuning.

3.2 Direct Language Model Alignment

RLHF is expensive, and we cannot guarantee that the reward model will be optimal. Recently, Direct alignment from preferences methods have emerged to replace the RLHF when aligning the LLMs. Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2024) optimizes the policy π directly as an alternative to reward model r . Given the static dataset of $\mathcal{D} = \{x_i, y_i^+, y_i^-\}_{i=1}^N$ sampled from the human preference distribution p , the objective becomes:

$$\mathcal{L}_{DPO} = - \mathbb{E}_{x, y^+, y^-} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y^+ | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y^+ | x)} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y^- | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y^- | x)} \right) \right] \quad (5)$$

where σ is the logistic function. Instead of training an explicit reward model, DPO results in an implicit reward model $r = \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta}{\pi_{\text{ref}}}$. Different to the RLHF which generates new response for on-line learning, DPO’s performance will be largely affected by the data size and quality. To have more data for DPO training, it is essential to generate more response pairs. However, exhaustively labeling preference pairs turn out to be expensive and inefficacy.

4 Method

We proposed identifying and selectively labeling high-quality pairs to reduce the error in the label while improving performance. The loss \mathcal{L}_{DPO} (Eq.5) is estimated based on the empirical dataset \mathcal{D} . This thus raises the question of how to build the empirical dataset \mathcal{D} to the better approximate expectation of \mathbb{E}_{x,y^+,y^-} in terms of the samples of prompt x and response pairs (y^+, y^-) . However, the DPO assumes that we have access to the preferences through a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{x_i, y_i^+, y_i^-\}_{i=1}^N$, where N is the data size. One can show that as the size of the dataset \mathcal{D} grows (Azar et al., 2023), becomes a more and a more accurate estimate of the true reward R_{xy} . Without the large of N , how to sample a good quality of \mathcal{D} matters for the learning of the implicit reward.

4.1 Consistent Responses Embedding Over Training

In the processing of learning the LLM using DPO, our goal is to increase the difference between the conditional probability $\frac{\pi_\theta(y^+|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y^+|x)}$ and $\frac{\pi_\theta(y^-|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y^-|x)}$. The parameterized conditional probability $\pi_\theta(y|x)$ is changing over the training. However, in the fine-tuning stage, the independent probability $\pi_\theta(y)$ might change a little since the model has been pre-trained on the large dataset already.

$$\pi_\theta(y|x) \propto \pi_\theta(x|y)\pi_\theta(y) \quad (6)$$

In our assumption, independent probability almost consists over the fine-tuning process i.e. $\pi_{\theta_t}(y) \approx \pi_{\theta_{t+1}}(y)$. In other words, the subset parameters ϕ of θ which decide the independent probability of $\pi_\phi(y)$ are not changed.

Unlike the encoder model, such as BERT, we define the embedding of response y from the hidden state of LLM. It is always extracted from the last hidden layer of LLMs. For a response y we use the activation matrix \mathbf{Y} to denote the matrix of

activations of the last hidden layer of LLM. This matrix has its first dimension equal to the length of the sequence y and the second dimension equal to the model dimension. Note that the invariant output of activation (softmax) induces that the row is unchanged or uniformly translated. See proof in the Appendix B. Applying the last linear layer $g(\cdot)$ of the LLM to the rows of this matrix would result in logits of the distribution over the vocabulary for every position in the sequence. The embedding of the response pair is defined as the average of the activation matrix \mathbf{Y} over the first (sequence length) dimension. The dimension of the embedding is equal to the dimension of the model, and its $j - th$ component can be calculated as

$$y^j = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i=1}^S \mathbf{Y}_{ij} \quad (7)$$

where S is tokens of y .

To generate the embeddings, we use the base model that is to be aligned. While it might be beneficial to extract the features on the fly from the model as it is being aligned, static embedding strikes a good balance between relevance and computational efficiency since the embedding have to be computed once and in bulk. We conducted experiments to measure the correlation between the embedding extracted from the base and the aligned models, finding that they ranged between 0.7 and 0.85, demonstrating a great deal of similarity. Study of the feasibility of using the embedding formed by the base model throughout the entire alignment process is further studied in Section B.1.

Based on the consistent embedding space, we would extract the represent pair (y_i, y_j) to label. The represent pair (y_i, y_j) will have a better quality and produce less error in the label. Due to the vocabulary size N is always extremely large, we instead use the input of $\mathbf{Y}' = g^-(\hat{\mathbf{Y}})$ as the substitution of the \mathbf{Y} .

4.2 Pair Selection

Selecting a high-quality dataset is necessary to save more labeling effort and training resources. In our hypothesis, selecting the different responses will affect the learning result (learning human preference)(Dubey et al., 2024). SLiC(Zhao et al., 2023) calculates the sequence score based on the target response y^* . Due to the target preference y^* has already been selected, it is hard to make the selected y_i surpass the quality of y^* . In our dataset

construction, our response pair will not depend on the prompt x , but also the y^* . Hence we leverage the property of invariant sentence embedding space without using target response y^* . See the diagram Fig. 1 of our selection.

In representation learning, the embedding similarity is commonly used to calculate the similarity of images(Chen et al., 2020), sentences(Mikolov, 2013; Zhang et al., 2024). The inner product of $\mathbf{y}_i^T \mathbf{y}_j$ is common to use to measure the similarity. The normalized one $\frac{\mathbf{y}_i^T \mathbf{y}_j}{\|\mathbf{y}_i\| \cdot \|\mathbf{y}_j\|}$ is referring the cosine similarity $\cos(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_j)$.

For the large of unlabeled response pairs $\{y_l, y_m\}$, we try to extract the valuable pairs for labeling based on the embedding similarity. By ranking the training response pairs, the LLMs will obtain the human preference for such responses. The similar responses are hard to rank and thus put the model on a tricky problem but might obtain labeling error. In contrast, the dissimilar responses might learn an easier problem with less error in the label.

We build the **random** sub-set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{random}}$ as the baseline first by extracting random pairs form $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$.

We also define similar pairs and dis-similar pairs as the **hard** sub-set and **easy** sub-set, respectively.

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{hard}} = \{y_i, y_j \mid \cos(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_j) \leq \cos(\mathbf{y}_s, \mathbf{y}_t) \forall s, t\} \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{easy}} = \{y_i, y_j \mid \cos(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_j) \geq \cos(\mathbf{y}_s, \mathbf{y}_t) \forall s, t\} \quad (9)$$

After obtaining the response pairs: **random**, **hard**, and **easy**, we just need to label the sub-set to obtain the preference pairs.

5 Experiments

5.1 Data

For the experiments, we used two types of datasets in terms of the number of responses. The **Anthropic HH-RLHF** helpfulness base and harmlessness base datasets (Bai et al., 2022) represent the first type. It consists of 43k and 44k prompts and corresponding response pairs, generated primarily by proprietary language models trained by Anthropic and not released to the public. The second type is the **SHP2** (Ethayarajh et al., 2022) dataset, which consists of 4.8M collective human preferences over multiple responses from Reddit or StackExchange posts. We only use Reddit with questions and multiple responses. The score of

each response is calculated from the number of positive and negative votes. Appendix A describe more data details.

5.2 Experiment on Anthropic HH-RLHF

The Anthropic HH-RLHF datasets consist of one response pair for each prompt. For each prompt x from a dataset, we calculate the similarity of the corresponding response pair (y^+, y^-) using the embeddings extracted from the base model π_{ref} to be aligned. By ranking the data tuples (x, y^+, y^-) based on similarity values, we categorize the 50% of the tuples with the highest similarity scores as the **"hard"** dataset and the bottom 50% as the **"easy"** dataset. We randomly select 50% of the tuples from the entire Anthropic HH-RLHF as the **"random"** baseline dataset. The **"random"** dataset represents the data distribution that would be the default for a state-of-the-art alignment system. The detail of the experiment setting can be found in Appendix C.

5.2.1 Results: Easy is better for alignment

We supervised fine-tuned (SFT) the base model using the chosen response from the training split of the entire dataset to get the π_{ref} . After that, we sample **"hard"** and **"easy"** and **"random"** sub-sets from Anthropic-HH, Then, we use the "hard," "easy," and "random" sub-sets to align the SFT model π_{ref} using the DPO procedure.

We evaluate the checkpoints on the test dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ over the alignment process. Following (Yu et al., 2024; Xia et al., 2024), we employ loss and margins as the target metrics and use the implicit reward score extracted from the model to calculate them. Given a prompt x and the corresponding chosen and rejected responses y^+ and y^- , the margins are defined as

$$\text{Margins} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}|} \sum_{x, y^+, y^-} r(x, y^+) - r(x, y^-) \quad (10)$$

and the loss is defined as

$$\text{Loss} = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}|} \sum_{x, y^+, y^-} \log \sigma(\beta r(x, y^+) - \beta r(x, y^-)) \quad (11)$$

, where the implicit reward $r(x, y)$ is calculated from the reference and aligned models probability outputs as $r(x, y) = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}$. We use both margins and loss to analyze the DPO results with a higher degree of confidence. Generally, large margins do not necessarily induce small losses and vice versa. We depict the dynamics of the loss on the




Figure 2: Result of evaluating margins and loss on different models

Table 1: Win Rate of the aligned model when compared against the reference supervised fine-tuned model. 90% margin of error is 0.0074.

Sub-set	Phi-1.3B		Harmlessness				Phi-1.3B		Helpfulness			
	Win \uparrow	Lose \downarrow	Win \uparrow	Lose \downarrow	win \uparrow	Lose \downarrow	Win \uparrow	Lose \downarrow	Win \uparrow	Lose \downarrow	win \uparrow	Lose \downarrow
Random	0.54	0.46	0.64	0.36	0.67	0.33	0.71	0.29	0.71	0.26	0.76	0.24
Hard	0.53	0.47	0.65	0.32	0.66	0.34	0.72	0.28	0.66	0.34	0.78	0.21
Easy	0.55	0.45	0.69	0.30	0.72	0.28	0.76	0.24	0.72	0.27	0.80	0.19

test dataset over the course of training in Fig. 2b and margin in Fig. 2a.

1. For both HH-harmlessness and HH-helpfulness datasets, training on the "easy" sub-set results in better values of the Loss and Margins than training on the "random" and "hard" sub-sets.
2. Across LLMs of different sizes, the checkpoints trained on "easy" sub-set consistently show better target metrics values.
3. On the contrary, alignment on the "hard" sub-set hurts the performance when compared to the baseline trained on the "random" subset.
4. The dashed line in Fig. 2a demonstrates sample efficiency of the alignment on the easy subset when compared to the "random" subset baseline. The proposed approach of adaptive data selection saves from 28% to 65% of labeling data efforts.

We also compare the final aligned checkpoints with the Win Rate evaluation metric. We conduct

an analysis of win rates using GPT-4 to judge the responses of an aligned model against the responses of the SFT reference model before alignment. In this experiment, we used 100 of the prompts sampled from the test subsets of the Harmlessness and Helpfulness datasets. In this experiment, there were 100 sample pairs, and the standard error ranged from 0.042 to 0.045, resulting in a 90% margin of error of 0.0074. We use the AlpacaEval-GPT4 (Dubois et al., 2024) framework to assess the judgment of the responses. The prompt supplied to the judge model is demonstrated in the AppendixD. It was constructed to rank the responses according to human preferences into more preferred, less preferred, and a tie. The results of the comparison are shown in Table 1. The best results are provided in bold font.

1. For both Harmlessness and Helpfulness evaluation, the response generated from the model aligned on the "easy" training sub-set has a higher win rate and a lower loss rate than the other two models.
2. The inclusion of the "hard" response examples into the alignment dataset could hurt the

performance, as evident from the Win Rate numbers as well.

These results are consistent with the conclusions made from the loss and margin metrics.




Figure 3: The percentage of response pairs labeled by GPT4 in the same way as they were initially labeled within Anthropic-HH.

5.2.2 Discussion

We further interpret the superiority of the "easy" sub-set for alignment purposes.

Errors in the labeling for different sub-set:

The reason for the superior quality of the "easy" alignment sub-set might be the decreased frequency of erroneous and biased data points within the training dataset. In the dataset, we assume that the chosen response y^+ will be more preferred by the human than the rejected response y^- so $y^+ > y^-$. However, we might made a mistake: indeed the $y^- > y^+$. In contrastive learning, such data points would be called "false negatives" (Zhang et al., 2024). We randomly selected 200 response pairs from "easy" and "hard" sub-sets sorted using the embeddings from all three base models under consideration: Phi1.5, Pythia-2.8B and LLaMa2-7B. We formed a baseline by randomly choosing 200 pairs from the Helpfulness and Harmlessness datasets. The GPT4 was used to re-label the pairs into chosen and rejected responses. In Figure 3, we plot the proportion of response pairs that were assigned the same labels as the ones recorded in the original dataset. The "hard" subset, which consists of more similar response pairs, evidently also contains more response pairs where the ranking is unclear, resulting in more incorrect pairs than the "random" and "easy" subsets. Similarly, the "easy" subset contains more confidently ranked pairs and fewer erroneous response labels, which results in a higher dataset quality. It is consistent

with the research that filters similar samples such as Llama3 (Dubey et al., 2024).

Easy bring lower reward: We also compare the training process of different sub-sets, as shown in Fig.4. From Figure 4a and Figure 4b, the Easy will converge to a lower reward than the Hard one so it is more sensitive to the margins $r(x, y^+) - r(x, y^-)$ change. Slight changes in the reward for the "easy" will bring more margins than "hard" and "random". The "hard" has the larger reward on both chosen and rejected so will induce a smaller increase on the margins. Therefore, the Easy obtains better margins in the training dataset, as shown in Fig. 4c.

Another explanation for the observed results might be that the prompts corresponding to the Easy response pairs have benign statistical qualities as, by construction of the subsets, the prompts are not shared between Easy and Hard subsets. To rule out this possibility, we conduct the experiments on another dataset, SHP2, where a single prompt corresponds to multiple responses.

5.3 Experiment on SHP2

In this section, we consider a scenario in which all prompts will be shared for all sub-sets. We used SHP2 Reddit folder, where each prompt is a Reddit post with a question/instruction and the responses are the top-level comments for that post. In this setting, we need to select the responses for each prompt. For k responses $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$, we select the one pair from it. Based on the selection strategy from Section 4.2, we have the "hard", "easy", and "random" subsets.

In addition, we consider a scenario of balancing the similarities and errors in the label, to selecting the centers of clusters in the embedding space. We have the "centroid" sub-set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{centroids}} = \{x, y_l, y_m\}$, where

$$y_l = \arg \min_{y_i \in C_1} \|y_i - \mathbf{u}_1\|^2$$

$$y_m = \arg \min_{y_j \in C_2} \|y_j - \mathbf{u}_2\|^2,$$

where \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 are the two clustering centers C_1 and C_2 in the embedding space. The centroid pairs are the nearest points to the centers. We compute the clustering center based on the K-means, i.e.,

$$\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2\} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{y \in C_i} \|y - \mathbf{u}_i\|^2 \quad (12)$$




Figure 4: Result of training on the different models




Figure 5: (a) Margins and Loss on the SHP2 Test Dataset, (b) Evaluation of Responses Using GPT-4 Compared to the reference model.

Once the embedding are normalized, minimizing the Euclidian distance $\|y_i - u_1\|^2$ is equivalent to maximizing the cosine similarity $\cos(y_i, u_1)$.

After selecting the response pairs, we label them as y^+ and y^- using the numbers of upvotes and downvotes on the corresponding Reddit comments.

5.3.1 Results

The experiments on SHP2 were conducted using the Phi1.5 model. Similarly to the experiments on Anthropic-HH-RLHF, we first fine-tune the base model on the training split of the SHP2 dataset. Due to the large dataset, we randomly select 1/3 data (with different random seeds) from the whole training data to do the SFT. Using the SFT model as the reference, we conduct the DPO alignment with four selected subsets of response pairs.

To evaluate the aligned models, we randomly select 100 prompts from the SHP2 test split and generate the responses using five versions of the Phi1.5 checkpoints: SFT, "random", "hard", "easy", and "centroid". We use AlpacaEval-GPT4 to judge the relative alignment of the test responses to human preferences. Specifically, we directly compare the responses of such checkpoints to the responses of the SFT reference model to calculate the win rate depicted in Fig. 5b. As shown in Fig. 5a, the "hard" has smaller margins and larger losses compared to others. We add the "centroid" method to

compare with the Easy. Both Easy and Centroid checkpoints show good results, with "centroid" being slightly ahead in terms of loss and margin. By mixing the "easy" and the "random", "centroid" obtained a better result on both metrics than Easy.

AlpacaEval-GPT4 are used to calculate the win rate with the reference model. The results are presented in Fig. 5b. "centroid" has the best Win and Easy has the best lose rate. This experiment provides evidence that using centroid and "easy" data to train the model by DPO will lead to a more safety and helpful generated model. Table 3 shows the generative responses.

6 Conclusion

This paper proposes a high-quality data selection method for DPO alignment, showing that an effective selection strategy improves LLM alignment efficiency. By considering the embedding space of response, we found that the dissimilar pair of responses will better align LLMs with human preferences. The similar pair might have more chance to obtain the error in the label from the data itself while it will obtain a larger gradient. Our method will benefit the data selection to avoid labeling larger human preference pairs. Choosing the data from the offline model embedding will also save much computation compared to the active data selections.

References

- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Bilal Piot, Daniel Guo, Daniele Calandriello, Michal Valko, and Rémi Munos. 2023. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12036*.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. 2022. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*.
- Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. 1952. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345.
- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2020. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR.
- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martić, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. 2017. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Ching-Yao Chuang, Joshua Robinson, Yen-Chen Lin, Antonio Torralba, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2020. Debaised contrastive learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:8765–8775.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Yann Dubois, Balázs Galambosi, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2024. Length-controlled alpaca-eval: A simple way to debias automatic evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04475*.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, Yejin Choi, and Swabha Swayamdipta. 2022. Understanding dataset difficulty with \mathcal{V} -usable information. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5988–6008. PMLR.
- Shangmin Guo, Biao Zhang, Tianlin Liu, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Felipe Llinares, Alexandre Rame, Thomas Mesnard, Yao Zhao, Bilal Piot, et al. 2024. Direct language model alignment from online ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04792*.
- Hao Liu, Carmelo Sferrazza, and Pieter Abbeel. 2023. Chain of hindsight aligns language models with feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02676*.
- Tomas Mikolov. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Tetsuro Morimura, Mitsuki Sakamoto, Yuu Jinnai, Ken-shi Abe, and Kaito Air. 2024. Filtered direct preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13846*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Burr Settles. 2009. Active learning literature survey.
- Feifan Song, Bowen Yu, Minghao Li, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, Yongbin Li, and Houfeng Wang. 2023. Preference ranking optimization for human alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17492*.
- Xinpeng Wang, Shitong Duan, Xiaoyuan Yi, Jing Yao, Shanlin Zhou, Zhihua Wei, Peng Zhang, Dongkuan Xu, Maosong Sun, and Xing Xie. 2024. On the essence and prospect: An investigation of alignment approaches for big models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04204*.
- Junkang Wu, Yuexiang Xie, Zhengyi Yang, Jiancan Wu, Jinyang Gao, Bolin Ding, Xiang Wang, and Xiangnan He. 2024. β -dpo: Direct preference optimization with dynamic β . *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08639*.
- Mengzhou Xia, Sadhika Malladi, Suchin Gururangan, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. 2024. Less: Selecting influential data for targeted instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04333*.
- Canwen Xu, Corby Rosset, Luciano Del Corro, Shweti Mahajan, Julian McAuley, Jennifer Neville, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, and Nikhil Rao. 2023. Contrastive post-training large language models on data curriculum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02263*.
- Runsheng Yu, Yong Wang, Xiaoqi Jiao, Youzhi Zhang, and James T Kwok. 2024. Direct alignment of language models via quality-aware self-refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21040*.
- Yongcheng Zeng, Guoqing Liu, Weiyu Ma, Ning Yang, Haifeng Zhang, and Jun Wang. 2024. Token-level direct preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11999*.
- Honggen Zhang, June Zhang, and Igor Molybog. 2024. Hasa: Hardness and structure-aware contrastive knowledge graph embedding. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 2116–2127.
- Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J Liu. 2023. Slic-hf: Sequence likelihood calibration with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10425*.

Yao Zhao, Misha Khalman, Rishabh Joshi, Shashi Narayan, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J Liu. 2022. Calibrating sequence likelihood improves conditional language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00045*.

A Appendix A

In this section, we list the dataset of HH-RLHF and SHP we used for training and testing.

HH Training dataset build step:

1. Regardless of the prompt, we calculate the embedding similarity for all response pairs given the base model (Phi1.5, Pythia 2.8B LLaMa2-7B). Note that the embeddings are obtained by the average of tokens.
2. We rank the response pairs based on the similarity on descent. Selecting the first 50% response pairs as the Easy dataset and the rest of 50% response pairs as the Easy dataset.
3. We also random select the 50% data as the Random dataset

Thus, we will obtain three sub-dataset. The Random and Easy, Hard will have 50% overlapped.

For the SHP2, we use the Reddit folder dataset. It is the response from the people’s answer to the question from Reddit. Each response has a score which is evaluated by the positive votes and negative votes. We exclude the response pairs length over 512 and the ratio of chosen score and rejected score less than 1.5. After that, we obtained 35.6k response pairs. Each prompt has three (most of) or four responses. Training dataset build step:

1. For each prompt, we calculate the embedding similarity of the combination of four or three responses. For example, the three responses will have $C_2^3 = 3$ response pairs.
2. We rank the 3 response pairs based on the similarity on descent. Selecting the largest similar value of response pairs as the Hard one and the smallest similar value of response pairs as the Easy one.
3. We cluster the 3 response based to two groups based on embedding. We select the most nearest centroid response as the center of the group. The centers will regard as the the Centroid pairs.
4. We also random select two responses from the 3 responses to build the Random dataset

Thus, we will obtain four sub-dataset: Easy, Hard, Centroid, and Random. Note that Centroid has overlap with Random and Easy but Hard when the $k = 3$.

Table 2: Dataset.

	Harmlessness	Helpfulness	SHP2
Raw Data	42k	44k	35k
Train	21k	22k	11k
Test	1.5k	1.5k	1.9k

B Appendix B

The invariant logit (output of softmax) induces that the row is unchanged or uniformly translated.

Proof:

Given z_t as the current vector for the input of softmax, d_t is the vector of arbitrary real numbers (not constant), representing the differences applied to each component of z_t . Thus, we have

$$z_{t+1} = z_t + d_t \quad (13)$$

The softmax function for a component i of z_t is:

$$\text{softmax}(z_t^i) = \frac{\exp(z_t^i)}{\sum_j \exp(z_t^j)} \quad (14)$$

For the z_{t+1} :

$$\text{softmax}(z_{t+1}^i) = \frac{\exp(z_t^i + d_t^i)}{\sum_j \exp(z_t^j + d_t^j)} \quad (15)$$

The presence of d_t^i in the exponent alters the relative scaling of each component. The softmax function effectively amplifies or diminishes the differences between the components of z_t in a non-linear fashion due to the exponential operation. When d_t is not uniform, the exponential increase or decrease applied to each z_i is different, affecting the proportion of each $\exp(z_t^i + d_t^i)$ in the sum $\sum_j \exp(z_t^j + d_t^j)$, hence altering the softmax output.


The only case where d_t does not change the softmax output is when all d_t^i all equal, essentially making d_t a uniform vector, i.e. $d_t = c\mathbf{1}$. Thus, we have the

$$\text{softmax}(z_{t+1}^i) = \frac{\exp(z_t^i + c)}{\sum_j \exp(z_t^j + c)} = \text{softmax}(z_t^i) \quad (16)$$


B.1 Evolution of embeddings throughout alignment

The definition (7) of the embedding of a response is model-dependent. Thus, it is natural to assume that the embedding of a response obtained using different checkpoints of the model being aligned will vary. In this Section, we describe the experiment aimed at verifying that the responses’ embedding does not change substantially throughout the fine-tuning process. Thus, neglecting the distribution shift during the training process is acceptable, and exploiting the base model for the response selection process (the process of identifying easy and hard response pairs) is justified.

In this section, we trained the complete dataset and saved 6 checkpoints for every 1,000 steps. Fig. 6a shows the changes of the difference $(y^j(t+1) - y^j(t))^2$ over time. The upper part \mathbf{Y} is obtained with the sentence (x, y) and the lower part \mathbf{Y} is obtained with only the response y . We can see the change is extremely small for the independent \mathbf{Y} . We also plot the similarity $s(y^+, y^-)$ of 20 pairs over time, as shown in Fig. 6b. The similarity distribution is consistent over time.



(a) y^j differences over time: The upper part is the conditional \mathbf{Y} . The low part figure is the independent \mathbf{Y}



(b) The pair similarity change over time

Figure 6: Sentence embedding change and similarity change over time

C Appendix C

Experiments Setting: We use three different-sized base LLMs (Phi1.5-1.3B, Pythia 2.8B, and LLama2 7B) as the backbone in our experiments. Using the dataset of the preferred prompt-response pairs (x, y^+) , we run the supervised finetuning (SFT) procedure with each base model to obtain their SFT versions. The supervised fine-tuning does not require a pairwise comparison of the responses and can be performed on prompt-response pairs outside the alignment dataset. However, our experiments use the preferred response pairs from the dataset under consideration (Anthropic HH-RLHF or SHP2). After the SFT stage, we run separate DPO procedures on each of the selected sub-sets (easy, hard, ect.) with each of the three SFT LLMs. This procedure is illustrated in Algorithm 1. All experiments are run on 4 A100 GPUs. We set the batch size as 64, 32, and 16 for Phi1.5-1.3b, Pythia 2.8, and LLama 7b, respectively. Algorithm C shows the pseudocode of alignment using subdata.

Algorithm 1: Model Alignment Experiment

Input : Sub-data \mathcal{D}_{sub} (random, hard, easy, or centroid), Base data \mathcal{D}_{SFT} , base language model π_0

Output : Optimal policy π_θ

- 1 Obtain π_{ref} via SFT of the base model π_0 using chosen pairs $(x, y^+) \in \mathcal{D}_{SFT}$;
- 2 Using π_{ref} as the reference policy, align the model with DPO to obtain π_θ using $(x, y^+, y^-) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{aug}}$;

D Appendix D

D.1 Evaluator Prompt

System: You are a highly efficient assistant, who evaluates and selects the best large language model (LLMs) based on the accuracy and harmless of their responses to a given instruction. This process will be used to create a leaderboard reflecting the most accurate and human-preferred answers.

User: I’ll provide you with prompts given to these models and their corresponding outputs. Your task is to assess these responses, and select the model that produces the best output from a human perspective.

Instruction:

```
{  
  "instruction": "{instruction}",  
}
```

Model Outputs: Here are the unordered outputs from the models. Each output is associated with a specific model, identified by a unique model identifier.

```
{  
  {  
    "model_identifier": "m",  
    "output": "{output_1}"  
  },  
  {  
    "model_identifier": "M",  
    "output": "{output_2}"  
  }  
}
```

Task: Evaluate the models based on the quality and relevance of their outputs, and select the model that generated the best output. Answer by providing the model identifier of the best model. We will use your output as the name of the best model, so make sure your output only contains one of the following model identifiers and nothing else (no quotes, no spaces, no new lines, ...): m or M.

D.2 Response Example From different Data selecting Methods

Table 3: Example of Responses.

Prompt	Human: How do I understand/perceive non functional harmony? I'm a self taught musician and I'm trying to learn as much theory as possible. But I just can't seem to wrap my head around this topic. Nor am I able to understand how someone could "feel" this kinda music. If that makes sense that is.
Reference	I think it's a matter of perception. If you're a trained musician, you're used to hearing music that sounds like it's not supposed to. You're used to hearing music that's not supposed to sound like it's supposed to.
Centroid	I think the best way to understand non functional harmony is to think of it as a kind of "noise" that is created by the instruments. It's not a "harmonious" sound, but it's not a "bad" sound
Easy	I think it's a very interesting topic. I think it's important to understand that non functional harmony is not about the music itself, but about the way it makes you feel. It's about the emotional response that the music evokes in you.
Hard	I think you're missing the point of non functional harmony. It's not about feeling the music, it's about understanding the music. It's about understanding the structure of the music, the way the notes are arranged, the way they interact with each
Random	I think you're missing the point of non functional harmony. It's not about feeling it, it's about understanding it. It's about understanding the structure of the music and how it works. It's about understanding the relationships between the different parts of