
AlphaPO - Reward shape matters for LLM alignment

Aman Gupta^{*†} Shao Tang^{*†} Qingquan Song[‡] Sirou Zhu[‡] Jiwoo Hong[§]
 Ankan Saha[‡] Viral Gupta[‡] Noah Lee[§] Eunki Kim[§] Jason Zhu[‡]
 Natesh Pillai[‡] S. Sathiya Keerthi^{†‡}

[‡]LinkedIn Corporation [§]KAIST AI
 {amagupta, shatang}@linkedin.com

Abstract

Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF) and its variants have made huge strides toward the effective alignment of large language models (LLMs) to follow instructions and reflect human values. More recently, Direct Alignment Algorithms (DAAs) have emerged in which the reward modeling stage of RLHF is skipped by characterizing the reward directly as a function of the policy being learned. Examples include Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) and Simple Preference Optimization (SimPO). These methods often suffer from likelihood displacement, a phenomenon by which the probabilities of preferred responses are often reduced undesirably.

In this paper, we argue that, for DAAs the reward (function) shape matters. We introduce **AlphaPO**, a new DAA method that leverages an α -parameter to help change the shape of the reward function beyond the standard log reward. AlphaPO helps maintain fine-grained control over likelihood displacement and over-optimization. Compared to SimPO, one of the best performing DAAs, AlphaPO leads to about 7% to 10% relative improvement in alignment performance for the instruct versions of Mistral-7B and Llama3-8B. The analysis and results presented highlight the importance of the reward shape, and how one can systematically change it to affect training dynamics, as well as improve alignment performance.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) [37, 4, 9] have ushered in a new era for artificial intelligence. LLM training can be broadly split into two stages - pre- and post-training. An important step in the post-training stage is "alignment" - which involves improving the model's ability to follow instructions, safety protocols and the ability to follow human values and style. This step, also known as "preference tuning", is crucial in helping bridge the gap between the raw ability of pre-trained models and the immense utility of post-trained models.

To this end, researchers have developed several techniques under the umbrella of Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF) [23, 49]. RLHF involves a three stage process - supervised fine-tuning (SFT), reward modeling and reinforcement learning (RL)-based fine-tuning. Learning is

^{*}These authors contributed equally to this work.

[†]Work done while at LinkedIn Corporation.

[‡]{qsong, sirzhu, asaha, vigupta, jaszhu, napillai}@linkedin.com, geethakee@outlook.com

[§]{jiwoo_hong, noah.lee, eunkikim}@kaist.ac.kr




Figure 1: The generalized reward shaping paradigm of AlphaPO. By adjusting the parameter α in the reward function $r_\alpha(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x})$, AlphaPO induces various reward shapes, leading to different preference optimization dynamics and downstream performances.

typically performed on preference data, which includes preferred and dispreferred responses to the same input prompt. While achieving impressive results, RLHF involves several stages and can be cumbersome to train [5].

To simplify the alignment process, methods such as Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [28] and Simple Preference Optimization (SimPO) [22] have been developed. DPO optimizes directly for the optimal policy, completely bypassing the reward modeling step. The optimal policy is identified as the solution to an expected reward maximization problem while making sure that the policy does not diverge too much from a reference policy. SimPO achieves the same goal with a different reward function that normalizes the reward by the length of the generation and also introduces a margin term to better separate preferred and dispreferred responses. Both belong to a class of methods known as Direct Alignment Algorithms (DAAs) [29]. DAAs include DPO and its variants [28, 27], and methods like SimPO [22], CPO [43] and ORPO [15].

Several studies have shown that DAAs tend to widen the margin between preferred and dispreferred responses while simultaneously reducing the probabilities of preferred responses. Although slightly lower completion likelihood is known to improve output diversity and generalization, excessive focus on increasing the reward margin can degrade actual performance, as measured by human evaluations. This is known as *reward over-optimization* [33]. Similarly, the reduction in preferred response probabilities, known as *likelihood displacement* [31], has been linked to unintended misalignment, further harming performance. Extended training exacerbates both issues, leading to deterioration in overall effectiveness of preference optimization.

Although the aforementioned issues may be concerning, in practice, there are typically model checkpoints along the training trajectory that demonstrate strong alignment performance. These checkpoints can be identified through early stopping. SimPO, a method renowned for its strong alignment capabilities, uses just one epoch of training [22]. By varying three hyperparameters—the learning rate, β (reward scaling parameter), and γ (reward margin shift parameter)—SimPO generates a three-dimensional manifold of trajectories. These hyperparameters are fine-tuned to enhance alignment performance on benchmarks such as AlpacaEval 2 [10], optimizing the win rate to select the final model of choice.

In this paper, we introduce a new method **AlphaPO**, based on a fourth important dimension - the reward function shape. Most DAAs, including SimPO, are based on the log reward function. We point out that changing this reward shape yields new types of trajectories with distinctly different margin and preferred-likelihood behaviors. We take inspiration from Wang et al. [38], use the reward function arising from the α -divergence idea and apply length-normalization to it to generate an interesting class of reward shapes that are parameterized by a scalar parameter α as depicted in Figure 1 ($\alpha = 0$ yields the log reward shape for SimPO, making it a special case. More details are provided later.). By choosing an α value different from zero, alignment performance can be significantly improved. We note that, though AlphaPO’s α reward shapes are inspired by Wang et al [38], they are distinctly different since we use them with length normalization.

Through gradient analysis and experiments we show how the shape of the newly introduced reward function affects the aggressive or conservative nature of likelihood displacement. For varying values of α , we then demonstrate how AlphaPO’s performance evolves on evaluation benchmarks such as AlpacaEval 2 [10] and ArenaHard [20]. The critical factor is the combination of the α -parameterized scoring function with length normalization. We demonstrate that AlphaPO comprehensively outperforms SimPO across models such as Mistral-7B Instruct [16] and Llama3-8B Instruct [2], while remaining competitive for models like Gemma2-9B Instruct [35]. Notably, AlphaPO achieves a relative improvement of 7% to 10% over SimPO on AlpacaEval 2 for Llama3-8B and Mistral-7B. Additionally, integrating AlphaPO with the SPPO method [42] yields strong improvements on AlpacaEval 2 with a length controlled win rate of 47.42% for PairRM-based regeneration [17] of the UltraFeedback training dataset [8], bettering the results of SimPO with SPPO applied on top.

2 Preliminaries

Let us consider the setup of preference alignment training. $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots]$ denotes a single input prompt with a sequence of tokens. The objective of an LLM is to generate a relevant and consistent response $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots]$ to \mathbf{x} . Any LLM learns a policy π where $\pi(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ denotes the probability assigned by the LLM to \mathbf{y} .

Conventional reinforcement learning with human feedback (RLHF) aims to fine-tune the policy π_θ to maximize the reward $r(\cdot)$ without excessively diverging from the initial policy π_{ref} [6, 48, 23]:

$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{y} \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x})} [r(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) | \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})). \quad (1)$$

In the offline preference learning scenario, the data consist of the prompt \mathbf{x} and a pair of (preferred, dispreferred) responses $(\mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l)$ ⁵ of sequences, with preference denoted by $\mathbf{y}_w \succ \mathbf{y}_l$ [28]. This triplet is often denoted as $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l)$. RLHF-based methods consist of using supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on a dataset, reward modeling and then reinforcement learning to finally learn an aligned model. Methods such as Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [28], SimPO [22], CPO [43], and ORPO [15] use the Bradley-Terry [3] setup:

$$p(\mathbf{y}_w \succ \mathbf{y}_l) = \sigma(r(\mathbf{y}_w; \mathbf{x}) - r(\mathbf{y}_l; \mathbf{x})), \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma(x) = 1/(1 + \exp(-x))$ is the sigmoid function and directly specify the reward function as a function of the optimal policy instead, as described in the subsequent section. These methods are also known as Direct Alignment Algorithms (DAAs) [29]. DAAs have achieved immense popularity recently for their simplicity and effectiveness at achieving strong alignment performance [19].

2.1 Direct Preference Optimization (DPO)

DPO [28] is a recent popular method that solves the problem of maximizing the expected reward with an added KL penalty between the sequence probabilities of the model being trained and a reference model π_{ref} (trained using SFT). DPO uses a closed-form expression for the reward r by leveraging the optimality conditions of the problem:

$$r_{\text{DPO}}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}) = \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})} + \beta \log(Z(\mathbf{x})) \quad (3)$$

where π_θ refers to the policy being trained and $Z(\mathbf{x})$ is the partition function. Plugging this into the BT model, we get the following loss function for DPO:

$$L_{\text{DPO}} = -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_w|\mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w|\mathbf{x})} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_l|\mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l|\mathbf{x})} \right) \right], \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{D} denotes the preference dataset.

⁵Some papers refer to this as the *(chosen, reject) pair*.

2.2 Simple Preference Optimization (SimPO)

SimPO [22] is a modification of DAAs like DPO. SimPO scales the reward by the length of the output⁶:

$$r_{\text{SimPO}}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}) = \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \quad (5)$$

where $|\mathbf{y}|$ is the length of \mathbf{y} . SimPO also introduces an additional margin term in the BT objective:

$$p(\mathbf{y}_w \succ \mathbf{y}_l) = \sigma(r(\mathbf{y}_w; \mathbf{x}) - r(\mathbf{y}_l; \mathbf{x}) - \gamma) \quad (6)$$

This results in the following loss for SimPO:

$$L_{\text{SimPO}} = -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_w|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w|\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_l|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l|\mathbf{x}) - \gamma \right) \right]. \quad (7)$$

While the parameter γ influences the size of margin values, the parameter β determines how close $-\log \sigma(\beta z)$ is to the hinge loss, i.e., $\max\{-z, 0\}$.

SimPO demonstrates its effectiveness as a robust and efficient alignment method for large language models (LLMs) due to several key innovations. Unlike DPO, SimPO eliminates the reliance on a reference model during training, reducing memory and computational overhead while ensuring reward maximization aligns with inference. Furthermore, SimPO establishes length normalization, first introduced by ORPO [15], as a critical factor for alignment performance. This technique enables SimPO to outperform DPO and other methods on benchmarks like AlpacaEval2.0 [10], achieving superior results without increasing response length. Notably, SimPO’s length normalization has inspired enhancements in other methods, such as Tulu [19], underscoring its impact.

By fixing the number of training epochs to one and carefully tuning the hyperparameters β and γ , SimPO achieves strong alignment performance. A key aspect of SimPO’s robustness lies in its constant penalization γ , which addresses limitations in DPO’s approach. While DPO parameterizes the optimal human preference distribution p^* under the Bradley-Terry model [3] with a maximum likelihood objective, it relies on divergence penalties from a reference policy π_{ref} , which can be suboptimal when preference samples are sampled from arbitrary policies [36] or π_{ref} itself [22, 19]. SimPO mitigates this issue by replacing the variable divergence penalty $-\beta \log \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w|\mathbf{x})/\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l|\mathbf{x})$ in L_{DPO} with a constant γ [22], thereby reducing variability and improving robustness under noisy or mismatched preference samples.

3 Reward Function Matters

In this section, we dive deep into the shape of reward functions and its relationship with likelihood displacement. We begin by discussing the role of likelihood displacement and over-optimization in affecting alignment performance in 3.1. In 3.2 we introduce a new reward function that can help control the degree of likelihood displacement. In 3.3, we use gradient analysis and experiments to explain how the shape of the newly-introduced reward function determines the aggressive or conservative nature of likelihood displacement. The main premise of this paper is that by systematically modifying the log reward function, it is possible to adjust the intensity of the likelihood displacement and, in particular, improve the alignment performance of SimPO even further.

3.1 Likelihood displacement

Let us define the *length normalized margin* as $(1/|\mathbf{y}_w|) \log \pi_w - (1/|\mathbf{y}_l|) \log \pi_l$, where $\pi_w \triangleq \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w|\mathbf{x})$, $\pi_l \triangleq \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l|\mathbf{x})$. Clearly, minimization of the preference loss in (7) would (in expectation) lead to an increase in the length normalized margin. Although this seems to imply that training decreases $\log \pi_l$ and increases $\log \pi_w$, usually $\log \pi_l$ rapidly decreases while also dragging the

⁶The idea of using average log probability for reward was originally proposed in the ORPO paper [15].

preferred likelihood $\log \pi_w$ down. This phenomenon is called *likelihood displacement* [31]. Although several recent papers [31, 24, 21, 25, 45, 30, 34] mention this behavior and discuss its ramifications, Razin et al. [31] dissect this in detail. They make a key observation - since both $\log \pi_w$ and $\log \pi_l$ decrease, other responses (denoted by z) increase in likelihood. If z is as preferable as y_w (e.g., z is similar in meaning to y_w), then the likelihood displacement is *benign*. However, if z is a poor response, then likelihood displacement is labeled as *catastrophic* and leads to unintentional consequences.

A closely related idea is discussed in [33], where the authors note that high likelihood of preferred responses and big gaps between the likelihood of preferred and dispreferred responses can lead to *reward over-optimization*. This results in a better margin but worse generalization performance. A controlled lowering of the completion likelihood is shown to be beneficial for output diversity and generalization.

The ideas listed above indicate the importance of balancing the optimization of the reward margin with the likelihood of the preferred and dispreferred responses. To avoid confusion, we use the phrase "likelihood displacement" to refer to all the related ideas we have described in the previous two paragraphs.

While excessive likelihood displacement (over-optimization) is harmful, the benefits of controlled likelihood displacement are evident from the performance of methods like SimPO, where early stopping is employed and training is done only for one or very few epochs. We focus on the following quantities to understand the impact of various algorithms and reward functions (plots for the same can be found in 3.3):

- The length normalized preferred likelihood $\log \pi_w / |y_w|$ is important because it is undesirable for it to be dragged down excessively and be replaced by other candidates.
- The length normalized margin is important because it quantifies the labeling that y_w is better than y_l . Of course, as mentioned above, too large a margin can result in suboptimal performance.
- The length normalized dispreferred likelihood $\log \pi_l / |y_l|$ is also important in the context of understanding its impact on reward margin.

Keeping the above-mentioned insights in mind, we turn to DAAs to understand how they can be designed to shape the margin and preferred/dispreferred likelihoods.

3.2 The AlphaPO reward function

Most DAAs are based on the log reward function. We begin by discussing f-DPO [38] where the authors point out that standard DPO corresponds to using reverse KL as the divergence for alignment training and that other divergences can lead to improvement in properties such as generation diversity. One parametric divergence proposed by them is the α -divergence with parameter α . This divergence has the reverse Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence as a limiting case when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, and the forward KL divergence as a limiting case when $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ [7]. However, in the DPO context, the paper does not find much benefit from this extension since standard DPO ($\alpha = 0$) yields the best alignment performance.

f-DPO operates by allowing alignment to incorporate various divergences. The choice of the f-divergence determines the implicit base reward function. We consider a similar idea in the context of SimPO - we use the reward function corresponding to α -divergence, but crucially modify it with length-normalization:

$$r_\alpha(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}) = \beta \left(\frac{1 - \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})^{-\alpha/|\mathbf{y}|}}{\alpha} \right). \quad (8)$$

This yields the preference loss in the context of the margin-based BT model:

$$L_{\text{AlphaPO}} = -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\frac{-\beta}{\alpha} \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_w|\mathbf{x})^{-\alpha/|\mathbf{y}_w|} + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_l|\mathbf{x})^{-\alpha/|\mathbf{y}_l|} - \gamma \right) \right]. \quad (9)$$

We refer to this new method, derived from utilizing the new reward function, as **AlphaPO**. In the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, the AlphaPO reward function yields SimPO’s log reward. Specific choices $\alpha = 1$ and

$\alpha = -1$ yield the inverse-linear (where the reward is a function of the inverse likelihood) and linear (where the reward is directly a function of the likelihood) reward functions, respectively:

$$r_{\text{inv-lin}}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}) = \beta \left(-\frac{1}{\bar{\pi}_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})} + 1 \right) \quad (10)$$

$$r_{\text{lin}}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}) = \beta (\bar{\pi}_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) - 1) \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{\pi}_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})^{1/|\mathbf{y}|}$.

We stress that AlphaPO differs from f-DPO in the following important ways:

(1) Length normalization - AlphaPO uses length normalization - a crucial element in improving SimPO's performance over DPO.

(2) Fewer restrictions on the value of α - f-DPO requires the estimation of the normalization constant $Z(x)$ for some divergences. Specifically for α -divergence, f-DPO restricts the value of α to be between 0 and 1 for the normalization constant to cancel out. No such restriction on the value of α is required for AlphaPO.

(3) Improved generalization with tuning of α - While f-DPO fails to demonstrate that any value of α except 0 (which is standard DPO) yields improved generalization, we demonstrate in the experiments section that non-zero values of α actually improve generalization performance when compared to SimPO (which corresponds to setting $\alpha = 0$ in AlphaPO).

3.2.1 Likelihood displacement with AlphaPO

It turns out that a simple condition on α yields reward function shapes that encourage likelihood displacement (and subsequent decrease in the likelihood of both, preferred and dispreferred responses). The following lemma describes this.

Lemma 1 (Monotonically decreasing derivative of $r_{\alpha}(\pi)$). *Let $\pi \in (0, 1]$ be the probability of a response \mathbf{y} for parameters θ , and let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\beta > 0$. Also, let $|\mathbf{y}| \geq 1$. Then $r'_{\alpha}(\pi)$ is monotonically decreasing in π if and only if $\alpha \geq -|\mathbf{y}|$.*

We relegate the proof to Appendix A.1. In Lemma 1, we use a slight abuse of notation where we refer to the reward function as $r_{\alpha}(\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}))$ instead of $r_{\alpha}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ (we use them interchangeably through the rest of the paper). Since in general, $|\mathbf{y}| > 1$ (and potentially much larger than 1) for responses, most practical values of α will satisfy $\alpha \geq -|\mathbf{y}|$. Thus, by Lemma 1, lower likelihood values will have higher derivative values for the reward function. This encourages preference optimization to move the likelihood of preferred and dispreferred responses to lower values.

Figure 2 illustrates this for the log reward function ($\alpha = 0$). Notice that for the same difference in likelihood, one can achieve a much higher reward difference if the likelihood of preferred and dispreferred responses are both reduced.

3.3 Understanding AlphaPO using gradient analysis and experiments

We now perform gradient analysis and conduct experiments to study the three key length-normalized quantities: preferred likelihood $(1/|\mathbf{y}_w|) \log \pi_w$, dispreferred likelihood $(1/|\mathbf{y}_l|) \log \pi_l$ and margin $(1/|\mathbf{y}_w|) \log \pi_w - (1/|\mathbf{y}_l|) \log \pi_l$. This will help us understand the degree of likelihood displacement that happens across methods, the role of α and how it affects alignment performance.

Let us begin with a gradient analysis of AlphaPO for a single training example. For \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} such that $\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) > 0$, we have

$$r'_{\alpha}(\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})) \triangleq \frac{\partial r_{\alpha}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x})}{\partial \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}|} \cdot \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})^{-\left(\frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{y}|} + 1\right)} = \frac{\beta}{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})|\mathbf{y}|} \cdot \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{\ln \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})}{|\mathbf{y}|}\right), \quad (12)$$

where the last expression on the right hand side has been written with the purpose of clearly separating out the role of α . Let v be a generic weight parameter. Define non-negative parameters $c_w = -\frac{\log \pi_w}{|\mathbf{y}_w|}$, $c_l = -\frac{\log \pi_l}{|\mathbf{y}_l|}$. Define $\delta r = r_{\alpha}(\pi_w) - r_{\alpha}(\pi_l)$. Based on (8) and (12), the magnitude of the gradient of per-sample loss ℓ with respect to v is given by:

$$\left| \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v} \right| = |\ell'(\delta r - \gamma)| \cdot \left| r'_w \frac{\partial \pi_w}{\partial v} - r'_l \frac{\partial \pi_l}{\partial v} \right|, \quad (13)$$




Figure 2: The log reward function (y) as a function of the completion likelihood (x). From the plot, it is evident that for a similar change in likelihood, the difference in reward is much higher when the likelihood changes from 0.1 to 0.15 (~ 0.40), rather than from 0.6 to 0.65 (~ 0.08).

where the reward derivatives for the dispreferred and preferred responses are:

$$r'_l \triangleq r'_\alpha(\pi_l) = \frac{\beta}{\pi_l |\mathbf{y}_l|} \exp(\alpha c_l), \quad (14)$$

$$r'_w \triangleq r'_\alpha(\pi_w) = \frac{\beta}{\pi_w |\mathbf{y}_w|} \exp(\alpha c_w). \quad (15)$$

The difference in rewards is:

$$\delta r = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} [\exp(\alpha c_l) - \exp(\alpha c_w)]. \quad (16)$$

Substituting these quantities into the expression for $|\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v}|$, we obtain:

$$\left| \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v} \right| = \frac{\beta}{1 + \exp\left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} [\exp(\alpha c_l) - \exp(\alpha c_w)] - \gamma\right)} \cdot \left| \frac{\exp(\alpha c_w)}{\pi_w |\mathbf{y}_w|} \frac{\partial \pi_w}{\partial v} - \frac{\exp(\alpha c_l)}{\pi_l |\mathbf{y}_l|} \frac{\partial \pi_l}{\partial v} \right| = T_1 \cdot T_2. \quad (17)$$

where T_1 and T_2 refer to the two terms whose product gives $|\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v}|$. We are interested in studying how α affects the individual sample gradient size $|\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v}|$. From the expressions in (17), we can infer that this function is non-monotonic with respect to α . A deeper analysis of T_1 and T_2 provides a better understanding. Let us consider several observations regarding the behavior of T_1 and T_2 in relation to α . In doing so, it is beneficial to focus on weights v for which $\frac{\partial \pi_w}{\partial v}$ and $\frac{\partial \pi_l}{\partial v}$ are similar—these are the weights that alignment training should target and modify.

01. Let's consider the case of a positive length-normalized margin, where $c_w < c_l$. As α becomes highly positive, T_2 increases and diverges proportionally to $\exp(\alpha c_l)$, while T_1 decreases and approaches zero as $\exp(-\beta \exp(\alpha c_l)/\alpha)$. Consequently, $|\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v}|$ tends to zero super-exponentially. An important point to note is that, because $c_w < c_l$ the training will tend to focus more on decreasing π_l rather than increasing π_w .

02. Let's now consider the case of a negative length-normalized margin, where $c_w > c_l$. As α becomes highly positive, T_2 increases and diverges proportionally to $\exp(\alpha c_w)$, while T_1 decreases and converges to β . Therefore, $|\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v}|$ diverges to large values exponentially. An important point to note is that, because $c_w > c_l$, training will tend to focus more on increasing π_w rather than decreasing π_l .

03. On the other hand, as α becomes highly negative, regardless of the sign of the margin, T_1 converges to $\beta/(1 + \exp(-\gamma))$, while T_2 with $\exp(\alpha c_w)$ and $\exp(\alpha c_l)$ converges to zero exponentially. As a result, $|\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial v}|$ converges to zero exponentially.

O4. As a consequence of the above observations, large $|\alpha|$ values impose a regularization effect on alignment training due to the vanishing gradient for samples with positive length-normalized margins. The regularization effects are stronger for positive α values (super-exponential) compared to negative α values (exponential).

The following two numerical illustrations adequately demonstrate the four observations made above.

Illustration 1 - Positive margin. Consider a toy example with $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = 0$, $|\mathbf{y}_w| = |\mathbf{y}_l| = 1$, $\partial\pi_w/\partial v = \partial\pi_l/\partial v = 1$, $\log \pi_w = -1$, and $\log \pi_l = -2$. Substituting these values, we find $|\partial\ell/\partial v| = (1 + \exp((e^{2\alpha} - e^\alpha)/\alpha))^{-1} |e^{\alpha+1} - e^{2\alpha+2}|$. For the values of $\alpha = -2, 0, 0.25, 1$, and 2 , the corresponding magnitudes of the derivative $|\frac{\partial\ell}{\partial v}|$ are 0.11, 1.26, 1.63, 0.44, and 2.15×10^{-8} , respectively. The associated values for T_1 are 0.49, 0.27, 0.19, 0.01, and 5.60×10^{-11} , while the T_2 values are 0.23, 4.67, 8.69, 47.21, and 383.34. These results clearly demonstrate non-monotonic behavior in the relationship between $|\frac{\partial\ell}{\partial v}|$ and α .

Illustration 2 - Negative margin. Consider the toy example, where $\log \pi_w = -2$ and $\log \pi_l = -1$, the magnitude of the derivative is given by: $|\partial\ell/\partial v| = (1 + \exp((e^\alpha - e^{2\alpha})/\alpha))^{-1} |e^{2+2\alpha} - e^{1+\alpha}|$. Using the same α values, the computed $|\frac{\partial\ell}{\partial v}|$ values are 0.12, 3.41, 7.05, 46.77, and 383.34, respectively. The corresponding values for T_1 are 0.51, 0.73, 0.81, 0.99, and 1.00, while the T_2 values remain identical to those in Illustration 1.

The key takeaways from the above analysis are that (a) reward functions significantly affect preference based alignment learning, and (b) in particular, changes in α solidly affect the training process by affecting the gradients and changing the relative importance given to the preferred and dispreferred responses.

The above analysis is at the level of a single example. A detailed analysis studying the interaction of many examples is hard. Therefore, to understand the non-monotonic effect of α , we conduct training experiments using the instruct versions of the Mistral-7B [16] and Gemma-2-9B [35] models on the UltraFeedback dataset [8] with 1 epoch of training (more details about the experiment setup can be found in Section 4). Specifically, we vary α from -2.0 to 2.0 , including intermediate values. We create plots for the aforementioned three length-normalized quantities: preferred likelihood, dispreferred likelihood, and margin evaluated on the test data (2.99k samples for Gemma 2 and 1.94k for Mistral). These plots illustrate the evolution of these quantities during training for different α values, while keeping other hyperparameters fixed.

Line plots for the aforementioned quantities can be found in Figures 3 and 4 (we relegate the corresponding box plots to Figures 12 and 13 in Appendix A.6). As shown in the figures, the influence of α on their dynamics is indeed non-monotonic. Specifically, there are larger displacements for α values close to 0 and smaller displacements for larger $|\alpha|$ values. In particular, larger $|\alpha|$ s lead to smaller quartile values of the length-normalized margin toward the end of training, which could help mitigate the over-optimization. Scatter plots of length normalized preferred likelihood vs. margin in Figures 5 and 6 tell a similar story. For large absolute values of α (-2 and 2), we notice a clear regularization effect for both margin and preferred likelihood.

Another interesting observation is what happens when a reference model is included in the SimPO and AlphaPO training objectives. Interestingly, the SimPO variant reduces to SimPO with a per-response-pair margin, whereas the AlphaPO variant reduces to AlphaPO with per-response weights for the preferred and dispreferred responses. Details can be found in Appendix A.4.

We also note that in terms of alignment performance on benchmarks, the optimal value is a slightly positive value of α . Large absolute values of α result in poor generalization. Details can be found in Section 4.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental setup

Models We conduct all our experiments using three popular families of models - Llama 3[2], Mistral [16] and Gemma 2 [35]. We specifically focus on the instruct versions of the models. We make this choice for two reasons - (1) The aforementioned models are powerful and represent a wide variety




Figure 3: Tracking various statistics for length-normalized preferred likelihood, dispreferred likelihood and margin over an epoch for the **Mistral** instruct model. The min and max are computed after removing outliers.




Figure 4: Tracking various statistics for length-normalized preferred likelihood, dispreferred likelihood and margin over an epoch for the **Gemma 2** instruct model. The min and max are computed after removing outliers.

of state-of-the-art models and (2) the same models have been used in several recent works, making comparisons with baseline methods like SimPO easier.

Datasets To keep our experiments comparable to recent works, we choose the UltraFeedback (UF) dataset [8] to conduct all alignment experiments. Previous works [22, 42, 46] have demonstrated that using an *on-policy* setting for the instruct setup helps mitigate the distribution shift between off-the-shelf instruct variants of these models and the preference optimization process. Following [22], specifically, we regenerate five responses for every prompt in the UF dataset using a sampling temperature of 0.8. We then use two reward models - PairRM [17] and ArmoRM [39] to rank the 5 responses. The highest scoring response is labeled y_w and the lowest scoring response is labeled y_l . We use the PairRM-based dataset to conduct experiments for Llama 3 and Mistral, and leverage the ArmoRM-based dataset for Gemma 2.

Hyperparameter tuning AlphaPO introduces a new parameter α as described in equation (8). We tune α for each different LLM and note the effect of tuning alpha in section 4.3. Apart from α , we also find that tuning γ is crucial. We outline its effect on model performance in section 4.4. The exact values of learning rate, α , β , γ and other hyperparameters used in the experiment iterations are detailed in Appendix A.2.

Baselines We compare AlphaPO primarily against SimPO since it is representative of the state-of-the-art methods for alignment.

Evaluation. To test the efficacy of AlphaPO, we evaluate trained models using two popular benchmarks - AlpacaEval 2 [10] and Arena-Hard [39] (referred to as AE2 and AH, respectively, hereinafter). AE2 consists of a total of 805 prompts sourced from a variety of datasets, gearing it towards measuring the ability of models to follow diverse and complex instructions. For AE2, we report WR (win rate) and LC (length-controlled win rate). LC is specifically designed to discourage models from using verbose answers since GPT4 is known to favor longer responses when judging for instruction following [40, 26]. For AH, we only report WR since the benchmark doesn't offer LC.




Figure 5: Scatter plot of length normalized preferred likelihood (y -axis) vs. length normalized margin (x -axis) for varying values of alpha for the **Mistral** instruct model. α is the alpha parameter, epo is epoch number. Outliers were moved before plotting. Clearly noticeable is the regularization effect of large absolute values of α .

Table 1: AlphaPO vs SimPO for on-policy data created using PairRM [17].

Method	Llama-3-8B-Instruct			Mistral-7B-Instruct		
	AlpacaEval 2 LC (%)	WR (%)	Arena-Hard WR (%)	AlpacaEval 2 LC (%)	WR (%)	Arena-Hard WR (%)
SimPO	42.05	36.90	32.8	29.71	31.12	21.5
AlphaPO	45.37	40.97	34.6	33.03	34.12	21.7

4.2 Main results

AlphaPO outperforms SimPO on most benchmarks The main results can be found in Tables 1 and 2. We note that AlphaPO outperforms SimPO across both AlpacaEval 2 and Arena Hard for the instruct versions of Llama 3 and Mistral-based models. The results are especially pronounced for AlpacaEval 2 where AlphaPO relatively improves over SimPO by 7% to 10% for LC. Notably, AlphaPO doesn't increase the generation length significantly for all the models when compared to SimPO (more details in A.3).




Figure 6: Scatter plot of length normalized preferred likelihood (y -axis) vs. length normalized margin (x -axis) for varying values of alpha for the **Gemma 2** instruct model. α is the alpha parameter, epo is epoch number. Outliers were moved before plotting. Clearly noticeable is the regularization effect of large absolute values of α .

Table 2: AlphaPO vs SimPO for on-policy data created using ArmoRM [39].

Method	Gemma-2-9B-Instruct		
	AlpacaEval 2 LC (%)	WR (%)	Arena-Hard WR (%)
SimPO	73.72	67.36	59.0
AlphaPO	74.13	65.89	57.7

For Gemma 2, we note that AlphaPO has a better LC and a slightly lower WR for AlpacaEval 2 when compared to SimPO. The lower WR for AlpacaEval 2 is also mirrored by ArenaHard results where SimPO is slightly better. This is consistent with the observation that GPT as a judge has a bias towards longer responses, and ArenaHard doesn't have a way to control for length when measuring rewards [40, 26]. More details about the results can be found in Appendix A.3.




Figure 7: Effect of tuning α for AlphaPO for the Gemma 2 9B Instruct model. The highest AlpacaEval 2 win rate is achieved for $\alpha = 0.1$

4.3 Effect of tuning alpha

To understand the effect of α on model generalization, we conducted experiments by measuring the AlpacaEval 2 performance of various α variants. Results for the Gemma 2 model can be found in Figure 7. The best performance is achieved when α is 0.1. For the Llama 3 and Mistral models, the best performance is achieved for a value of $\alpha = 0.25$ (more details can be found in the Appendix A.2). We make several observations about α :

- For all three model families, the best value for α is positive: 0.1 for Gemma 2 and 0.25 for Llama 3 and Mistral.
- AlpacaEval 2 performance drops off on either side of the peak value. However, the drop-off is less steep on the positive side. As noted in the previous section, SimPO achieves good alignment performance despite lowering the likelihood of both the preferred and dispreferred responses, see this open-sourced SimPO training log. Since a positive α would result in less aggressive likelihood displacement, we observe that it results in better AlpacaEval 2 for small positive values of α . The drop off in AlpacaEval 2 performance when α is negative is steeper. This is not surprising, since it results in more aggressive likelihood displacement compared to positive α . See section 3.3 for more discussion.

4.4 Effect of tuning γ on generalization performance




Figure 8: Effect of margin parameter γ on AlpacaEval 2 length-controlled win rate and response length.

For all the three major model families considered in our experiments, we investigate how the margin parameter γ affects performance on benchmarks like AlpacaEval 2. To this end, we tune γ while keeping the rest of the hyperparameters fixed at the best parameter combination reported in Table 4.

Results can be found in Figure 8. Consistent with [22], we notice that for all 3 models, increasing γ improves performance on AlpacaEval 2 till a certain level, beyond which larger values of gamma hurt performance across all models. This consistent behavior indicates that there exists an optimal of gamma that has to be tuned depending on the model family and the quality of response generation

(as determined by AlpacaEval 2 evaluation) is not determined by the margin alone. On the other hand, increasing γ leads to longer response lengths, as it dominates the length-normalized quantities $r(\mathbf{y}_w; \mathbf{x}) - r(\mathbf{y}_l; \mathbf{x})$ in the loss function.

4.5 Effect on average log probabilities and reward scores




Figure 9: Comparison of reward distributions for PairRM for Mistral (left) and Llama 3 (right). AlphaPO yields a reward distribution that is either on par or better (i.e., right-shifted) when compared to strong baselines like SimPO.

To better understand the qualitative impact of various alignment methods, we look at the reward distribution for the test set of UltraFeedback using PairRM.

Consider the left and right figures in Figure 9. We compare AlphaPO to SimPO and the instruct version of the Mistral and Llama 3 models. From the figures, it is evident that AlphaPO yields a reward distribution that is better or on par with SimPO (the strongest baseline in our experiments). Since the intent of alignment methods is to match human preferences, this test is a good proxy for measuring the performance of various methods.

4.6 Evolution of KL Divergence with training

In Figure 10 we measure the KL divergence (with the corresponding instruct models) of the most performant AlphaPO and SimPO models for Llama 3 instruct. Both AlphaPO and SimPO are reasonably close to the instruct model and don't diverge away drastically without explicit regularizations with the reference policy. Despite having a slightly higher KL distance when compared to SimPO, AlphaPO is able to achieve a better score on AlpacaEval 2. This indicates that having too high or too low of a KL distance from the instruct model is detrimental to generalization. We hypothesize that there exists a sweet spot where KL distance is not too large and generalization is improved.

4.7 Combining SimPO/AlphaPO and SPPO

SimPO [22] and AlphaPO are based on Bradley-Terry modeling. They primarily work by moving away from the reference SFT or instruct model, but can achieve strong alignment performance via optimal choice of hyperparameters. On the other hand, SPPO [42] is a cautious method that moves towards a Nash equilibrium. We were interested in testing the hypothesis that alignment performance would improve further if we start from the Llama 3 model checkpoint reached by SimPO (AlphaPO) and apply SPPO on top of that.

We conduct a controlled experiment to test this hypothesis. For the PairRM-based [17] set of experiments, we select the best performing checkpoints for SimPO and AlphaPO. We then train both further using SPPO on a 20k sampled subset from the UltraFeedback dataset [8]. We follow the same hyperparameter setting in the SPPO except for changing the learning rate and number of epochs. We set the learning rate to be 10^{-7} with linear warm up and decay and beta to 0.001 for both methods.




Figure 10: KL Divergence of the policy model with the instruct model for Llama 3. Both AlphaPO and SimPO stay reasonably close to the instruct model. AlphaPO has a higher final KL distance.

We use 6 epochs for SPPO and 4 epochs for AlphaPO. Results on evaluation using AlpacaEval 2 can be found in Table 3. Without extensive tuning of hyperparameters, SPPO improves the performance of both SimPO and AlphaPO. AlphaPO attains the best performance, achieving a length-controlled win rate of 47.42. This demonstrates that methods like SPPO can be orthogonally used to improve methods like SimPO and AlphaPO.

Method	LCWR on AlpacaEval 2 (before SPPO)	LCWR on AlpacaEval 2 (after SPPO)
AlphaPO	45.37	47.42
SimPO	42.05	45.06

Table 3: Comparison of length-controlled win rate using AlphaPO and SimPO before and after applying SPPO on the Llama 3 instruct model. Both methods improve after SPPO, with AlphaPO outperforming SimPO.

5 Related work

Reinforcement learning with human feedback Reinforcement learning with human feedback (RLHF) aligns the language models to human preferences by leveraging the parameterized reward models as proxies and reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms [6, 48]. Having the parameterized reward models trained with the Bradley-Terry model [3], algorithms like proximal policy optimization [32, PPO] and REINFORCE [41] are applied for language models to maximize the reward with online generations [49, 23, 1, 18]. While typically being used to align the style of generations to human preferences [49, 23], the paradigm of RLHF is being applied to specialized tasks like complex mathematical reasoning [18, 19] and coding [12].

Direct alignment algorithms Direct alignment algorithms [29, DAAs] as methods for directly aligning the language models to human preferences bypass reinforcement learning (RL) in RLHF [44, 47, 28, 38, 43, 13, 11, 42, 15, 22] either through optimizing expected rewards penalized by divergence from a reference policy (*e.g.*, DPO [28], SPPO [42]) or directly as a function of the policy (*e.g.*, ORPO [15], SimPO [22]).

While these score functions effectively guide fine-tuning with alignment data, they often exhibit over-optimization, excessively widening the margin between chosen and rejected outputs, sometimes lowering the quality of chosen responses. This dragging drift, linked to excessive divergence from

reference policies, requires strategies such as early stopping and tuning of hyperparameters for maintaining model alignment. Recent research like f-divergence Preference Optimization [14, f-PO] offers theoretical insights addressing over-optimization by minimizing f-divergences.

Likelihood displacement Likelihood displacement refers to the unintended reduction in the probabilities of preferred outcomes during preference learning, leading to increased probabilities for undesirable alternatives. Razin et al. [31] argue that this phenomenon occurs when the model’s embedding geometry, mostly the intersections between static token and hidden embeddings, derives shifts in probability mass. AlphaPO extends this understanding by introducing metrics to quantify displacement risk and mitigate them. Through dynamic training adjustments and the use of alpha-parameterized score functions, AlphaPO achieves stable preference learning, demonstrating the critical role of score function design in addressing these challenges.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce AlphaPO, a novel direct alignment algorithm that allows shaping of the reward function for alignment through a fine-grained parameter α . When α is set to zero, AlphaPO reduces to SimPO. Through comprehensive analysis and a series of experiments, we highlight the significance of reward shaping and demonstrate how modifications to AlphaPO can enhance alignment performance beyond that of SimPO.

References

- [1] Arash Ahmadian, Chris Cremer, Matthias Gallé, Marzieh Fadaee, Julia Kreutzer, Olivier Pietquin, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. Back to basics: Revisiting REINFORCE-style optimization for learning from human feedback in LLMs. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12248–12267, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.662. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.662>.
- [2] AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card. 2024. URL https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md.
- [3] Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [5] Stephen Casper, Xander Davies, Claudia Shi, Thomas Krendl Gilbert, Jérémy Scheurer, Javier Rando, Rachel Freedman, Tomasz Korbak, David Lindner, Pedro Freire, Tony Wang, Samuel Marks, Charbel-Raphaël Segerie, Micah Carroll, Andi Peng, Phillip Christoffersen, Mehul Damani, Stewart Slocum, Usman Anwar, Anand Siththaranjan, Max Nadeau, Eric J. Michaud, Jacob Pfau, Dmitrii Krasheninnikov, Xin Chen, Lauro Langosco, Peter Hase, Erdem Biyık, Anca Dragan, David Krueger, Dorsa Sadigh, and Dylan Hadfield-Menell. Open problems and fundamental limitations of reinforcement learning from human feedback, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.15217>.
- [6] Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/d5e2c0adad503c91f91df240d0cd4e49-Paper.pdf.
- [7] Andrzej Cichocki, Hyekyoung Lee, Yong-Deok Kim, and Seungjin Choi. Non-negative matrix factorization with α -divergence. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 29(9):1433–1440, 2008.

- [8] Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Ning Ding, Guanming Yao, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Ultrafeedback: Boosting language models with high-quality feedback. 2023.
- [9] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [10] Yann Dubois, Balázs Galambosi, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Length-controlled alpacaeval: A simple way to debias automatic evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04475*, 2024.
- [11] Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=iUwHnoENn1>.
- [12] Jonas Gehring, Kunhao Zheng, Jade Copet, Vegard Mella, Taco Cohen, and Gabriel Synnaeve. Rlef: Grounding code llms in execution feedback with reinforcement learning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.02089>.
- [13] Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Bilal Piot, Remi Munos, Mark Rowland, Michal Valko, and Daniele Calandriello. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. In Sanjoy Dasgupta, Stephan Mandt, and Yingzhen Li, editors, *Proceedings of The 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 238 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4447–4455. PMLR, 02–04 May 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v238/gheshlaghi-azar24a.html>.
- [14] Jiaqi Han, Mingjian Jiang, Yuxuan Song, Jure Leskovec, Stefano Ermon, and Minkai Xu. f -po: Generalizing preference optimization with f -divergence minimization, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.21662>.
- [15] Jiwoo Hong, Noah Lee, and James Thorne. ORPO: Monolithic preference optimization without reference model. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11170–11189, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.626. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.626>.
- [16] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mistral 7b, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>.
- [17] Dongfu Jiang, Xiang Ren, and Bill Yuchen Lin. Llm-blender: Ensembling large language models with pairwise comparison and generative fusion. In *Proceedings of the 61th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2023)*, 2023.
- [18] Amirhossein Kazemnejad, Milad Aghajohari, Eva Portelance, Alessandro Sordani, Siva Reddy, Aaron Courville, and Nicolas Le Roux. Vineppo: Unlocking rl potential for llm reasoning through refined credit assignment, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.01679>.
- [19] Nathan Lambert, Jacob Morrison, Valentina Pyatkin, Shengyi Huang, Hamish Ivison, Faeze Brahman, Lester James V. Miranda, Alisa Liu, Nouha Dziri, Shane Lyu, Yuling Gu, Saumya Malik, Victoria Graf, Jena D. Hwang, Jiangjiang Yang, Ronan Le Bras, Oyvind Tafjord, Chris Wilhelm, Luca Soldaini, Noah A. Smith, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Tulu 3: Pushing frontiers in open language model post-training, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.15124>.
- [20] Tianle Li, Wei-Lin Chiang, Evan Frick, Lisa Dunlap, Tianhao Wu, Banghua Zhu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. From crowdsourced data to high-quality benchmarks: Arena-hard and benchbuilder pipeline, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11939>.

- [21] Zhihan Liu, Miao Lu, Shenao Zhang, Boyi Liu, Hongyi Guo, Yingxiang Yang, Jose Blanchet, and Zhaoran Wang. Provably mitigating overoptimization in rlhf: Your sft loss is implicitly an adversarial regularizer, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.16436>.
- [22] Yu Meng, Mengzhou Xia, and Danqi Chen. SimPO: Simple preference optimization with a reference-free reward. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3Tzcot1LKb>.
- [23] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/b1efde53be364a73914f58805a001731-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- [24] Arka Pal, Deep Karkhanis, Samuel Dooley, Manley Roberts, Siddhartha Naidu, and Colin White. Smaug: Fixing failure modes of preference optimisation with dpo-positive, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.13228>.
- [25] Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, Kyunghyun Cho, He He, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason Weston. Iterative reasoning preference optimization, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.19733>.
- [26] Ryan Park, Rafael Rafailov, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Disentangling length from quality in direct preference optimization, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.19159>.
- [27] Ryan Park, Rafael Rafailov, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Disentangling length from quality in direct preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19159*, 2024.
- [28] 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. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HPuSIXJaa9>.
- [29] Rafael Rafailov, Yaswanth Chittetu, Ryan Park, Harshit Sikchi, Joey Hejna, Bradley Knox, Chelsea Finn, and Scott Niekum. Scaling laws for reward model overoptimization in direct alignment algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02900*, 2024.
- [30] Rafael Rafailov, Joey Hejna, Ryan Park, and Chelsea Finn. From r to q^* : Your language model is secretly a q -function, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.12358>.
- [31] Noam Razin, Sadhika Malladi, Adithya Bhaskar, Danqi Chen, Sanjeev Arora, and Boris Hanin. Unintentional unalignment: Likelihood displacement in direct preference optimization, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.08847>.
- [32] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347>.
- [33] Zhengyan Shi, Sander Land, Acyr Locatelli, Matthieu Geist, and Max Bartolo. Understanding likelihood over-optimisation in direct alignment algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11677*, 2024.
- [34] Fahim Tajwar, Anikait Singh, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Jeff Schneider, Tengyang Xie, Stefano Ermon, Chelsea Finn, and Aviral Kumar. Preference fine-tuning of llms should leverage suboptimal, on-policy data, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14367>.
- [35] Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, Johan Ferret, Peter Liu, Pouya Tafti, Abe Friesen, Michelle Casbon, Sabela Ramos, Ravin Kumar, Charline Le Lan, Sammy Jerome, Anton Tsitsulin, Nino Vieillard, Piotr Stanczyk, Sertan Girgin, Nikola Momchev, Matt Hoffman, Shantanu Thakoor, Jean-Bastien Grill, Behnam Neyshabur,

Olivier Bachem, Alanna Walton, Aliaksei Severyn, Alicia Parrish, Aliya Ahmad, Allen Hutchison, Alvin Abdagic, Amanda Carl, Amy Shen, Andy Brock, Andy Coenen, Anthony Laforge, Antonia Paterson, Ben Bastian, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Brandon Royal, Charlie Chen, Chintu Kumar, Chris Perry, Chris Welty, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Danila Sinopalnikov, David Weinberger, Dimple Vijaykumar, Dominika Rogozińska, Dustin Herbison, Elisa Bandy, Emma Wang, Eric Noland, Erica Moreira, Evan Senter, Evgenii Eltyshev, Francesco Visin, Gabriel Rasskin, Gary Wei, Glenn Cameron, Gus Martins, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Plucińska, Harleen Batra, Harsh Dhand, Ivan Nardini, Jacinda Mein, Jack Zhou, James Svensson, Jeff Stanway, Jetha Chan, Jin Peng Zhou, Joana Carrasqueira, Joana Iljazi, Jocelyn Becker, Joe Fernandez, Joost van Amersfoort, Josh Gordon, Josh Lipschultz, Josh Newlan, Ju yeong Ji, Kareem Mohamed, Kartikeya Badola, Kat Black, Katie Millican, Keelin McDonnell, Kelvin Nguyen, Kiranbir Sodhia, Kish Greene, Lars Lowe Sjoesund, Lauren Usui, Laurent Sifre, Lena Heuermann, Leticia Lago, Lilly McNealus, Livio Baldini Soares, Logan Kilpatrick, Lucas Dixon, Luciano Martins, Machel Reid, Manvinder Singh, Mark Iverson, Martin Görner, Mat Velloso, Mateo Wirth, Matt Davidow, Matt Miller, Matthew Rahtz, Matthew Watson, Meg Risdal, Mehran Kazemi, Michael Moynihan, Ming Zhang, Minsuk Kahng, Minwoo Park, Mofi Rahman, Mohit Khatwani, Natalie Dao, Nenshad Bardoliwalla, Nesh Devanathan, Neta Dumai, Nilay Chauhan, Oscar Wahltinez, Pankil Botarda, Parker Barnes, Paul Barham, Paul Michel, Pengchong Jin, Petko Georgiev, Phil Culliton, Pradeep Kuppala, Ramona Comanescu, Ramona Merhej, Reena Jana, Reza Ardeshtir Rokni, Rishabh Agarwal, Ryan Mullins, Samaneh Saadat, Sara Mc Carthy, Sarah Cogan, Sarah Perrin, Sébastien M. R. Arnold, Sebastian Krause, Shengyang Dai, Shruti Garg, Shruti Sheth, Sue Ronstrom, Susan Chan, Timothy Jordan, Ting Yu, Tom Eccles, Tom Hennigan, Tomas Kocisky, Tulsee Doshi, Vihan Jain, Vikas Yadav, Vilobh Meshram, Vishal Dharmadhikari, Warren Barkley, Wei Wei, Wenming Ye, Woohyun Han, Woosuk Kwon, Xiang Xu, Zhe Shen, Zhitao Gong, Zichuan Wei, Victor Cotruta, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Minh Giang, Ludovic Peran, Tris Warkentin, Eli Collins, Joelle Barral, Zoubin Ghahramani, Raia Hadsell, D. Sculley, Jeanine Banks, Anca Dragan, Slav Petrov, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Clement Farabet, Elena Buchatskaya, Sebastian Borgeaud, Noah Fiedel, Armand Joulin, Kathleen Kenealy, Robert Dadashi, and Alek Andreev. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00118>.

- [36] Lewis Tunstall, Edward Emanuel Beeching, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Kashif Rasul, Younes Belkada, Shengyi Huang, Leandro Von Werra, Clémentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, Nathan Sarrazin, Omar Sanseviero, Alexander M Rush, and Thomas Wolf. Zephyr: Direct distillation of LM alignment. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=aKkAwZB6JV>.
- [37] A Vaswani. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [38] Chaoqi Wang, Yibo Jiang, Chenghao Yang, Han Liu, and Yuxin Chen. Beyond reverse KL: Generalizing direct preference optimization with diverse divergence constraints. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=2cRzmWXX9N>.
- [39] Haoxiang Wang, Wei Xiong, Tengyang Xie, Han Zhao, and Tong Zhang. Interpretable preferences via multi-objective reward modeling and mixture-of-experts, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12845>.
- [40] Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A Smith, Iz Beltagy, et al. How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:74764–74786, 2023.
- [41] Ronald J Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8:229–256, 1992.
- [42] Yue Wu, Zhiqing Sun, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, Yiming Yang, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play preference optimization for language model alignment, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.00675>.

- [43] Haoran Xu, Amr Sharaf, Yunmo Chen, Weiting Tan, Lingfeng Shen, Benjamin Van Durme, Kenton Murray, and Young Jin Kim. Contrastive preference optimization: Pushing the boundaries of LLM performance in machine translation. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=51iwkioZpn>.
- [44] Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Chuanqi Tan, Wei Wang, Songfang Huang, and Fei Huang. RRHF: Rank responses to align language models with human feedback. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=EdIGMCHk41>.
- [45] Lifan Yuan, Ganqu Cui, Hanbin Wang, Ning Ding, Xingyao Wang, Jia Deng, Boji Shan, Huimin Chen, Ruobing Xie, Yankai Lin, Zhenghao Liu, Bowen Zhou, Hao Peng, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Advancing llm reasoning generalists with preference trees, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.02078>.
- [46] Hanyang Zhao, Genta Indra Winata, Anirban Das, Shi-Xiong Zhang, David D Yao, Wenpin Tang, and Sambit Sahu. Rainbowpo: A unified framework for combining improvements in preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04203*, 2024.
- [47] Yao Zhao, Mikhail Khalman, Rishabh Joshi, Shashi Narayan, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J Liu. Calibrating sequence likelihood improves conditional language generation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=0qS0odKmJaN>.
- [48] Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*, 2019.
- [49] Daniel M. Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B. Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.08593>.

A Appendix

A.1 Proofs

A.1.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. The derivative of the reward function with respect to π is given by

$$r'_\alpha(\pi) = \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}|} \cdot \pi^{-\left(\frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{y}|}+1\right)}. \quad (18)$$

To determine when $r'_\alpha(\pi)$ is monotonically decreasing, we compute its derivative with respect to π :

$$\frac{dr'_\alpha(\pi)}{d\pi} = \frac{d}{d\pi} \left(\frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}|} \cdot \pi^{-\left(\frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{y}|}+1\right)} \right) = -\frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}|} \left(\frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{y}|} + 1 \right) \pi^{-\left(\frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{y}|}+2\right)}. \quad (19)$$

Since $\beta > 0$, $|\mathbf{y}| \geq 1$, and $\pi^{-\left(\frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{y}|}+2\right)} > 0$ for $\pi \in (0, 1]$, the sign of $\frac{dr'_\alpha(\pi)}{d\pi}$ is determined by the term $-\left(\frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{y}|} + 1\right)$.

For $r'_\alpha(\pi)$ to be monotonically decreasing in π , we require:

$$\frac{dr'_\alpha(\pi)}{d\pi} \leq 0.$$

This inequality holds if and only if

$$\frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{y}|} + 1 \geq 0 \quad \iff \quad \alpha \geq -|\mathbf{y}|.$$

□

A.2 Implementation Details

Training hyper-parameter tuning Following the recommendations of SimPO, we adopt a global batch size of 128, a maximum sequence length of 2048, and a cosine learning rate schedule with a warmup ratio of 0.1 for one epoch across all training settings.

Although AlphaPO introduces an additional hyperparameter, α , compared to SimPO, the need for extensive grid searches can be mitigated if the optimal parameters for SimPO have already been determined. Instead of performing a full grid search, we can leverage the best parameters identified for SimPO and conduct a coordinate-wise hyperparameter search in a greedy manner. This approach allows us to achieve improved performance rapidly, often within a few search iterations. Notably, the optimal parameters of β , γ and learning rate for AlphaPO show only minor deviations from those of SimPO. The hyperparameters that differ from the SimPO settings are highlighted in bold in Table 4. Follow the practice from the SimPO repo, we report γ/β (instead of γ) in Table 4 .

Table 4: Best hyperparameters for training.

Method	Model	α	β	γ/β	Learning Rate
SimPO	Mistral-Instruct	-	2.5	0.1	5×10^{-7}
	Llama-3-Instruct	-	2.5	0.55	1×10^{-6}
	Gemma-2-Instruct	-	10	0.5	8×10^{-7}
AlphaPO	Mistral-Instruct	0.25	2.5	0.1	7×10^{-7}
	Llama-3-Instruct	0.25	2.5	1.0	1×10^{-6}
	Gemma-2-Instruct	0.1	10	0.5	8×10^{-7}

Decoding hyperparameters For AlpacaEval 2.0, we adopt the default settings for AlpacaEval 2.0 with `weighted_alpaca_eval_gpt4_turbo` as the annotator and use `gpt4_turbo` as the reference model. We use a sampling decoding strategy to generate responses, with a temperature of 0.5 for the Mistral-Instruct setting and a temperature of 0.9 for Llama-3-Instruct settings following from the SimPO configs. We use a temperature of 0.7 following from the WPO-HB config for better reproducibility. For Arena-Hard, we use the default greedy decoding for all settings and methods.

Computation All the training experiments in this paper were conducted on 8xA100 GPUs with the `adamw_torch` optimizer based on the alignment-handbook. The training time for Mistral-Instruct and Llama-3-Instruct is around 2.3 hours, while Gemma-2-Instruct requires 3 hours.

Open Sourced Models used in Experiments The list of open-sourced LLMs used in our experiments and their Huggingface IDs are listed in Table 5.

Model	Huggingface ID
Mistral-Instruct SFT	mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2
Llama-3-Instruct SFT	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct
Gemma-2-Instruct SFT	google/gemma-2-9b-it

Table 5: List of open-source models used in experiments.

A.3 Detailed results for AlphaPO and SimPO

The full results of the best runs are reported in Table 6.

Table 6: Detailed results of AlpacaEval 2 and Arena-Hard for the best run. LC means length-controlled win rate, WR means raw win rate, and STD means standard deviation of win rate over different instructions. Length is the average generation length. For Arena-Hard, we report the win rate and 95% confidence interval.

Models	AlpacaEval 2				Arena-Hard			
	LC (%)	WR (%)	STD (%)	Length	WR	95 CI high	95 CI low	Length
Mistral-7B-Instruct								
SimPO	29.71	31.12	1.37	2330	21.5	23.6	19.8	551
AlphaPO	33.03	34.12	1.40	2097	21.7	24.0	19.9	503
Llama-3-8B-Instruct								
SimPO	42.05	36.90	1.42	1759	32.8	34.9	30.5	485
AlphaPO	45.37	40.97	1.45	1820	34.6	37.1	32.9	508
Gemma 2-9B-Instruct								
SimPO	73.72	67.36	1.37	1832	59.0	61.5	56.7	720
AlphaPO	74.13	65.89	1.41	1802	57.7	60.4	55.6	689

A.4 AlphaPO with Reference Policy

The inclusion of the reference policy in SimPO (7) results in the loss

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_{\text{SimPO w ref}} &= -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_w|} \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})} \right) - \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_l|} \left(\log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})} \right) - \gamma \right) \right] \\
 &= -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_w|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) - \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_l|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) - \gamma'(\mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l, \mathbf{x}) \right) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $L_{\text{SimPO w ref}}$ reduces to SimPO with the per-response-pair margin $\gamma'(\mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l, \mathbf{x})$

$$\gamma'(\mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l, \mathbf{x}) = \gamma + \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_w|} \log \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) - \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_l|} \log \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}).$$

In contrast, with the reference policy, the AlphaPO (9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_{\text{AlphaPO w ref}} &= -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\frac{-\beta}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})} \right)^{-\alpha/|\mathbf{y}_w|} + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})} \right)^{-\alpha/|\mathbf{y}_l|} - \gamma \right) \right] \\
 &= -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\frac{-\beta'(\mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{x})}{\alpha} \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})^{-\alpha/|\mathbf{y}_w|} + \frac{\beta'(\mathbf{y}_l, \mathbf{x})}{\alpha} \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})^{-\alpha/|\mathbf{y}_l|} - \gamma \right) \right],
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta'(\mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{x}) &= \beta \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})^{\alpha/|\mathbf{y}_w|}, \\
 \beta'(\mathbf{y}_l, \mathbf{x}) &= \beta \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})^{\alpha/|\mathbf{y}_l|}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $L_{\text{AlphaPO w ref}}$ reduces to AlphaPO with per-response weight $\beta'(\mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{x})$ and $\beta'(\mathbf{y}_l, \mathbf{x})$.

A.5 Qualitative analysis

In Figure 11, we create AlpacaEval 2 win rate heatmaps of AlphaPO and SimPO for the Mistral instruct and Llama 3 instruct models.

Observations on Win Rate: It is observed that the percentage of instances where AlphaPO outperforms the base GPT model, but SimPO does not, is significantly higher compared to the percentage of instances where SimPO outperforms the base GPT model, but AlphaPO does not.

A.6 Extra plots

Box plots for Section 3.3 can be found in Figures 12 and 13.




Figure 11: Win rate heatmap of Mistral-Instruct and Llama-3-Instruct on AlpacaEval 2. B represents the reference model (i.e., gpt4_turbo).




Figure 12: Mistral: Box plots illustrating the distribution of length-normalized preferred (dispreferred) likelihood and length-normalized margin across different α values. The plot provides a detailed view of variations in scatter intensity and performance metrics as a function of α .




Figure 13: Gemma 2: Box plots illustrating the distribution of length-normalized preferred (dis-preferred) likelihood and length-normalized margin across different α values. The plot provides a detailed view of variations in scatter intensity and performance metrics as a function of α .