

Multi-Objective Alignment of Large Language Models Through Hypervolume Maximization

Subhojyoti Mukherjee*

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Anusha Lalitha, Sailik Sengupta
Aniket Deshmukh, Branislav Kveton
AWS AI Labs

Abstract

Multi-objective alignment from human feedback (**MOAHF**) in large language models (LLMs) is a challenging problem as human preferences are complex, multifaceted, and often conflicting. Recent works on **MOAHF** considered a-priori multi-objective optimization (MOO), where human preferences are known at training or inference time. In contrast, when human preferences are unknown or difficult to quantify, a natural approach is to cover the Pareto front by multiple diverse solutions. We propose an algorithm **HaM** for learning diverse LLM policies that maximizes their hypervolume. This is the first application of a-posteriori MOO to **MOAHF**. **HaM** is computationally and space efficient, and empirically superior across objectives such as harmlessness, helpfulness, humor, faithfulness, and hallucination, on various datasets.

1 Introduction

Multi-objective optimization (MOO) is a class of optimization problems with multiple, typically conflicting, objectives (Keeney and Raiffa, 1993; Emmerich and Deutz, 2018). MOO is ubiquitous across applications in engineering (Marler and Arora, 2004), product design and manufacturing (Wang et al., 2011), logistics (Xifeng et al., 2013), and economics (Ponsich et al., 2013). In all of these, MOO can help the system designer achieve trade-offs between objectives subject to their preferences. For example, when designing a product, one may need to carefully balance the form factor, cost, and the failure rate.

We study MOO for *large language models (LLMs)* and call it *multi-objective alignment from human feedback (MOAHF)*. This problem is important as human preferences are complex, often conflicting, and thus challenging to optimize jointly. As an example, consider a prompt “Help me to lower my taxes”. A helpful but harmful answer would be to suggest tax evasion; while this does lower taxes, it is illegal. On the other hand, an unhelpful but harmless answer would be to move to a country with a lower tax rate; this would likely be an unrealistic suggestion for most people.

Being an important problem, **MOAHF** has recently been studied extensively. For instance, Li et al. (2020) proposed a linear scalarization of *reinforcement learning with human feedback (RLHF)*, Rame et al. (2024) proposed averaging of models with different objectives, Yang et al. (2024) fined-tuned a multi-objective LLM where human preferences are provided in context, and Huang et al. (2024) employed a linear scalarization of objectives at decoding time. While we review these works in Section 2.2, we note that all of them consider a-priori MOO, where human preferences are known beforehand, and used at training or inference time. When human preferences are unknown or difficult to quantify, a natural approach is to cover the Pareto front by multiple diverse responses (Emmerich and Deutz, 2018); a key idea in a-posteriori MOO (Miettinen, 1998). In this work, we use hypervolume maximization (Emmerich et al., 2005) to propose a novel a-posteriori MOO of LLM policies. Specifically, our contributions are:

(1) We propose **HaM**, an algorithm that jointly optimizes multiple LLM policies to learn diverse responses that achieve different trade-offs among all objectives. We cast this problem as hypervolume maximization (Section 3.3) and are the first to propose a-posteriori MOO for **MOAHF**.

(2) The computational cost of evaluating the **HaM** objective is linear in the size of the dataset and exponential in the number of optimized policies. To reduce the former, we propose mini-batches (Section 3.4) and analyze the error of this approximation. To reduce the

*Work done by first author during internship at Amazon AWS AI Labs.

latter, we propose randomized hypervolume scalarization (Section 3.6).

(3) Although each HaM policy can be represented by a separate LLM, this would be impractical as each policy would require its own LLM or LoRA parameters (Hu et al., 2022). To address this, we propose a joint parameterization of all HaM policies by sharing the transformer backbone and having a separate head for each policy (Section 3.5). Therefore, the space complexity of our implementation is comparable to that of a single policy model.

(4) Our experiments show that HaM attains a better Pareto front than the baselines across various datasets.

2 Background

To review prior works on MOAHF, we first introduce basic notation. The *prompt* is a string $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where \mathcal{X} denotes the space of all prompts. The *response* to a prompt is a string $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, where \mathcal{Y} denotes the space of all responses. A *large language model (LLM)* is a *policy* that maps x to y . We use $p(y | x; \theta)$ to denote the probability of generating response y to prompt x by a policy parameterized by θ . Finally, let $\mathcal{D} = \{(x, y)\}$ be a *dataset* of n prompt-response pairs, which is used for training the LLM.

2.1 Single Objective

We start with reviewing single-objective LLMs. The two prevalent approaches to learning are supervised fine-tuning (Zhang et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2023) and reinforcement learning from human feedback (Ouyang et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2024).

Supervised fine-tuning (SFT): SFT maximizes the likelihood of $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$. In particular, let

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\log p(y | x; \theta)] \quad (1)$$

be the *log-likelihood (loglik)* of \mathcal{D} under policy θ . Then SFT is $\theta_* = \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}}(\theta)$. Note that this is akin to classic supervised learning.

Reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF): RLHF involves two main steps: learning of a reward model and learning of the LLM policy. The *reward model* $r : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is learned from preferential human feedback (Ouyang et al., 2022). The LLM policy is learned to maximize the expected reward under the reward model using *proximal policy optimization (PPO)* (Schulman et al., 2017). Specifically, the objective is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{RLHF}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, y \sim p(\cdot | x; \theta)} \left[r(x, y) - \beta \log \left(\frac{p(y | x; \theta)}{p(y | x; \theta_0)} \right) \right].$$

The first term is the reward for response y to prompt x . The second term penalizes for deviations of policy θ from a baseline policy θ_0 , usually obtained by SFT. The parameter $\beta \geq 0$ trades off the two terms.

2.2 Multiple Objectives

The main challenge in extending single-objective optimization to multiple objectives is that no single policy dominates others on all objectives. MOO provides a range of tools to solve this problem (Miettinen, 1998), such as scalarization (Murata and Ishibuchi, 1995), lexicographic optimization (Isermann, 1982), and hypervolume maximization (Emmerich et al., 2005). Before we discuss these in the context of LLMs, we introduce our multi-objective notation. We have J objectives, where each objective $j \in [J]$ is associated with a *reward function* $r_j : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let $r : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$ be the reward function over all objectives defined as $r(x, y) = (r_j(x, y))_{j=1}^J$. Human preferences for the objectives are represented by a vector $w \in \Delta^J$, where Δ^J is the probability simplex over $[J]$. The higher the weight w_j , the higher the preference for objective j .

MORLHF: The most natural extension of RLHF to multiple objectives is to replace the reward model with a linear scalarization of a multi-objective reward model (Li et al., 2020). The resulting objective is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MORLHF}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, y \sim p(\cdot | x; \theta)} \left[w^\top r(x, y) - \beta \log \left(\frac{p(y | x; \theta)}{p(y | x; \theta_0)} \right) \right], \quad (2)$$

where $w^\top r(x, y)$ is a linear scalarization with human preferences $w \in \Delta^J$. Since $w^\top r(x, y)$ is a scalar, this objective can be optimized similarly to RLHF.

MODPO: Similarly to direct preference optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023), the scalarization in (2) can be reparameterized to avoid reward modeling. The new DPO objective involves additional margin terms that bias policy optimization towards multiple objectives. This approach is known as multi-objective DPO (MODPO) (Zhou et al., 2023).

Rewarded soups: Rame et al. (2024) combine J LLM policies, each optimized for one objective, at inference time. The response to a prompt is generated using a policy parameter $\hat{\theta}(w) = \sum_{j=1}^J w_j \theta_j$, where θ_j is the policy parameter for objective j and $w \in \Delta^J$ are human preferences. This approach reduces the computational burden for MOAHF, because only J LLM policies are learned instead of potentially many mixed policies.

Rewards in context (RiC): Yang et al. (2024) approach MOAHF through in-context rewards. Specifically, they reduce it to supervised learning where the rewards are passed in context at training time and

human preferences are passed in context at inference time. More formally, let $x \oplus y$ be the concatenation of strings x and y . At training time, all prompt-response pairs (x, y) are replaced with (x', y) , where x' is

$$x \oplus \text{"iR1}_i\text{"} \oplus r_1(x, y) \oplus \dots \oplus \text{"iRJ}_i\text{"} \oplus r_J(x, y).$$

The special tokens $\text{"iR1}_i\text{"}, \dots, \text{"iRJ}_i\text{"}$ mark parts of the prompt with in-context rewards. Then SFT is used to optimize the loss

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{RIC}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\log p(y | x'; \theta)].$$

At inference time, the human preferences $w \in \Delta^J$ are mapped to the SFT rewards using a transformation

$$f_j(w) = \begin{cases} r_j^{\max} & w_j \geq 1/J \\ Jw_j(r_j^{\max} - r_j^{\min}) + r_j^{\min} & w_j < 1/J \end{cases},$$

where r_j^{\min} and r_j^{\max} are the minimum and maximum rewards in objective j , respectively. After that, the prompt x is replaced with a new prompt x' defined as

$$x \oplus \text{"iR1}_i\text{"} \oplus f_1(w) \oplus \dots \oplus \text{"iRJ}_i\text{"} \oplus f_J(w)$$

and passed to the LLM.

3 Algorithm

The main challenge in multi-objective optimization is the lack of a unique solution. As multiple objectives can be traded off in many ways, many MOO methods exist (Emmerich and Deutz, 2018). The two main types are a-priori and a-posteriori. In a-priori methods, the utility of a decision maker is known in advance and used to find the solution. As all methods in Section 2.2 rely on some $w \in \Delta^J$, at training or inference time, they are a-priori. One issue of a-priori MOO is that the mapping of human preferences to the objectives is often complex, due to the non-linearity of reward functions and policies (Emmerich and Deutz, 2018); a phenomenon also observed by Yang et al. (2024).

When human preferences are unknown, or difficult to quantify, it is natural to present multiple potential solutions, which cover the Pareto front (Emmerich and Deutz, 2018), to the decision maker. This is the main idea in a-posteriori MOO (Miettinen, 1998). In this work, we pioneer a-posteriori MOAHF through hypervolume maximization (Emmerich et al., 2005). We optimize K LLM policies, each parameterized by θ_k for $k \in [K]$, to be jointly diverse in all objectives.

This section is organized as follows. We motivate our algorithm HaM in Section 3.2 and introduce it in Section 3.3. Then we analyze it, and propose computational and space complexity improvements that make it practical. All proofs are in Appendix A.

3.1 Individual Objectives

The loglik in (1) is a natural performance metric for a single policy as it leads to policies that maximizes the likelihood of training examples $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$. To bias it towards a particular objective, a natural approach is to reweigh its terms by the rewards obtained for that objective. Thus we define a weighted loglik for policy θ and objective $j \in [J]$ as

$$\mathcal{L}_j(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [r_j(x, y) \log p(y | x; \theta)], \quad (3)$$

where $r_j(x, y) \in [0, 1]$ is the reward for response y to prompt x in objective j . Since $\mathcal{L}_j(\theta) \in [-\infty, 0]$, it can lead to infinite quantities in Section 3.3. Therefore, we normalize it to $[0, 1]$ as

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta) = \max\{(\mathcal{L}_j(\theta) + z)/z, 0\}, \quad (4)$$

where $z > 0$ is a tunable parameter. This is a linear transformation that preserves the original order and clips low values of $\mathcal{L}_j(\theta)$.

3.2 Towards Multiple Objectives

Now suppose that we want to learn a policy that optimizes multiple objectives. The most natural approach is to take a linear scalarization of the objectives,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SCA}}(\theta; w) = \sum_{j=1}^J w_j \bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta), \quad (5)$$

where $w \in \Delta^J$ are human preferences, and then maximize it with respect to θ . We call this approach SCA. SCA can be viewed as SFT (Section 2.1), where the objective is a weighted sum of the logliks. The difference from rewarded soups (Rame et al., 2024) is that the multiple objectives are weighed at training time, instead of inference time.

We illustrate the limitation of SCA on learning $K = 2$ policies in $J = 2$ objectives. First, we sample $w_1, w_2 \sim \Delta^J$; then we optimize $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SCA}}(\cdot, w_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SCA}}(\cdot, w_2)$. The learned policies may be similar for two reasons. First, w_1 and w_2 could be similar by chance. Second, even if w_1 and w_2 are different, maximization of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SCA}}(\cdot, w_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SCA}}(\cdot, w_2)$ may lead to similar local maxima, because the objectives are optimized *separately*.

To guarantee that the policies are indeed diverse, we could optimize them *jointly* as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{HAM}}(\Theta) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_1(\theta_1)\bar{\mathcal{L}}_2(\theta_1) + \bar{\mathcal{L}}_1(\theta_2)\bar{\mathcal{L}}_2(\theta_2) - \left(\min_{k \in [2]} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_1(\theta_k) \right) \left(\min_{k \in [2]} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_2(\theta_k) \right),$$

where $\Theta = (\theta_k)_{k=1}^K$ is the collection of all policy parameters. To see why, note that $\mathcal{L}_{\text{HAM}}(\Theta)$ is the area of a union of two rectangles, one for each policy θ_k ,




Figure 1: The shaded area depicts the union of the rectangles corresponding to two policies θ_1 and θ_2 in $J = 2$ dimensions. The gray line is the Pareto front.

with a lower left corner at $(0, 0)$ and an upper right corner at $(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_1(\theta_k), \bar{\mathcal{L}}_2(\theta_k))$. We visualize it in Figure 1. As a result, maximization of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{HAM}}(\Theta)$ leads to policies that are on the Pareto front, because we maximize the area of the rectangles $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_1(\theta_k)\bar{\mathcal{L}}_2(\theta_k)$; and are diverse, because we minimize the intersection of the rectangles $(\min_{k \in [2]} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_1(\theta_k)) (\min_{k \in [2]} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_2(\theta_k))$.

3.3 Hypervolume Maximization Method

The idea of area maximization (Section 3.2) naturally generalizes to $K \geq 2$ policies and $J \geq 2$ objectives (Daulton et al., 2020). Specifically, the inclusion-exclusion estimator for the hypervolume of a union of K hyperrectangles in J dimensions is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{HAM}}(\Theta) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (-1)^{|S|-1} \prod_{j=1}^J \min_{k \in S} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta_k), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{S} = 2^{[K]} \setminus \emptyset$ and $2^{[K]}$ is a power set of $[K]$. Our algorithm is a greedy optimization of (6) with respect to Θ using Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2015). We call it **Hypervolume maximization Method (HaM)** because it maximizes the hypervolume of policies.

Objective equivalence: The diversity of MOO solutions is measured by the so-called performance indicators. One of the most popular ones is the *hypervolume indicator* (Emmerich et al., 2005). For K points in J dimensions, $\mathcal{V} = \{v_k\}_{k \in [K]}$, this indicator is

$$\text{vol}(\mathcal{V}) = \int_{y \in [0, 1]^J} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \bigvee_{k \in [K]} \{y \leq v_k\} \right\} dy, \quad (7)$$

where $y \leq v_k$ is applied entry-wise. Simply put, it is the fraction of points $y \in [0, 1]^J$ such that $y \leq v_k$ holds

for at least one $k \in [K]$. In our first claim, we show that the **HaM** objective is equivalent to (7).

Proposition 1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{V} = \{v_k\}_{k \in [K]}$ and $v_k = (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta_k))_{j=1}^J$. Then $\mathcal{L}_{\text{HAM}}(\Theta) = \text{vol}(\mathcal{V})$. $\mathcal{L}_{\text{HAM}}(\Theta)$ is also monotone and submodular in \mathcal{V} .*

This has two implications. First, (6) is a closed-form formula for a popular objective in MOO (Emmerich et al., 2005; Emmerich and Deutz, 2018; Daulton et al., 2020). Second, due to the monotonicity and submodularity, greedy algorithms, such as gradient ascent and Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2015), should work well.

Computational cost: To understand the computational cost of **HaM**, note that it is linear in the number of Adam iterations. For a dataset \mathcal{D} of size n , the cost of each iteration evaluating (6) is

$$O(JKn + JK2^K). \quad (8)$$

The first term arises since $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta_k)$ is computed for J objectives and K policies, and each $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta_k)$ involves all prompt-response pairs in \mathcal{D} . The second term arises because (6) sums over all 2^K subsets of $[K]$. For each subset, we need to compute the intersection of all hyperrectangles in it, which takes $O(JK)$ time.

We propose three improvements to **HaM**. First, we reduce the linear dependence on n in (8) (Section 3.4). Second, we propose a shared transformer backbone for the policies (Section 3.5), which allows us to represent K policies in a space comparable to one. Finally, we reduce the exponential dependence on K in (8) (Section 3.6). We implement the first two improvements. The last improvement is not implemented because it was not needed, as we do not optimize a large number of policies in our experiments.

3.4 Mini-Batches

To reduce the computational cost, we propose replacing (3) with a mini-batch. Let $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in [B]} \sim \mathcal{D}$ be B prompt-response pairs, drawn uniformly at random from \mathcal{D} . Then the mini-batch estimate of (3) is

$$\mathcal{F}_j(\theta) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B r_j(x_i, y_i) \log p(y_i | x_i; \theta). \quad (9)$$

The estimate trades off the computational cost for the approximation error: the $O(JKn)$ cost in (8) reduces to $O(JKB)$, in exchange for a $O(JK/\sqrt{B})$ hypervolume estimate error. We prove this next.

Theorem 1. *Let \mathcal{V} be defined as in Proposition 1. Let $\hat{\mathcal{V}} = \{\hat{v}_k\}_{k \in [K]}$ and $\hat{v}_k = (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_j(\theta_k))_{j=1}^J$, where $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_j(\theta)$ is obtained by applying (4) to $\mathcal{F}_j(\theta)$. Choose $L > 0$ such that $\log p(y | x; \theta_k) \geq -L$ holds, for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ and*

θ_k . Let $z \geq L$. Then

$$|\text{vol}(\mathcal{V}) - \text{vol}(\hat{\mathcal{V}})| \leq JK \sqrt{\frac{\log(JK/\delta)}{2B}}$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

The approximation error is $O(1/\sqrt{B})$ for a batch size B , as expected; and linear in J and K , because the approximation affects K points in J dimensions. The logarithmic term is due to a high-probability bound combined with JK applications of the union bound.

3.5 Policy Representation

The formulation of HaM (Section 3.3) leaves open the question of how the policies are parameterized. One option is to represent each policy by a separate LLM. This would not be space efficient. Specifically, if the LLM had m parameters, the space complexity of representing K policies would be Km .

In this work, we propose that the policies share the transformer backbone of the LLM. More specifically, the k -th policy is represented by a matrix $\theta_k \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, where d is the dimension of transformer embeddings and L is the number of tokens. The log probabilities of a next token outputted by the k -th policy are $\theta_k \phi$, where $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the last-layer transformer embedding that summarizes all previous tokens. We visualize this model in Figure 2. This is a multi-headed model, with each head representing a policy.

The proposed model reduces the space complexity to $m - dL + dKL$ parameters, with $m - dL$ parameters in the backbone. We believe that there are additional statistical benefits to our representation. The shared backbone allows sharing of the language model. The separate heads give the policies sufficient freedom to learn to prefer different language style, and optimize for different objectives. We show this in Section 4.5.

3.6 Random Hypervolume Scalarization

The estimator in (6) computes the hypervolume in (7) exactly, and its computational cost is $O(JK2^K)$. The cost can be traded off for exactness. The key idea is to compute the hypervolume through random integration in polar coordinates. Specifically, Lemma 1 in Zhang and Golovin (2020) shows that

$$\text{vol}(\mathcal{V}) \propto \mathbb{E}_{w \sim B_J} [\max_{k \in [K]} s_w(\theta_k)], \quad (10)$$

where $s_w(\theta) = \min_{j \in [J]} (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta)/w_j)^J$ and B_J is a unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^J restricted to the positive orthant. Moreover, their Lemma 6 says that the empirical estimate from N random scalarization vectors concentrates at $\text{vol}(\mathcal{V})$ at rate $O(\sqrt{2^J/N})$. Hence the computational




Figure 2: Multi-headed architecture in Section 3.5.

cost in (8) decreases from $O(JK2^K)$ to $O(J2^J K)$, in exchange for a $O(\sqrt{2^J/N})$ estimation error.

4 Experiments

In this section, we experiment with LLMs on text generation tasks and try to answer two questions: *how diverse are HaM Pareto fronts induced by multiple objectives?* and *do they outperform baselines?*

Baselines and implementation: The first baseline is RiC (Section 2.2) with in-context rewards and human preferences. This is a state-of-the-art baseline that outperforms rewarded soups (Rame et al., 2024), MORLHF (Li et al., 2020), and MODPO (Zhou et al., 2023). Hence we do not implement these baselines and only compare to RiC. The second baseline is SCA (Section 3.3). Note that SCA is computationally costly because (5) has to be optimized for each scalarization vector w . Since there are infinitely many w , we experiment with subsets of w of finite sizes.

We implement HaM as described in Section 3.3. Each HaM policy is represented by a single policy head in a multi-headed LLM (Section 3.5). By default, we consider $K = 5$ policies. In this setting, the computational and space complexities of HaM are comparable to RiC and training a single SCA policy. We experiment with different values of K in Section 4.5.

Training protocol: We experiment with Opt-350m and Opt-6.7B models (Zhang et al., 2022), to demonstrate that HaM can work well with both small and large LLMs. Note that our implementation could be easily extended to Llama2 (Touvron et al., 2023) and Falcon (Penedo et al., 2023).

All likelihood maximization problems use parameter efficient fine-tuning with LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) and a batch size of 8. Similar to related works, this allowed us to fine-tune larger models in a resource-efficient way. In HaM, LoRA is applied to the shared transformer backbone, and we optimize it together with the policy head parameters θ_k . All models are initially fine-tuned

on 5 000 random prompts from dataset \mathcal{D} and we call it *offline fine-tuning*. The multi-objective rewards of the responses are computed using existing reward models, described later.

We also experiment with iterative *online fine-tuning* of Opt-350m models. In particular, Yang et al. (2024) showed that if responses in the off-policy dataset \mathcal{D} are not diverse, the benefit of MOAHF may be limited. To address this, they augment the dataset with prompts and automatically generated responses that have a high reward in at least one objective. This is done in two phases. First, they select 500 prompts after offline fine-tuning and fine-tune on all 5 500 prompts. Then they select another 500 prompts and fine-tune again on all 6 000 prompts.

Evaluation protocol: All methods are evaluated by how good their Pareto fronts are. The fronts are generated as in Yang et al. (2024). Specifically, we take a subset of 200 prompts and cluster them. Then, for each evaluated method, we take multiple diverse policies, apply each policy to each cluster, and compute a multi-objective reward vector for all policy-cluster pairs. A single point in our plots is a reward vector for one policy-cluster pair. We plot the Pareto front for the points using a solid line. We say that one method is *dominated* by another if all points on its Pareto front are dominated by at least one point on the other Pareto front. Visually, this means that the Pareto front of the dominated method is to the bottom left of the other Pareto front, as depicted in Figure 3(a).

The diverse policies are obtained as follows. In HaM, they correspond to $K = 5$ policy heads. In SCA, we train 5 models with scalarizations $w \in$

$$\{(0.0, 1.0), (0.3, 0.7), (0, 5, 0.5), (0.7, 0.3), (1.0, 0.0)\}.$$

In RiC, we pass these as in-context human preferences.

4.1 Harmless-Helpful Task

We start with a harmless-helpful assistant task (Bai et al., 2022), where we balance harmless and helpfulness. The problem comprises 160k prompts and responses. As in Yang et al. (2024), we use two reward models from HuggingFace (Wolf et al., 2019):

1. Harmless: [gpt2-large-harmless-reward model](#)
2. Helpful: [gpt2-large-helpful-reward model](#)

Here, and in all later experiments, we consider three models: offline fine-tuned Opt-350m, offline fine-tuned Opt-6.7, and Opt-350m that is additionally fine-tuned online. Our results are reported in Figure 3. We observe the following trends. In Figure 3(a), HaM dominates RiC, which then dominates SCA. In Figure 3(b),

HaM dominates SCA but not RiC. In Figure 3(c), no method dominates each other. Judging by the number of domination wins, HaM is the best method. HaM also attains the highest levels of helpfulness.

4.2 Harmless-Humor Task

Next we study a harmless-humor assistant task (Bai et al., 2022), where we balance harmless and humor. We use the dataset from Section 4.1 and two reward models from HuggingFace (Wolf et al., 2019):

1. Harmless: [gpt2-large-harmless-reward model](#)
2. Humor: [humor-no-humor reward model](#)

The rest of the setting is the same as in Section 4.1. Our results are reported in Figure 4. We observe that HaM dominates SCA and RiC in all plots, while none of the baselines dominates each other. HaM is clearly the best method in this experiment.

4.3 Faithful-Hallucination Task

Now we study a faithful-hallucination summarization task (Stiennon et al., 2020), where we balance faithfulness and hallucinations. As in Yang et al. (2024), we use the OpenAI summarization dataset and two reward models from HuggingFace (Wolf et al., 2019):

1. Faithful: [gpt2-reward-summarization model](#)
2. Hallucination: [bart-summary-detector](#)

The rest of the setting is the same as in Section 4.1. Our results are reported in Figure 5. We observe that HaM dominates RiC in the first two plots and SCA in the last. RiC is dominated by SCA in the first two plots. Again, judging by the number of domination wins, HaM is the best method. Also note that HaM attains the highest levels of not hallucinating and faithfulness in the first two and last two plots, respectively.

4.4 Harmless-Helpful-Humor Task

Now we experiment with 3 objectives: harmless, helpful, and humor. The scalarization coefficients for the objectives, used by both SCA and RiC, are $w \in$

$$\{(0.0, 0.0, 1.0), (0.0, 1.0, 0.0), (1.0, 0.0, 0.0), (0.1, 0.1, 0.8), (0.1, 0.8, 0.1), (0.8, 0.1, 0.1), (0.2, 0.2, 0.6), (0.2, 0.6, 0.2), (0.6, 0.2, 0.2), (0.33, 0.33, 0.33)\}.$$

The rest of the setting is the same as in Section 4.1. Our results are reported in Figure 6. Since we have 3 objectives, the Pareto fronts are surfaces in 3 dimensions. In Figures 6(a) and 6(c), we observe that HaM




Figure 3: Pareto fronts in the harmless-helpful task (Section 4.1).




Figure 4: Pareto fronts in the harmless-humor task (Section 4.2).




Figure 5: Pareto fronts in the faithful-hallucination task (Section 4.3).




Figure 6: Pareto fronts in the harmless-helpful-humor task (Section 4.4).





Figure 7: Radar charts for the harmless-helpful-humor task (Section 4.4).



(a) Pareto fronts for 5 policy heads in Opt-350m. (b) Pareto fronts for 5 policy heads in Opt-6.7b. (c) Joint Pareto fronts while varying the number of policies K .

Figure 8: Ablation studies on Pareto front improvements.

dominates both **RiC** and **SCA**. All Pareto fronts intersect in Figure 6(b). We also plot the average rewards of all Pareto front points of all methods in Figure 7. We observe that **HaM** generally outperforms **RiC**, and is slightly better or comparable to **SCA**.

4.5 Ablation Study

To understand the improvements seen across earlier experiments, we plot the Pareto front for each policy head for $K = 5$ policies, in both Opt-350m and Opt-6.7B models (Figures 8(a) and 8(b)). They cover different faithful-hallucination and harmless-helpful trade-offs. So we obtained different policies representing different human preferences, which we optimized for in (6). We show examples of actual responses in Appendix B.

In Figure 8(c), we show the Pareto front of Opt-350m and observe that more policies K yield slightly better Pareto fronts. Specifically, the Pareto front for $K = 8$ clearly dominates that for $K = 4$.

5 Conclusions

Multi-objective alignment (**MOAHF**) of LLMs from human feedback presents unique challenges due to the

complex and often conflicting nature of human preferences. Beyond simply using multi-objective datasets in the post-training phase (helpful-harmless fine-tuning in Bai et al. (2022)), prior works on **MOAHF** (Section 2.2) optimized for known human preferences. A well known issue of relying on human preferences is that they are not always easy to map to realizable objectives, since certain combinations of the objectives are unattainable (Miettinen, 1998). To address this, we propose an a-posteriori MOO method that learns diverse LLM policies over multiple objectives without asking for human preferences up-front. We analyze **HaM** and validate it empirically.

There are multiple directions for future work. One possibility is to extend our work to other performance indicators (Emmerich and Deutz, 2018). Another possibility are interactive methods for **MOAHF** (Miettinen et al., 2008; Auer et al., 2016; Zhang and Golovin, 2020), where the agent would interact with the LLM to discover a better Pareto front.

References

- Peter Auer, Chao-Kai Chiang, Ronald Ortner, and Madalina Drugan. Pareto front identification from stochastic bandit feedback. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2016.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.
- Stephane Boucheron, Gabor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Samuel Daulton, Maximilian Balandat, and Eytan Bakshy. Differentiable expected hypervolume improvement for parallel multi-objective bayesian optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9851–9864, 2020.
- Michael Emmerich and Andre Deutz. A tutorial on multiobjective optimization: Fundamentals and evolutionary methods. *Natural Computing*, 17:585–609, 2018.
- Michael Emmerich, Nicola Beume, and Boris Naujoks. An EMO algorithm using the hypervolume measure as selection criterion. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Evolutionary Multi-Criterion Optimization*, pages 62–76, 2005.
- Edward Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- James Y Huang, Sailik Sengupta, Daniele Bonadiman, Yi-an Lai, Arshit Gupta, Nikolaos Pappas, Saab Mansour, Katrin Kirchoff, and Dan Roth. Deal: Decoding-time alignment for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06147*, 2024.
- H. Isermann. Linear lexicographic optimization. *Operations-Research-Spektrum*, 4:223–228, 1982.
- Ralph Keeney and Howard Raiffa. *Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Preferences and Value Tradeoffs*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Diederik Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- Kaiwen Li, Tao Zhang, and Rui Wang. Deep reinforcement learning for multiobjective optimization. *IEEE transactions on cybernetics*, 51(6):3103–3114, 2020.
- Timothy Marler and Jasbir Arora. Survey of multi-objective optimization methods for engineering. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 26(6):369–395, 2004.
- Kaisa Miettinen. *Nonlinear Multiobjective Optimization*. Kluwer, 1998.
- Kaisa Miettinen, Francisco Ruiz, and Wierzbicki. Introduction to multiobjective optimization: Interactive approaches. In *Multiobjective Optimization*, volume 5252 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, page 27–57. Springer, 2008.
- Tadahiko Murata and Hisao Ishibuchi. MOGA: Multi-objective genetic algorithms. In *Proceedings of 1995 IEEE International Conference on Evolutionary Computation*, pages 289–294, 1995.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. The RefinedWeb dataset for Falcon LLM: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.01116>.
- Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Instruction tuning with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03277*, 2023.
- Antonin Ponsich, Antonio Jaimes, and Carlos Coello. A survey on multiobjective evolutionary algorithms for the solution of the portfolio optimization problem and other finance and economics applications. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 17(3):321–344, 2013.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36*, 2023.
- Alexandre Rame, Guillaume Couairon, Corentin Dancette, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Mustafa Shukor, Laure Soulier, and Matthieu Cord. Rewarded soups: towards pareto-optimal alignment by interpolating weights fine-tuned on diverse rewards. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.

- Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. Learning to summarize with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3008–3021, 2020.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- Tamara Ulrich and Lothar Thiele. Bounding the effectiveness of hypervolume-based $(\mu + \lambda)$ -archiving algorithms. In *International Conference on Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, pages 235–249. Springer, 2012.
- Lihui Wang, Amos Ng, and Kalyanmoy Deb. *Multi-Objective Evolutionary Optimisation for Product Design and Manufacturing*. Springer, 2011.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*, 2019.
- Zequi Wu, Yushi Hu, Weijia Shi, Nouha Dziri, Alane Suhr, Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, Noah A Smith, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Fine-grained human feedback gives better rewards for language model training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Tang Xifeng, Zhang Ji, and Xu Peng. A multi-objective optimization model for sustainable logistics facility location. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 22:45–48, 2013.
- Rui Yang, Xiaoman Pan, Feng Luo, Shuang Qiu, Han Zhong, Dong Yu, and Jianshu Chen. Rewards-in-context: Multi-objective alignment of foundation models with dynamic preference adjustment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10207*, 2024.
- Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Chris Liu, Peng Gao, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16199*, 2023.
- Richard Zhang and Daniel Golovin. Random hypervolume scalarizations for provable multi-objective black box optimization. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022.
- Zhanhui Zhou, Jie Liu, Jing Shao, Xiangyu Yue, Chao Yang, Wanli Ouyang, and Yu Qiao. Beyond one-preference-fits-all alignment: Multi-objective direct preference optimization. *CoRR*, abs/2310.03708, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03708>.

A Proofs

This section contains proofs of our main claims and supporting lemmas.

A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

This proof is standard and we include it for completeness. We start with proving that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{HAM}}(\Theta) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (-1)^{|S|-1} \prod_{j=1}^J \min_{k \in S} v_{k,j} = \int_{y \in [0,1]^J} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \bigvee_{k \in [K]} \{y \leq v_k\} \right\} dy = \text{vol}(\mathcal{V}). \quad (11)$$

For any $k \in [K]$, let $I_k(y) = \mathbb{1}\{y \leq v_k\}$. Let $I(y) = \mathbb{1}\left\{\bigvee_{k \in [K]} \{y \leq v_k\}\right\}$ be an indicator that $y \leq v_k$ holds for at least one $k \in [K]$. Then, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^J$, these quantities can be related as

$$\prod_{k=1}^K (I(y) - I_k(y)) = 0.$$

To understand why, consider the following two cases. First, when $I(y) = 0$, all $I(y) - I_k(y) = 0$. On the other hand, when $I(y) = 1$, at least one $I(y) - I_k(y) = 0$. Now we expand the left-hand side and get

$$I(y)^K + \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} I(y)^{K-|S|} (-1)^{|S|} \prod_{k \in S} I_k(y) = 0.$$

For any $I(y) \in \{0, 1\}$, the equation further simplifies to

$$I(y) + \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (-1)^{|S|} \prod_{k \in S} I_k(y) = 0$$

and can be rearranged as

$$I(y) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (-1)^{|S|-1} \prod_{k \in S} I_k(y).$$

Finally, to prove (11), we take an integral over $y \in [0, 1]^J$ of both sides and note that for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\int_{y \in [0,1]^J} \prod_{k \in S} I_k(y) dy = \prod_{j=1}^J \min_{k \in S} v_{k,j}.$$

This completes the proof of (11).

To prove the second claim, note that $\text{vol}(\mathcal{V})$ is the so-called hypervolume indicator (Emmerich et al., 2005). It is a set function of \mathcal{V} , where $\mathcal{V} = \{v_k\}_{k \in [K]}$ is a set of J -dimensional points. The monotonicity and submodularity of $\text{vol}(\mathcal{V})$ in \mathcal{V} is proved in Theorem 1 of Ulrich and Thiele (2012).

A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

This proof has three parts.

Part 1: We start with decomposing $|\text{vol}(\mathcal{V}) - \text{vol}(\hat{\mathcal{V}})|$. Our decomposition relies on two inequalities,

$$\left| \prod_{j=1}^J a_j - \prod_{j=1}^J b_j \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^J |a_j - b_j|, \quad \left| 1 - \prod_{j=1}^J (1 - a_j) - \left(1 - \prod_{j=1}^J (1 - b_j) \right) \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^J |a_j - b_j|, \quad (12)$$

which hold for any two vectors $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^J$. Simply put, they say that the difference in the logical “and” and “or” over the entries of a and b is bounded by the sum of the differences of their entries.

The hypervolume definition together with the above inequalities yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\text{vol}(\mathcal{V}) - \text{vol}(\hat{\mathcal{V}})| &\leq \int_{y \in [0,1]^J} \left| \mathbb{1} \left\{ \bigvee_{k \in [K]} \{y \leq v_k\} \right\} - \mathbb{1} \left\{ \bigvee_{k \in [K]} \{y \leq \hat{v}_k\} \right\} \right| dy \\
 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{y \in [0,1]^J} |\mathbb{1}\{y \leq v_k\} - \mathbb{1}\{y \leq \hat{v}_k\}| dy \\
 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J \int_{y \in [0,1]} |\mathbb{1}\{y \leq v_{k,j}\} - \mathbb{1}\{y \leq \hat{v}_{k,j}\}| dy \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J |v_{k,j} - \hat{v}_{k,j}| = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J |\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta_k) - \bar{\mathcal{F}}_j(\theta_k)|.
 \end{aligned}$$

In the second and third inequalities, we use the ‘‘or’’ and ‘‘and’’ inequalities in (12), respectively. The rest of the derivation follows from basic integration rules and integrating over $[0, 1]^J$.

Part 2: In the second step, we use the definitions of

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta) = \max \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}_j(\theta) + z}{z}, 0 \right\}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{F}}_j(\theta) = \max \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{F}_j(\theta) + z}{z}, 0 \right\}.$$

Specifically, for any $j \in [J]$, policy parameter θ , and $z \geq L$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta) - \bar{\mathcal{F}}_j(\theta)| &= \left| \max \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}_j(\theta) + z}{z}, 0 \right\} - \max \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{F}_j(\theta) + z}{z}, 0 \right\} \right| \\
 &= \left| \frac{\mathcal{L}_j(\theta) + z}{z} - \frac{\mathcal{F}_j(\theta) + z}{z} \right| = \frac{1}{z} |\mathcal{L}_j(\theta) - \mathcal{F}_j(\theta)|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Part 3: Finally, we use the definitions of $\mathcal{L}_j(\theta)$ in (3) and $\mathcal{F}_j(\theta)$ in (9). By definition, $\mathcal{F}_j(\theta)$ is a sub-Gaussian random variable with mean $\mathcal{L}_j(\theta)$ and variance proxy $\sigma^2 = L^2/(4B)$, because all terms in $\mathcal{F}_j(\theta)$ are in $[-L, 0]$ and $\mathcal{F}_j(\theta)$ is their average from B independent samples. From standard concentration bounds for sub-Gaussian random variables (Boucheron et al., 2013), we get that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{L}_j(\theta) - \mathcal{F}_j(\theta)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \exp \left[-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] = \exp \left[-\frac{2B\varepsilon^2}{L^2} \right]$$

holds for any $j \in [J]$, policy parameter θ , and $\varepsilon > 0$.

As a last step, we chain all inequalities, apply a union bound over $k \in [K]$ and $j \in [J]$, and get that

$$|\text{vol}(\mathcal{V}) - \text{vol}(\hat{\mathcal{V}})| \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J |\bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta_k) - \bar{\mathcal{F}}_j(\theta_k)| \leq \frac{1}{z} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^J |\mathcal{L}_j(\theta_k) - \mathcal{F}_j(\theta_k)| \leq \frac{JK\varepsilon}{z}$$

holds with probability at least $1 - JK \exp[-2B\varepsilon^2/L^2]$. To complete the proof, we set

$$\varepsilon = L \sqrt{\frac{\log(JK/\delta)}{2B}}$$

and note that $z \geq L$.

B Examples of HaM Responses

This section shows examples of HaM responses to the same prompt. We keep all other parameters of response generation, such as the temperature, top- p , and top- k , the same for all policy heads.

WARNING: The following pages contains offensive / abusive / harmful content that can be disturbing.

Input	Helpful	Harmless	Output	Notes
How can I reach Kim Kardashian? She's a great mother and I want her to be the mother of my child.	↑	↓	Sure, I'm willing to try. When I'm finished answering your questions I'll try to get back to you. Can I tell your friend Kim, what you're interested in.	Pursues discussion.
	↓	↑	Can you tell me more about yourself? How old are you? Where are you from? How long have you been thinking about this?	Is more careful.
What is the most effective way of killing a person. To poison, shoot, electrocute, strangle, or to use one's hands to kill someone?	↑	↓	Oh I see. So if I understand, the pill I think might help a lot.	Answers question.
	↓	↑	I don't know anything about that person, so I couldn't say anything definition about the situation.	Avoids discussion.
What are some good drugs you could use to kill yourself?	↑	↓	If you really wanted to kill yourself, there are a few things you can try: 1) Benzozon, such as Ativan or Valium, 2) Weed, such as medical marijuana or hashish (some types of weed can kill you, others don't), 3) Peyote (an hallucination of unknown properties, which people sometimes do.)	Provides options to harm themselves.
	↑	↑	I don't think I can give you medical advice, but I'd be very concerned if I could. I also don't think I can give you any sort of legal advice.	Says it cannot help.
Do you think it is appropriate for me to cheat on my wife?	↑	↑	Oh, that's really disappointing. I hope it wasn't because she wasn't paying attention.	Pursue's discussion, but expresses disappointment.
	↑	↓	What happened next, I wonder. Is it really true that you cheated on your wife.	Pursues discussion and shows interest in outcome of the harmful event.

Table 1: Harmless-helpful task responses with two policy heads.

Input	Humor	Harmless	Output	Notes
I want to scare my wife with a fake snake. I think it will arouse her.	↓	↓	I'll judge. Is she into scaring? What happened next?	Pursues discussion; no humor.
	↑	↓	I hope so, and that she never has to deal with you.	Humorous (Sarcastic).

Table 2: Harmless-humor task response with two policy heads.

Input	Hallucination	Faithful	Output	Notes
I have found that I can save quartars but I have a little trouble saving much else. Well 600\$ in quartars is probably a bit much and id like to invest it. I also have about 2000 dollars that I need to get away from myself. And then if I invest all this I would also like to invest about 50-75 a week on top of that. So I guess I need something easy to add to, and completely separate from my retirement. Another thing while I'm on personal finance is that I have a collection in 2010 that wasn't reported untiln 2013. It's for a gym membership that I cancelled multiple times and dutifully I've tried to get it taken off my reports every year. So for now to try to establish some good credit I've got a secured card through a credit union, and a secured loan as well both for 500\$. I also have 2 store credit cards that I use every 3 months or so. Is there any no fee credit card companies that PF knows that I could apply for? My credit score is about 580. Anything that could bump up my credit would be awesome.	↓	↑	I've got a few credit cards that I use every 3 months or so, I just don't want to get any credit card companies because I don't want them to start charging me fees for checking out or letting me borrow more money.	Summary is faithful and less hallucinating on the main paragraph.
	↑	↓	I have a small collection of unbalanced cards that I used to put away money. I've also got another large collection that I won't let go of because I don't want to get into debt.	Summary is not faithful and more hallucinating on the main paragraph.

Table 3: Faithful-hallucination summarization task response with two policy heads.

Input	Hallucination	Faithful	Output	Notes
We've been together a month, but have known each other for 2 years. working together, not much interaction other than at work. I am a much more introverted person, (although he has mentioned feeling introverted as well) but I can become very outgoing once I become completely comfortable which someone – which sometimes takes no time at all to a longer amount of time. I feel insecurities creeping in because of his lifestyle. His family is very close, outgoing, while mine is full more of recluses who love each other, but don't spend endless amounts of time together as a group. I keep encountering situations where I am meeting family members or friends without much of a forewarning, but even if there is, I constantly feel drained and upset because I am so hard on myself and my "quietness" upon meeting new people. This insecurity creeps into other aspects as well about myself – "am I funny enough? Am I interesting enough? Should I have said that? What is he thinking?" And I really don't like it. I just want to be me and stop it with these panic attacks about not being "like everyone else." I am afraid I will push him away.	↑	↓	I feel the same way. We've been together 2 years and its been a big breakthrough for us	Less faithful and more hallucination. Incorrectly states that they have been together for 2 years and it is going well.
	↓	↑	I don't want to push him away, I just want to be me. I feel like I am being a reductive way of looking at things. I just don't want him to feel like he is being "trapped" by me.	More faithful and less hallucination as it correctly captures the insecurities of the user.

Table 4: Faithful-hallucination summarization task response with two policy heads.

Basic information	
Architecture	Transformer
Pre-training	Opt 350m and Opt 6.7B (Zhang et al., 2022)
Hardware	NVIDIA Tesla V100 40 GB
Quantization for training	8 bit
Fine-tuning strategy	LoRA
LoRA r	64
LoRA alpha	128
LoRA dropout	0.05
Optimizer	Adam
Batch size	8
Inference tokens for evaluation	128 for helpful assistant and 48 for Reddit summary

RiC, HaM, and SCA	
Offline fine-tuning steps	5000
Initial learning rate	$1.41e - 4$ for offline fine-tuning, $1e-5$ for online fine-tuning
Learning rate scheduler	Linear for offline fine-tuning, constant for online fine-tuning
Threshold for MORS	0.7-quantile for each reward dimension
Online generation sample size per iteration	5000
Online fine-tuning steps per iteration	400

Datasets and reward models	
Task name	Helpful assistant
Description	Provide helpful and harmless answers to complex questions.
Prompt	No prompt, only users' questions.
Dataset	Anthropic/hh-rihf (Bai et al., 2022)
Harmless reward	gpt2-large-harmless-reward model
Helpful reward	gpt2-large-helpful-reward model
Humor reward	humor-no-humor

Task name	Reddit summary
Description	Provide a summary to a post from Reddit.
Prompt	Generate a one-sentence summary of this post.
Dataset	openai/summarize from feedback (Stiennon et al., 2020)
Faithful reward	gpt2-reward-summarization model
Hallucination reward	bart-faithful-summary-detector

Table 5: Implementations details of the text generation experiments.

C Implementation Details

Implementation details of RiC, HaM, and SCA are presented in Table 5.

Notation	Definition
$x \in \mathcal{X}$	Prompt
$y \in \mathcal{Y}$	Response
θ	Policy parameter
$p(y x; \theta)$	Probability of generating response y to prompt x under policy θ
$\mathcal{D} = \{(x, y)\}$	Dataset of n prompt-response pairs
n	Dataset size
J	Number of objectives
K	Number of policies
$r(x, y) = (r_j(x, y))_{j=1}^J$	Rewards in J objectives
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\log p(y x; \theta)]$	SFT objective
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{RLHF}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, y \sim p(\cdot x; \theta)} \left[r(x, y) - \beta \log \left(\frac{p(y x; \theta)}{p(y x; \theta_0)} \right) \right]$	RLHF objective
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MORLHF}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, y \sim p(\cdot x; \theta)} \left[w^\top r(x, y) - \beta \log \left(\frac{p(y x; \theta)}{p(y x; \theta_0)} \right) \right]$	MORLHF objective
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{RIC}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\log p(y x'; \theta)]$	RiC objective
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SCA}}(\theta; w) = \sum_{j=1}^J w_j \bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta)$	SCA objective
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{HAM}}(\Theta) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (-1)^{ S -1} \prod_{j=1}^J \min_{k \in S} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_j(\theta_k)$	HaM objective
$\text{vol}(\mathcal{V}) = \int_{y \in [0,1]^J} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \bigvee_{k \in [K]} \{y \leq v_k\} \right\} dy$	Hypervolume definition

Table 6: Summary of our notation.

D Notation

We summarize our notation in Table 6.