

# CONGRAD: Conflicting Gradient Filtering for Multilingual Preference Alignment

Jiangnan Li<sup>1</sup>, Thuy-Trang Vu<sup>1</sup>, Christian Herold<sup>2</sup>, Amirhossein Tebbifakhr<sup>2</sup>,  
Shahram Khadivi<sup>2</sup>, Gholamreza Haffari<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Data Science and AI, Monash University, Australia

<sup>2</sup>eBay Inc.

{first.last, trang.vu}@monash.edu,

{cherold, atebbifakhr, skhadivi}@ebay.com

## Abstract

Naive joint training of large language models (LLMs) for multilingual preference alignment can suffer from *negative interference*. This is a known issue in *multilingual training*, where conflicting objectives degrade overall performance. However, the impact of this phenomenon in the context of *multilingual preference alignment* remains largely underexplored. To address this issue, we propose CONGRAD, a scalable and effective filtering method that selects high-quality preference samples with minimal gradient conflicts across languages. Our method leverages *gradient surgery* to retain samples aligned with an aggregated multilingual update direction. Additionally, we incorporate a *sublinear gradient compression* strategy that reduces memory overhead during gradient accumulation. We integrate CONGRAD into self-rewarding framework and evaluate on LLaMA3-8B and Gemma2-2B across 10 languages. Results show that CONGRAD consistently outperforms strong baselines in both seen and unseen languages, with minimal alignment tax.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Preference alignment has emerged as a pivotal post-training technique for aligning large language models (LLMs) with human values and intentions (Ouyang et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023). It has driven significant performance improvements across multiple natural language processing (NLP) tasks such as summarisation (Ziegler et al., 2019), reasoning (Pang et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024d) and instruction following (Bai et al., 2022; Ouyang et al., 2022). However, the progress in preference alignment research remains predominantly English-centric due to the scarcity of high-quality human preference data for non-English languages and the prohibitive costs of human annotation. Previous research observes that state-of-the-art aligned LLMs often overfit to English capabilities with noticeable degraded alignment and odd behaviours in less-represented languages (Schwartz et al., 2022; Kotek et al., 2023; Khondaker et al., 2023; Vashishtha et al., 2023; Deng et al., 2023).

The scarcity of human preference data has spurred interest in synthetic data generation, where strong LLMs such as OpenAI GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024) act as a judge to provide preference scores or rewards (Dubois et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2024; Cui et al., 2024). Notably, the self-rewarding method further reduces reliance on external judges by the iterative training process, where the same LLM generates and scores its own responses (Yuan et al., 2024). However, most synthetic preference data are generated in English first, then translated into other languages (Lai et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024c). Their quality is highly dependent on the translation models and potentially suffers from translation artifacts (Torral & Sánchez-Cartagena, 2017). Additionally, translated preference pairs often lack diversity, which is crucial for robust model performance (Kirk et al., 2024). Once constructed, these multilingual preference datasets are typically used to jointly train aligned multilingual LLMs (Dang et al.,

<sup>1</sup>Code will be released upon acceptance

2024). However, it is well-known in the multilingual and machine translation literature that naively optimising a model across multiple languages often leads to *negative interference* - a phenomenon where training on multiple tasks or languages degrades performance due to conflicting objectives (Wang et al., 2020). While this problem has been widely studied in machine translation and multilingual pretraining (Arivazhagan et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2020; Conneau et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2021; 2024a), its impact in the context of multilingual preference alignment remains under-explored.

Multilingual preference alignment is inherently a multi-task learning problem, where each language constitutes a distinct task with potentially conflicting optimisation objectives. Therefore, it is also prone to negative interference (Wang et al., 2020; 2021). Motivated by prior work demonstrating that gradient conflicts are strong indicators of task interference (Yu et al., 2020), we propose CONGRAD, an effective and scalable filtering method to select high-quality synthetic multilingual preference data. The core idea is to filter out training samples likely to cause interference, especially those whose gradients exhibit negative cosine similarity with other languages’ gradients.

Our approach consists of two main steps. We first apply a gradient surgery method, Project Conflicting Gradient (PCGrad) (Yu et al., 2020), to deconflict the accumulated exponential moving average (EMA) gradients across languages and obtain an aggregated cross-lingual gradients. We then filter and retain the top- $k$  preference samples that exhibit the highest gradient similarity with this aggregated direction. Samples with higher similarity to this global gradient are expected to contribute less interference during training. To make this approach scalable to LLMs, we address the practical challenge of storing full-rank gradient matrices by introducing sublinear gradient compression (Hao et al., 2024). Gradients are compressed into a low-dimensional subspace during accumulation using fixed random projections, and then up-projected during filtering and PCGrad computation. This strategy ensures stable gradient estimation, effective conflict mitigation, and memory efficiency.

We integrate our proposed CONGRAD filtering method into the self-rewarding framework (Yuan et al., 2024) with Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) training (Rafailov et al., 2023). To evaluate its effectiveness, we conduct experiments on two LLMs of different scales: Llama3-8B (Grattafiori et al., 2024) and Gemma2-2B (Team et al., 2024) across 10 languages from different language families and writing scripts. The experimental results demonstrate the importance of high-quality preference data, where most filtering methods outperform the baselines without data filtering. Our proposed CONGRAD method consistently outperforms strong filtering baselines on multilingual instruction following benchmark for both languages seen during training and generalised well to unseen languages, without significant alignment tax (Lin et al., 2024).

In summary, our contributions are as follows.

- We propose a conflict-aware self-rewarding algorithm for multilingual preference alignment, which constructs preference data without relying on external annotations and enables iterative self-improvement across languages.
- We introduce a gradient-level filtering strategy based on PCGrad that selects preference samples with high cross-lingual affinity, effectively mitigating negative interference during multilingual training.
- We conduct comprehensive experiments on Llama3-8B and Gemma2-2B, showing our method significantly improves underrepresented language while preserving dominant language capabilities and generalizes to unseen languages with minimal alignment tax.

## 2 Preliminaries

**Multilingual Preference Alignment** Alignment is the process of steering the output of large language models (LLMs) toward desirable behaviors, typically specified through a preference dataset. While significant progress has been made in preference alignment for English, extending these methods to multilingual settings remains relatively underexplored (Dang et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2025b). In this paper, we study the problem of multilingual preference alignment. For a given set of languages  $L$ , each language  $l \in L$  is associated with a preference dataset  $\mathcal{D}^l = \{(x_{i,r}^l, y_{i,c}^l, y_{i,r}^l)\}_{i=1}^{N^l}$  where  $N^l$  is the dataset size. Each data point is

a tuple of prompt input  $x_i^l$ , chosen response  $y_{i,c}^l$  and rejected response  $y_{i,r}^l$ . For brevity, we omit the index  $i$  when it is clear from the context.

The goal of mono-lingual alignment is to align the LLM  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$ , parameterised by  $\theta$ , using preference optimisation methods such as reinforcement learning with human feedback (RLHF), *e.g.*, PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) or Direct Preference Optimisation (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023). We adopt DPO due to its simplicity and strong empirical performance. Unlike RLHF which learns a reward model before optimization, DPO directly minimises the negative log probability of preferring the chosen response  $y_c$  over the rejected response  $y_r$  given prompt  $x$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\mathcal{M}_\theta, \mathcal{D}) = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, y_c, y_r) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \log \sigma \left( \beta \log \frac{\mathcal{M}_\theta(y_c|x)}{\mathcal{M}_{\text{ref}}(y_c|x)} - \beta \log \frac{\mathcal{M}_\theta(y_r|x)}{\mathcal{M}_{\text{ref}}(y_r|x)} \right) \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ref}}$  is the reference model. When it extends to multilingual, we jointly optimise the DPO loss across multiple languages,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mpa}}(\mathcal{M}_\theta) = \frac{1}{|L|} \sum_{l \in L} \mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\mathcal{M}_\theta, \mathcal{D}^l). \quad (2)$$

Compared to mono-lingual alignment, alignment in a multilingual context presents additional challenges, such as negative inter-language interference (Dang et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2020). The objective of this paper is to mitigate this problem by designing a data filtering algorithm to filter data that is prone to negative inter-language interference.

**Self-rewarding Iterative DPO** Collecting human preferences for training LLMs is a challenging and resource-intensive task. Self-rewarding method addresses this challenge by leveraging LLMs to generate responses and evaluate them to construct their own training preference data (Yuan et al., 2024).

Specifically, starting from an instruction-tuned model  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_0}$ , we apply an iterative DPO training procedure. At iteration  $t > 1$ , the model  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_t}$  is initialised with the previous model  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_{t-1}}$ . For each prompt  $x^l$ , it generates a set of  $k$  candidate responses  $\{y_1^l, \dots, y_k^l\}$ . The same model  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_{t-1}}$  is then used to evaluate each response, resulting in reward scores  $\{r_1^l, \dots, r_k^l\}$ . Since the model has the strongest instruction-following ability in English, we use the same English prompt when scoring responses in all languages  $l \in L$ . Preference pairs are then constructed by selecting the highest and lowest-scoring responses, discarding pairs with identical scores. These pairs are then used to train  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_t}$ . Further details of the prompts are provided in Appendix B.




Figure 1: Overview of the multilingual preference alignment framework which consists of three steps: (i) computation of the aggregated cross-lingual PCGrad with gradient compression for memory efficiency; (ii) generation of synthetic preference data via self-rewarding; and (iii) CONGRAD filtering, which selects preference samples based on their gradient similarity to the aggregated PCGrad direction, retaining only those with high similarity ( $g_i^{de}$  in this example).

### 3 Conflicting Gradient Filtering for Multilingual Preference Alignment

To address the challenge of cross-lingual preference in multilingual preference alignment, we propose Conflicting Gradient Filtering (ConGrad) to select high-quality preference data that minimises gradient conflict across languages. Our method can integrate seamlessly with the self-rewarding framework, as shown in Figure 1.

### 3.1 Conflicting Gradient Filtering via PCGrad

Wang et al. (2021) observe that gradient similarity along the optimisation trajectory correlates strongly with language proximity and overall model performance. When gradient trajectories across languages are more similar, negative interference decreases, resulting in a better multilingual model. Building on this insight, we propose a preference data filtering method which favors self-rewarding samples exhibiting high gradient similarity with the aggregated gradients across languages (see Algorithm 1).

**Aggregated Cross-lingual PCGrad** To compute the aggregated gradients, we first record the exponential moving average (EMA) of gradients, denoted as  $G_\tau^l$ , for each language  $l$  across all minibatches  $b_\tau^l \sim \mathcal{D}_i^l$  in the current DPO training round  $t$ .

---

#### Algorithm 1 Conflicting Gradient Filtering

---

**Require:** Set of languages  $L$ , gradient EMAs  $\{G^l\}_{l \in L}$ , self-rewarding dataset  $\{\mathcal{D}^l\}_{l \in L}$ , model  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$

- 1: Initialise  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l \leftarrow G^l \quad \forall l \in L$
- 2: **for** each language  $l \in L$  **do**
- 3:   **for** each language  $l' \in \text{shuffle}(L \setminus \{l\})$  **do**
- 4:     **if**  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l \cdot G^{l'} < 0$  **then**
- 5:        $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l \leftarrow \mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l - \frac{\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l \cdot G^{l'}}{\|G^{l'}\|^2} G^{l'}$
- 6:     **end if**
- 7:   **end for**
- 8: **end for**
- 9:  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}} = \sum_{l \in L} \mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l$      // aggregated PCGrad
- 10: // Filtering step
- 11: **for** each language  $l \in L$  **do**
- 12:   **for** each sample  $(x_i^l, y_{i,c}^l, y_{i,r}^l) \in \mathcal{D}^l$  **do**
- 13:      $\mathbf{g}_i^l \leftarrow \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{LP-DPO}}(\mathcal{M}_\theta, (x_i^l, y_{i,c}^l, y_{i,r}^l))$
- 14:   **end for**
- 15:    $S_{\text{selected}}^l \leftarrow \text{ArgTopK}_{(x_i^l, y_{i,c}^l, y_{i,r}^l) \in \mathcal{D}^l} \cos(\mathbf{g}_i^l, \mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l)$
- 16: **end for**
- 17: **return**  $\{S_{\text{selected}}^l\}_{l \in L}$

---

The EMA gradient of language  $l$  is computed as  $G_\tau^l = \gamma G_{\tau-1}^l + (1 - \gamma) \mathbf{g}_\tau^l$  where  $\mathbf{g}_\tau^l = \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_\theta, b_\tau^l)$  is the gradient at training step  $\tau$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  is the decay factor. The final EMA gradient  $G^l = G_\tau^l$  summarises the gradient direction for a given language in the current DPO iteration.

We then apply pairwise Projecting Conflict Gradient (PCGrad) to derive a deconflicted gradient direction for each language  $l$ , denoted as  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l$ . The process is described in Algorithm 1. For each language  $l$ , we initialise the projected gradient  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l$  with the EMA gradient  $G^l$ . We then iterate through all other languages  $l'$  in random order and compute the cosine similarity between  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l$  and  $G^{l'}$ . If the similarity is negative, it indicates a conflict between two languages, we update  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l$  by projecting it onto the normal plane of  $G^{l'}$  via  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l \leftarrow \mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l - \frac{\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l \cdot G^{l'}}{\|G^{l'}\|^2} G^{l'}$ .

The final aggregated PCGrad is the sum of all deconflicted gradients across languages  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}} = \sum_{l \in L} \mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}^l$ , which represents an update direction that minimises the interference.

**Conflicting Gradient Filtering** In the subsequent DPO iteration, for each language  $l$ , after generating new preference pairs, we compute the instantaneous gradient  $\mathbf{g}_i^l$  for each sample  $(x_i^l, y_{i,c}^l, y_{i,r}^l)$ . We then select preference data samples by calculating the cosine similarity between  $\mathbf{g}_i^l$  and the aggregated PCGrad  $\mathbf{g}_{\text{pc}}$  and retaining a fixed percentage of those with high cosine similarity. The goal is to reduce conflict in gradient updates across languages.

### 3.2 EMA Gradient Compression

The massive number of parameters in LLMs imposes prohibitive memory requirements for storing gradients and the EMA gradients for each language. Inspired by the previous work, which uses sublinear memory for gradient accumulation and momentum calculation (Hao et al., 2024), we compress the gradients produced by each weight matrix before the EMA update. Specifically, for each weight matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  in the model, we construct a down-projection matrix  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times m}$  (with  $r \ll m$ ). In order to guarantee consistency across steps, we generate  $P$  using a constant random seed for both compression (down-projection) and decompression (up-projection).

Given an instantaneous gradient  $\mathbf{g}_\tau^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  for language  $l$  at time step  $\tau$ , we first compress it by computing  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\tau^l = \mathbf{g}_\tau^l P^\top$  to reduce its dimension from  $m$  to  $r$ . We then update the gradient EMA of the compressed gradients  $\tilde{G}_\tau^l = \gamma \tilde{G}_{\tau-1}^l + (1 - \gamma) \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\tau^l$ , where  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  is the decay factor. At the end of the DPO training, we up-project the recorded compressed EMA gradients  $\tilde{G}_\tau^l$  back to the original space using the same fixed projection matrix  $P$ , that is  $G^l = \tilde{G}^l P$ . Although the recovered gradient is not equal to the original, theory and experience proved that it can represent the original direction very well (Hao et al., 2024).

For each language, we then flatten and concatenate the recovered gradients from all weight matrices into a single vector that represents the overall gradient for that language. We then compute the aggregated gradient which is used as the reference to compute cosine similarities with new sample gradients for filtering, as described in Section 3.1.

### 3.3 Iterative Self-Rewarding Procedure

We integrate CONGRAD filtering method to self-rewarding procedure, as shown in Algorithm 2. At iteration  $t = 1$ , the model is first updated using the self-generated preference pairs without gradient filtering. For  $t > 1$ , the gradient filtering module is activated to remove samples that could lead to conflicting updates across languages.

We update the model parameters via Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) with an integrated length penalty to mitigate response verbosity (Liu et al., 2024). Specifically, for each preference pair  $(x, y_c, y_r) \in \mathcal{D}$ , we de-

fine the *preference margin*  $p_m = \log \left( \frac{M_\theta(y_w|x)}{M_t(y_w|x)} - \frac{M_\theta(y_l|x)}{M_t(y_l|x)} \right)$ , where  $M_\theta(\cdot | x)$  is the current policy model, and  $M_t(\cdot | x)$  is the frozen reference model from iteration  $t$ . To discourage verbosity, we also define the *length margin* as  $l_m = |y_c| - |y_r|$  where  $|y|$  denotes the token length of response  $y$ . A positive  $l_m$  indicates that the preferred response is longer than the rejected one, which under a length penalty, reduces the overall preference margin.

The Length-Penalty DPO loss is then formulated as a margin-based cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LP-DPO}} = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, y_c, y_r) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \log \sigma \left( \beta p_m + \alpha l_m \right) \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $\sigma(\cdot)$  denotes the sigmoid function, and  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$  are hyperparameters controlling the trade-off between the preference margin and the length penalty. Training proceeds by minimizing  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LP-DPO}}$ , thereby updating the model parameters so that the optimized model favors responses that are both preferred according to the reward model and conciseness.

## 4 Experimental Setup

We evaluate our self-rewarding multilingual LLM framework on several benchmarks and using different gradient filtering strategies. In particular, our experiment are designed to investigate the following three research questions:

- **RQ1:** Is iterative self-rewarding effective for multilingual LLM alignment?
- **RQ2:** Can our CONGRAD filtering algorithm for preference data mitigate negative interference in multilingual LLM alignment?

---

### Algorithm 2 Modified Iterative Self-Rewarding with CONGRAD Filtering

---

**Require:** Set of languages  $L$ , seed model  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_0}$ , prompt dataset  $\{\mathcal{X}^l\}_{l \in L}$ , total iterations  $T$

- 1: initialise  $\tilde{G}^l \leftarrow 0$ , for all  $l \in L$
- 2: **for**  $t = 1$  to  $T$  **do**
- 3:   **for** each language  $l \in L$  **do**
- 4:     gen responses  $\mathcal{Y}^l$  using  $\mathcal{X}^l$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_{t-1}}$
- 5:     gen rewards  $\mathcal{R}^l$  for  $\mathcal{Y}^l$  via self-eval
- 6:     construct  $\mathcal{D}_t^l$  via pref pairs in  $\mathcal{Y}^l$  and rewards  $\mathcal{R}^l$
- 7:   **end for**
- 8:   **if**  $t > 1$  **then**
- 9:      $\{S_{\text{selected}}^l\}_{l \in L} \leftarrow$   
ALGORITHM 1( $L, \{\tilde{G}^l * P\}_{l \in L}, \{\mathcal{D}_t^l\}_{l \in L}, \mathcal{M}_{\theta_{t-1}}$ )
- 10:    **else**
- 11:      $\{S_{\text{selected}}^l\}_{l \in L} \leftarrow \{\mathcal{D}_t^l\}_{l \in L}$
- 12:    **end if**
- 13:     $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_t} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\theta_{t-1}}$
- 14:    **for** minibatches  $b_\tau^l \in \{S_{\text{selected}}^l\}_{l \in L}$  **do**
- 15:      $\mathbf{g}_\tau^l \leftarrow \nabla_{\theta_t} \mathcal{L}_{\text{LP-DPO}}(\mathcal{M}_{\theta_t}, b_\tau^l)$
- 16:      $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_t} \leftarrow \text{UpdateModel}(\mathcal{M}_{\theta_t}, \mathbf{g}_\tau^l)$
- 17:      $\tilde{G}^l \leftarrow \gamma \tilde{G}^l + (1 - \gamma) \mathbf{g}_\tau^l * P^\top$
- 18:    **end for**
- 19: **end for**
- 20: **return**  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_T}$

---

- **RQ3:** How do different preference data filtering methods compare in terms of their effectiveness and characteristics?

**Models** We use widely adopted `llama3-8b-instruct` and `gemma2-2b-it` as seed models for self-rewarding. Both models support multiple languages, but the capabilities are very uneven between languages. We chose two different sizes of models to see how the various algorithms perform in different parameter sizes.

**Implementation Details:** In each round, for each prompt, we generate and score four responses and construct preference pairs. For preference data, we filter the top half based on metrics and then perform one epoch of DPO training. More details are in Appendix C.

#### 4.1 Datasets and Metrics

**Training Dataset** is based on `AlpaGasus` (Chen et al., 2024a), which contains 9K high-quality English instruction following data filtered from the 52K `Alpaca` dataset (Taori et al., 2023). We randomly sample 1K prompts from `AlpaGasus` and use Google Translate to translate them into 9 languages: Italian (it), Chinese (zh), Portuguese (pt), Korean (ko), Spanish (es), German (de), Arabic (ar), Japanese (jp) and French (fr). For our multilingual experiments, we split the 1K prompts equally into 10 non-overlapping partitions, i.e. 100 prompts per language. For monolingual experiments, we use the full 1K prompts.

**Evaluation Datasets** include: (1) *aya evaluation suite* for instruction-following (Singh et al., 2024b). *aya evaluation suite* contains multilingual open-ended conversation-style prompts to evaluate multilingual open-ended generation quality. It is a high-quality prompt-based benchmark that contains translations and edits by human experts. (2) *Global MMLU* and multilingual version of *ARC challenge* for alignment tax (Singh et al., 2024a). *Global MMLU* improves upon previous translated MMLU variants by incorporating human-verified translations and annotating subsets for cultural sensitivity. This enables robust evaluation of LLMs across both culturally agnostic and culturally sensitive tasks. *ARC challenge* is a benchmark of grade-school science questions that are specifically selected to be unsolvable by simple retrieval or co-occurrence methods, requiring advanced reasoning and knowledge understanding from models (Clark et al., 2018; Lai et al., 2023).

**Metrics** include: (1) *Head-to-Head win rate* on *aya evaluation suite*. We utilize GPT-4o to compare the model after self-rewarding alignment during different iterations and the original base model and calculate the win rate of the model after training over the seed model. (2) *5-shot Accuracy* on *Global MMLU* and multilingual version of *ARC challenge*.

#### 4.2 Baselines

We compare our approach, CONGRAD, against multiple baseline methods:

- **Monolingual Preference Alignment (MONO)** We perform self-rewarding using a full 1K prompt dataset for each language. This baseline serves as a reference point to multilingual baselines and provides evidence of negative interference if high-resource languages perform worse in the multilingual setting.
- **Multilingual Preference Alignment on Full Data (MULT-FULL)** We perform self-rewarding across 10 languages, on the full preference dataset containing 100 prompts per language (1K total).
- **Multilingual Preference Alignment with Filtering Data** We compare our approach against several filtering techniques for DPO training: (i) Random filtering (**RAND**), where we report average performance of 3 runs. (ii) Length margin filtering, based on the length gap between chosen and rejected responses. We explore two variants: maximum length margin (**MAX-LEN**) and minimum length margin (**MIN-LEN**). (iii) Reward margin filtering based on the self-reward scores for the two responses. It can be viewed as the model’s confidence in a sample, where a large margin indicates high confidence. We consider two variants: maximum reward margin (**MAX-REWARD**) and min reward margin (**MIN-REWARD**). (iv) Our CONGRAD method where we retain the top scoring samples based on the gradient similarity (**MAX-CONGRAD**). We also compare with a variant that retains the bottom scoring samples (**MIN-CONGRAD**).

Method/Round	Llama					Gemma				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
MONO	56.25	61.16	63.80	65.79	66.08	49.14	46.98	43.01	39.09	38.11
MULT-FULL	57.57	60.94	61.75	64.42	66.52	57.80	57.93	57.31	57.51	59.53
RAND	57.57	61.56	64.06	65.21	66.32	57.80	56.27	57.98	54.25	57.25
MIN-LEN	57.57	58.19	59.13	61.55	63.57	57.80	51.56	58.94	52.66	54.29
MAX-LEN	57.57	60.33	59.88	61.11	67.03	57.80	58.83	58.84	58.94	59.52
MIN-REWARD	57.57	59.40	57.11	58.32	57.27	57.80	50.09	45.18	44.67	40.90
MAX-REWARD	57.57	<b>64.66</b>	<u>67.23</u>	<u>70.39</u>	<u>70.64</u>	57.80	<b>61.49</b>	<u>63.73</u>	<u>67.72</u>	<u>61.82</u>
MIN-CONGRAD	57.57	56.84	58.01	55.12	64.06	57.80	50.76	56.34	55.58	57.01
MAX-CONGRAD	57.57	<u>61.88</u>	<b>68.02</b>	<b>70.53</b>	<b>72.58</b>	57.80	<u>60.11</u>	<b>64.62</b>	<b>68.57</b>	<b>64.71</b>

Table 1: The average win rates of self-rewarding variants on aya evaluation suite. **Bold** indicates the best, underline the second-best.

## 5 Experimental Results

### 5.1 Instruction Following Performance

**Iterative Self-Rewarding Improves Multilingual Alignment** As illustrated in Table 1, most variants of the self-rewarding procedure yield a sustained increase in win rates over successive iterations, demonstrating that the iterative self-rewarding strategy consistently improves instruction-following performance across different languages. In the Gemma experiments, our methods exhibited a decline in performance at the fifth round of iteration, suggesting that the benefits of self-rewarding may saturate or reverse due to overfitting.

**CONGRAD Filtering Enhances Self-Rewarding and Outperforms Other Filtering Methods** Compared to the vanilla self-rewarding algorithm MULT-FULL, CONGRAD further improves performance (72.58% vs 66.52% on Llama and 68.57% vs 59.53% on Gemma). This indicates two points: first, negative cross-lingual interference is present during multilingual alignment; second, our filtering method, which discards samples with low gradient similarity, can effectively mitigate this interference. While our method outperforms other filter methods, we also observe that MAX-REWARD is a strong baseline, because the base models have modest capacity, leading to noise during scoring. The method reduces noise in preference data by selecting samples with the highest confidence (i.e., MAX-REWARD). In contrast, filtering based on length differences only yields limited gains.

**Coexistence of Positive Transfer and Negative Interference Across Languages** Beyond negative interference, our experiments reveal clear evidence of positive cross-lingual transfer. For instance, in the Gemma results, compared to the MONO, MULT-FULL significantly boosts performance for several languages. The average win rates on best epoch increase from 49.14% to 59.53%, even though the data volume is controlled to be the same between the multilingual and monolingual settings. In more detailed results in Appendix D, we find that these improvements come mainly from underperforming languages such as Arabic, Korean and German. This suggests that alignment improvements can largely stem from positive transfer from better-performing languages for languages with initially low performance.




Figure 2: Average win rate of different filter percentages.

**Impact of Gradient Filter Percentage** The percentage of the filter serves as an important hyperparameter that controls the strength of the filter algorithm. Ideally, the algorithm should not be too sensitive to the filtering strength within a certain range. In Figure 2, we report the win rate resulting from retaining different percentages of preference data while performing filtering. As shown, for Llama, retaining the top 50% of the data yields the best performance but is overall insensitive to the filter strength. For Gemma, on the other hand, retaining 25% yields the best results at the best iteration round. This may be due to the fact that the performance in Gemma is weaker compared to Llama, so there is more noise in the

Method/Round	Global MMLU (Seed Model: 48.67)					ARC Challenge (Seed Model: 72.23)				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
MULT-FULL	48.85	49.01	49.14	49.27	49.47	72.41	72.45	72.51	72.45	72.57
RAND	48.85	49.13	49.16	49.16	49.23	72.41	72.40	72.52	72.36	72.42
MIN-LEN	48.85	<b>50.40</b>	<b>50.47</b>	<b>50.52</b>	<b>50.62</b>	72.41	<b>72.82</b>	<b>72.84</b>	<b>72.99</b>	<b>72.99</b>
MAX-LEN	48.85	<u>50.25</u>	<u>50.17</u>	<u>49.92</u>	<u>49.78</u>	72.41	<u>72.78</u>	<b>72.85</b>	<u>72.81</u>	<u>72.79</u>
MIN-REWARD	48.85	49.03	49.19	49.40	49.40	72.41	72.40	72.54	72.60	72.66
MAX-REWARD	48.85	48.72	<b>48.63</b>	<b>48.57</b>	<b>48.28</b>	72.41	72.29	<b>72.19</b>	<b>72.23</b>	<b>72.09</b>
MIN-CONGRAD	48.85	49.00	49.07	49.15	49.11	72.41	72.40	72.49	72.32	72.41
MAX-CONGRAD	48.85	49.09	49.19	49.11	48.90	72.41	72.37	72.25	72.31	72.28

Table 2: The average accuracy of self-rewarding variations built on Llama. **Red numbers** indicate lower performance than the seed model. **Bold** indicates the best, underline the second-best.

Method/Round	Global MMLU (Seed Model: 38.88)					ARC Challenge (Seed Model: 62.85)				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
MULT-FULL	40.03	39.78	39.50	40.07	40.48	63.65	63.52	63.81	63.81	64.03
RAND	40.03	39.50	39.29	39.05	39.73	63.65	63.42	63.03	<b>62.68</b>	63.12
MIN-LEN	40.03	39.39	39.31	<b>37.41</b>	<b>37.00</b>	63.65	63.08	63.10	<b>61.93</b>	<b>61.28</b>
MAX-LEN	40.03	40.83	<u>41.35</u>	<u>41.80</u>	<u>41.80</u>	63.65	<u>63.94</u>	<u>64.17</u>	<u>64.22</u>	<u>64.35</u>
MIN-REWARD	40.03	39.78	<b>38.68</b>	<b>38.32</b>	<b>36.40</b>	63.65	63.41	63.04	62.91	<b>61.99</b>
MAX-REWARD	40.03	<b>40.87</b>	<b>41.93</b>	<b>41.97</b>	<b>42.48</b>	63.65	<b>63.96</b>	<b>64.35</b>	<b>64.45</b>	<b>64.48</b>
MIN-CONGRAD	40.03	40.29	39.54	40.98	<b>38.81</b>	63.65	63.56	63.29	63.61	<b>62.81</b>
MAX-CONGRAD	40.03	39.75	39.93	39.77	39.18	63.65	63.58	63.58	63.42	63.38

Table 3: The average accuracy of self-rewarding variations built on Gemma. **Red numbers** indicate lower performance than the seed model. **Bold** indicates the best, underline the second-best.

process of reward computation, and increasing the filter strength improves the performance to some extent.

## 5.2 Alignment Tax

Previous work has shown that after alignment training such as DPO or RLHF, the model may forget some of its knowledge, which in turn leads to some degradation of the basic capabilities, also known as the alignment tax. Ideally, alignment algorithms should not produce much alignment tax. To test whether our algorithm suffers alignment tax, we use two datasets for testing, *Global MMLU* and *ARC challenge*. For *Global MMLU*, we test the same ten languages. For *ARC challenge*, we test the other eight languages due to their lack of Korean data and Japanese data. From the experimental results of Table 2 and Table 3, we can find that our algorithm even slightly improves the model’s performance on both datasets without incurring an alignment tax. This may stem from the fact that the increase in the model’s instruction following capability boosts its 5-shot in-context learning performance.

## 5.3 Analysis

**Performance on Unseen Languages** In some extreme cases, we may need to use certain languages that are not included in the self-rewarding process. To verify the usability of our model in such cases, we randomly selected three other widely varying languages, Hindi, Vietnamese and Russian, for validation. According to Table 4, multilingual self-rewarding generalizes well to unseen languages, indicating a positive transfer between languages. In addition, better results can still be achieved using CONGRAD, illustrating the generalizability of our approach.

**Overlap of Filtered Data** Using a reward margin to filter data is a strong baseline when the seed model produces noisy preference data. To compare filtering via reward margin and gradient similarity, we computed the expected and observed overlap of Llama from the second filtering round (the first round data remains unfiltered). Assuming two independent random selections of  $m$  samples from  $n$ , the expected overlap is  $E[\text{overlap}] = \frac{m^2}{n}$ . The probability that the overlap exceeds a threshold  $l$  can be estimated via simulation. Table 5



Method/Round	Hindi					Vietnamese					Russian				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Llama3-8B</b>															
MULT-FULL	54.50	57.50	61.25	62.25	65	59.25	62.00	65.00	65.00	69.25	55.53	58.50	<u>63.00</u>	64.75	66.25
MAX-REWARD	54.50	<b>66.00</b>	<u>67.25</u>	<u>69.25</u>	<u>71.00</u>	59.25	<u>63.00</u>	<u>68.50</u>	<u>70.75</u>	<b>73.50</b>	55.53	<b>61.70</b>	<b>68.00</b>	<b>70.25</b>	<u>71.25</u>
MAX-CONGRAD	54.50	<u>63.75</u>	<b>68.00</b>	<b>70.25</b>	<u>73.75</u>	59.25	<b>63.75</b>	<b>71.75</b>	<b>71.25</b>	<u>72.50</u>	55.53	<u>61.00</u>	<u>67.50</u>	<u>69.75</u>	<b>71.50</b>
<b>Gemma2-2B</b>															
MULT-FULL	54.52	<b>59.55</b>	55.78	55.78	56.03	56.50	54.00	55.75	55.00	58.25	59.05	61.81	58.29	63.32	61.81
MAX-REWARD	54.52	54.52	<u>61.56</u>	<u>63.07</u>	<u>57.54</u>	56.50	<u>60.00</u>	<u>62.50</u>	<u>63.00</u>	<b>66.50</b>	59.05	<u>63.32</u>	<b>69.85</b>	<u>65.83</u>	<u>64.32</u>
MAX-CONGRAD	54.52	<u>55.03</u>	<b>62.81</b>	<b>63.82</b>	<u>58.04</u>	56.50	<b>62.00</b>	<b>64.00</b>	<u>71.75</u>	<u>65.50</u>	59.05	<b>66.08</b>	<u>65.33</u>	<u>69.60</u>	<u>67.09</u>

Table 4: The average win rates of self-rewarding variants on unseen languages from aya evaluation suite. **Bold** indicates the best, underline the second-best.

	it	zh	pt	en	ko	es	de	ar	ja	fr	total
expected overlap size	19.5	20.5	20	15	21	19.5	18	22.5	19.5	21.5	197
observed overlap size	19	26	21	12	24	20	23	26	24	19	214

Table 5: Overlap of filtered data between reward-margin- and gradient-based filter. The observed overlap significantly exceeds the expected value under random ( $p < 0.005$ ).

shows that the observed overlap is significantly higher than expected, implying that gradient similarity also removes some noisy samples. Since the two methods do not largely overlap, they might be combined for further improvements.

## 6 Related Work

**Multilingual Preference Optimization** Recent work has explored bridging the performance gap between high- and low-resource languages through multilingual preference optimization. Li et al. (2024); Zhang et al. (2024) align internal representations and outputs using contrastive learning and instruction tuning. Yang et al. (2025b) leverage language imbalance as a natural preference signal for iterative self-improvement across languages, while Yang et al. (2025a) transfer implicit rewards from English-aligned models to other languages without explicit multilingual preference data. Dang et al. (2024) show that cross-lingual transfer emerges from multilingual preference training, with online methods outperforming offline ones. Zhang et al. (2024) propose a self-distillation method to improve multilingual generation by utilizing strong responses in resource-rich languages. Meanwhile, Gureja et al. (2024) reveal significant performance gaps in multilingual reward models, emphasizing the need for more robust evaluation and alignment across languages.

**Synthetic Multilingual Dataset Creation** Many studies create multilingual preference data via translation from English instructions (Lai et al., 2023; Shaham et al., 2024; Mondshine et al., 2025). Okapi (Lai et al., 2023) translates English prompts into 26 languages and ranks responses using GPT-3.5. Shaham et al. (2024) find that adding just a few multilingual examples improves cross-lingual generalization. Mondshine et al. (2025) propose selective pre-translation of prompt components, improving performance across 35 languages. Other work leverages language imbalance as a heuristic to generate multilingual preference pairs (Yang et al., 2025b).

**Instruction and Preference Data Filtering** Instruction data filtering methods aim to identify the most useful samples for fine-tuning. LESS (Xia et al., 2024) selects influential instructions by estimating gradient similarity with few-shot targets, while DART-Math (Tong et al., 2024) prioritizes difficult queries during data synthesis to enhance reasoning. Alpargas (Chen et al., 2024b) filters low-quality instruction-response pairs using GPT-based scoring. Wu et al. (2024b) balance quality and diversity via a graph-based selector. For preference data, fDPO (Morimura et al., 2024) introduces reward-model-based filtering during DPO training, showing that preference data quality critically impacts alignment. Overall, most prior work focuses on instruction data, while systematic filtering of preference data remains underexplored.

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we propose CONGRAD, a multilingual LLM alignment framework with conflicting gradient filtering, which avoids the reliance on external annotations. Our approach iteratively generates and scores preference data and introduces a PCGrad-based gradient filtering strategy to mitigate negative cross-lingual interference. Extensive experiments on LLaMA3 and Gemma2 show that our approach significantly improves instruction following for underrepresented languages, maintains performance for mainstream languages, and generalizes to unseen languages. Furthermore, our analysis highlights the dual role of positive transfer and negative interference in multilingual training, suggesting that careful data selection is essential to fully unlock the multilingual potential of aligned LLMs.

## References

- Naveen Arivazhagan, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dmitry Lepikhin, Melvin Johnson, Maxim Krikun, Mia Xu Chen, Yuan Cao, George Foster, Colin Cherry, et al. Massively multilingual neural machine translation in the wild: Findings and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.05019*, 2019.
- 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.
- Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Srinivasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, and Hongxia Jin. Alpargasus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=FdVXgSJhvz>.
- Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Srinivasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, et al. Alpargasus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024b.
- Pinzhen Chen, Shaoxiong Ji, Nikolay Bogoychev, Andrey Kutuzov, Barry Haddow, and Kenneth Heafield. Monolingual or multilingual instruction tuning: Which makes a better alpaca. In Yvette Graham and Matthew Purver (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2024*, pp. 1347–1356, St. Julian’s, Malta, March 2024c. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-eacl.90/>.
- Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’24*. JMLR.org, 2024d.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *ArXiv*, abs/1803.05457, 2018.
- Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault (eds.), *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 8440–8451, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.747. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.747/>.
- Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Ning Ding, Guanming Yao, Bingxiang He, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Ruobing Xie, Yankai Lin, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Ultrafeedback: boosting language models with scaled ai feedback. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’24*. JMLR.org, 2024.

- John Dang, Arash Ahmadian, Kelly Marchisio, Julia Kreutzer, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. RLHF can speak many languages: Unlocking multilingual preference optimization for LLMs. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 13134–13156, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.729. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.729/>.
- Yue Deng, Wenxuan Zhang, Sinno Jialin Pan, and Lidong Bing. Multilingual jailbreak challenges in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06474*, 2023.
- Yann Dubois, Chen Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy S Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. AlpacaFarm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:30039–30069, 2023.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Srishti Gureja, Lester James V Miranda, Shayekh Bin Islam, Rishabh Maheshwary, Drishti Sharma, Gusti Winata, Nathan Lambert, Sebastian Ruder, Sara Hooker, and Marzieh Fadaee. M-rewardbench: Evaluating reward models in multilingual settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15522*, 2024.
- Yongchang Hao, Yanshuai Cao, and Lili Mou. Flora: Low-rank adapters are secretly gradient compressors. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03293>.
- Jian Hu, Xibin Wu, Zilin Zhu, Weixun Wang, Dehao Zhang, Yu Cao, et al. Openrlhf: An easy-to-use, scalable and high-performance rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11143*, 2024.
- Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024.
- Md Tawkat Islam Khondaker, Abdul Waheed, El Moatez Billah Nagoudi, and Muhammad Abdul-Mageed. GPTAraEval: A comprehensive evaluation of ChatGPT on Arabic NLP. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 220–247, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.16. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.16/>.
- Robert Kirk, Ishita Mediratta, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Jelena Luketina, Eric Hambro, Edward Grefenstette, and Roberta Raileanu. Understanding the effects of RLHF on LLM generalisation and diversity. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=PXDF3FAVHJT>.
- Hadas Kotek, Rikker Dockum, and David Sun. Gender bias and stereotypes in large language models. In *Proceedings of The ACM Collective Intelligence Conference, CI '23*, pp. 12–24, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400701139. doi: 10.1145/3582269.3615599. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582269.3615599>.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pp. 611–626, 2023.
- Viet Lai, Chien Nguyen, Nghia Ngo, Thuat Nguyen, Franck Dernoncourt, Ryan Rossi, and Thien Nguyen. Okapi: Instruction-tuned large language models in multiple languages with reinforcement learning from human feedback. In Yansong Feng and Els

- Lefever (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pp. 318–327, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-demo.28. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-demo.28/>.
- Harrison Lee, Samrat Phatale, Hassan Mansoor, Thomas Mesnard, Johan Ferret, Kellie Lu, Colton Bishop, Ethan Hall, Victor Carbune, Abhinav Rastogi, and Sushant Prakash. Rlaif vs. rlhf: scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'24*. JMLR.org, 2024.
- Chong Li, Shaonan Wang, Jiajun Zhang, and Chengqing Zong. Improving in-context learning of multilingual generative language models with cross-lingual alignment. In Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 8058–8076, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.445. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.naacl-long.445/>.
- Yong Lin, Hangyu Lin, Wei Xiong, Shizhe Diao, Jianmeng Liu, Jipeng Zhang, Rui Pan, Haoxiang Wang, Wenbin Hu, Hanning Zhang, Hanze Dong, Renjie Pi, Han Zhao, Nan Jiang, Heng Ji, Yuan Yao, and Tong Zhang. Mitigating the alignment tax of RLHF. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 580–606, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.35. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.35/>.
- Jie Liu, Zhanhui Zhou, Jiaheng Liu, Xingyuan Bu, Chao Yang, Han-Sen Zhong, and Wanli Ouyang. Iterative length-regularized direct preference optimization: A case study on improving 7b language models to gpt-4 level. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11817*, 2024.
- Itai Mondshine, Tzuf Paz-Argaman, and Reut Tsarfaty. Beyond english: The impact of prompt translation strategies across languages and tasks in multilingual llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09331*, 2025.
- Tetsuro Morimura, Mitsuki Sakamoto, Yuu Jinnai, Kenshi Abe, and Kaito Ariu. Filtered direct preference optimization. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 22729–22770, 2024.
- 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.
- Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, He He, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason E Weston. Iterative reasoning preference optimization. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=4XIKfvNYvx>.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:53728–53741, 2023.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Reva Schwartz, Reva Schwartz, Apostol Vassilev, Kristen Greene, Lori Perine, Andrew Burt, and Patrick Hall. *Towards a standard for identifying and managing bias in artificial intelligence*, volume 3. US Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology ..., 2022.

- Uri Shaham, Jonathan Herzig, Roei Aharoni, Idan Szpektor, Reut Tsarfaty, and Matan Eyal. Multilingual instruction tuning with just a pinch of multilinguality. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pp. 2304–2317, 2024.
- Shivalika Singh, Angelika Romanou, Clémentine Fourrier, David I Adelani, Jian Gang Ngui, Daniel Vila-Suero, Peerat Limkonchotiawat, Kelly Marchisio, Wei Qi Leong, Yosephine Susanto, et al. Global mmlu: Understanding and addressing cultural and linguistic biases in multilingual evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03304*, 2024a.
- Shivalika Singh, Freddie Vargus, Daniel D’souza, Börje Karlsson, Abinaya Mahendiran, Wei-Yin Ko, Herumb Shandilya, Jay Patel, Deividas Mataciunas, Laura O’Mahony, Mike Zhang, Ramith Hettiarachchi, Joseph Wilson, Marina Machado, Luisa Moura, Dominik Krzemiński, Hakimeh Fadaei, Irem Ergun, Ifeoma Okoh, Aisha Alaagib, Oshan Mudannayake, Zaid Alyafeai, Vu Chien, Sebastian Ruder, Surya Guthikonda, Emad Alghamdi, Sebastian Gehrmann, Niklas Muennighoff, Max Bartolo, Julia Kreutzer, Ahmet Üstün, Marzieh Fadaee, and Sara Hooker. Aya dataset: An open-access collection for multilingual instruction tuning. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 11521–11567, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024b. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.620. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.620/>.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca), 2023.
- Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118*, 2024.
- Yuxuan Tong, Xiwen Zhang, Rui Wang, Ruidong Wu, and Junxian He. Dart-math: Difficulty-aware rejection tuning for mathematical problem-solving. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:7821–7846, 2024.
- Antonio Toral and Víctor M. Sánchez-Cartagena. A multifaceted evaluation of neural versus phrase-based machine translation for 9 language directions. In Mirella Lapata, Phil Blunsom, and Alexander Koller (eds.), *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pp. 1063–1073, Valencia, Spain, April 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/E17-1100/>.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Aniket Vashishtha, Kabir Ahuja, and Sunayana Sitaram. On evaluating and mitigating gender biases in multilingual settings. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 307–318, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.21. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.21/>.
- Zirui Wang, Zachary C. Lipton, and Yulia Tsvetkov. On negative interference in multilingual models: Findings and a meta-learning treatment. In Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 4438–4450, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.359. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-main.359/>.

- Zirui Wang, Yulia Tsvetkov, Orhan Firat, and Yuan Cao. Gradient vaccine: Investigating and improving multi-task optimization in massively multilingual models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL [https://openreview.net/forum?id=F1vEjWK-1H\\_](https://openreview.net/forum?id=F1vEjWK-1H_).
- Minghao Wu, Yitong Li, Meng Zhang, Liangyou Li, Gholamreza Haffari, and Qun Liu. Uncertainty-aware balancing for multilingual and multi-domain neural machine translation training. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 7291–7305, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.580. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.580/>.
- Minghao Wu, Thuy-Trang Vu, Lizhen Qu, and Reza Haf. Mixture-of-skills: Learning to optimize data usage for fine-tuning large language models. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 14226–14240, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024a. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.787. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.787/>.
- Minghao Wu, Thuy-Trang Vu, Lizhen Qu, and Gholamreza Haffari. The best of both worlds: Bridging quality and diversity in data selection with bipartite graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12458*, 2024b.
- Mengzhou Xia, Sadhika Malladi, Suchin Gururangan, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. LESS: Selecting influential data for targeted instruction tuning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024.
- Wen Yang, Junhong Wu, Chen Wang, Chengqing Zong, and Jiajun Zhang. Implicit cross-lingual rewarding for efficient multilingual preference alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.04647*, 2025a.
- Wen Yang, Junhong Wu, Chen Wang, Chengqing Zong, and Jiajun Zhang. Language imbalance driven rewarding for multilingual self-improving. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Kak2ZH5Itp>.
- Tianhe Yu, Saurabh Kumar, Abhishek Gupta, Sergey Levine, Karol Hausman, and Chelsea Finn. Gradient surgery for multi-task learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:5824–5836, 2020.
- Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Xian Li, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. Self-rewarding language models. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’24*. JMLR.org, 2024.
- Yuanchi Zhang, Yile Wang, Zijun Liu, Shuo Wang, Xiaolong Wang, Peng Li, Maosong Sun, and Yang Liu. Enhancing multilingual capabilities of large language models through self-distillation from resource-rich languages. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 11189–11204, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.603. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.603/>.
- 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.

## A Limitations and Future Work

While CONGRAD demonstrates strong empirical performance in mitigating negative cross-lingual interference, several limitations remain. First, although sublinear gradient compression significantly reduces memory overhead, it introduces approximation noise that may impact the accuracy of gradient filtering. Second, our experiments are limited to ten typologically diverse but relatively balanced languages; generalization to highly imbalanced or severely low-resource language scenarios remains an open challenge. Finally, the evaluation is conducted in a self-rewarding framework using synthetic preferences. Further studies with human-annotated data and real-world deployment may be needed to validate robustness.

Future work can explore hybrid filtering strategies that combine gradient-based and reward-based signals to improve sample selection. Additionally, integrating cross-lingual alignment objectives directly into the optimization process, beyond data filtering, may further enhance multilingual alignment. Lastly, extending the framework to support dynamic filtering during training, rather than round-level static selection, could enable finer-grained control over training dynamics.

## B Self-rewarding Iterative DPO Prompts

### Response Evaluation Prompt for Self-Rewarding

```

Review the user's question and the corresponding response
using the additive 5-point scoring system described below.
Points are accumulated based on the satisfaction of each
criterion:
- Add 1 point (total Score: 1) if the response is relevant
and provides some information related to the user's inquiry,
even if it is incomplete or contains some irrelevant content.
- Add another point (total Score: 2) if the response
addresses a substantial portion of the user's question, but
does not completely resolve the query or provide a direct
answer.
- Add another point (total Score: 3) if the response answers
the basic elements of the user's question in a useful way,
regardless of whether it seems to have been written by an AI
Assistant or if it has elements typically found in blogs or
search results.
- Add another point (total Score: 4) if the response
is clearly written from an AI Assistant's perspective,
addressing the user's question directly and comprehensively,
and is well-organized and helpful, even if there is slight
room for improvement in clarity, conciseness or focus.
- Add another point (total Score: 5) for a response that
is impeccably tailored to the user's question by an AI
Assistant, without extraneous information, reflecting expert
knowledge, and demonstrating a high-quality, engaging, and
insightful answer.
User: 0
<response>1</response>
Remember to assess from the AI Assistant perspective. To
evaluate the response in alignment with this additive scoring
model, we'll systematically attribute points based on the
outlined criteria.
After examining the user's instruction and the response:

```

```

- Briefly analyse the response in *English*, *up to 100
words*, which is a *strict limit*, from the AI Assistant
perspective.
- ** Conclude with the score of the response *strictly using
English* and the format: "Score: <total points>" **
- The score should be an **integer from 0 to 5**
    
```

### C Implementation Details

To optimize model performance, we conducted systematic hyperparameter tuning during training. We tuned key hyperparameters, including the learning rate, compression dimension and the length penalty strength  $\alpha$  used in DPO training. Specifically, we searched the learning rate over  $[2 \times 10^{-6}, 1 \times 10^{-6}, 5 \times 10^{-7}]$ , while the batch size was fixed at 16 and the compression dimension was fixed at 64 to balance GPU memory constraints and training stability. The length penalty strength parameter was explored within  $[0.02, 0.01, 0.005]$ .

For Llama, all training was performed on 4 A100 GPUs, and for Gemma, all training was performed on 2 A100 GPUs. We use the openrlhf framework (Hu et al., 2024) for DPO training and vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023) for inference.

### D Addition results

	it	zh	pt	en	ko	es	de	ar	ja	fr	avg
MONO	52.50	71.20	59.20	55.75	76.00	60.64	64.00	71.26	76.50	73.76	66.08
MULT-FULL	61.75	64.6	66.00	54.56	75	67.82	63	63.98	74.00	74.50	66.52
RAND	63.50	70.88	63.20	53.37	74.75	66.83	62.25	59.72	72.75	75.99	66.32
MIN-LEN	58.00	69.00	65.40	53.17	70.50	58.17	58.75	64.17	71.00	67.57	63.57
MAX-LEN	63.25	65.86	64.20	53.17	75.50	66.83	63.00	69.49	77.00	72.03	67.03
MIN-REWARD	55.75	59.44	56.20	45.63	60.00	58.25	58.75	55.91	59.25	63.61	57.27
MAX-REWARD	<u>69.75</u>	<b>76.91</b>	<u>70.40</u>	<b>58.93</b>	<b>78.25</b>	<b>71.5</b>	<u>66.25</u>	<u>59.45</u>	<u>76.50</u>	<u>78.47</u>	<u>70.64</u>
MIN-CONGRAD	60.00	65.26	65.20	53.57	73.75	66.58	61.00	57.94	69.75	67.57	64.06
MAX-CONGRAD	<b>72.00</b>	<u>75.40</u>	<b>70.60</b>	<u>57.94</u>	<u>78.00</u>	<b>71.53</b>	<b>71.50</b>	<b>64.88</b>	<b>84.00</b>	<b>79.95</b>	<b>72.58</b>

Table 6: The win rate of self-rewarding variations of Llama3-8B evaluated on aya evaluation suite for each language in the final round. The best results are highlighted in **bold**, and the second-best results are highlighted in underline.

	it	zh	pt	en	ko	es	de	ar	ja	fr	avg
MONO	43.50	62.65	49.60	55.40	45.25	50.25	46.50	31.22	46.75	60.30	49.14
MULT-FULL	61.00	62.45	59.00	58.4	70.00	51.25	56.75	56.85	60.5	59.05	59.53
RAND	58.25	63.45	58.20	55.40	63.00	54.27	56.25	60.00	54.25	56.75	57.98
MIN-LEN	51.01	57.29	53.20	52.78	61.75	42.50	45.00	58.10	51.75	42.25	51.56
MAX-LEN	61.75	63.45	58.40	58.73	63.25	51.76	59.50	60.84	59.25	58.25	59.52
MIN-REWARD	50.00	50.00	46.80	47.40	55.00	44.72	52.75	59.64	47.50	49.75	50.09
MAX-REWARD	<u>70.75</u>	<u>69.68</u>	<u>63.80</u>	<u>61.51</u>	<u>72.25</u>	<b>69.60</b>	<u>64.75</u>	<b>67.07</b>	<b>69.25</b>	<u>68.59</u>	<u>67.72</u>
MIN-CONGRAD	60.75	56.63	55.40	57.14	64.25	49.25	54.75	60.69	53.50	57.75	57.01
MAX-CONGRAD	<b>73.50</b>	<b>72.29</b>	<b>65.00</b>	<b>63.10</b>	<b>75.00</b>	<u>65.25</u>	<u>71.25</u>	<u>64.72</u>	<u>66.75</u>	<b>68.84</b>	<b>68.57</b>

Table 7: The win rate of self-rewarding variations of Gemma2-2B evaluated on aya evaluation suite for each language in the fourth round. The best results are highlighted in **bold**, and the second-best results are highlighted in underline.