
Online Self-Preferring Language Models

Yuanzhao Zhai^{1,2}, Zhuo Zhang^{3,4}, Kele Xu^{1,2}, Hanyang Peng⁴,
Yue Yu^{1,2}, Dawei Feng^{1,2*}, Cheng Yang^{1,2}, Bo Ding^{1,2}, Huaimin Wang^{1,2}

¹National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China

²State Key Laboratory of Complex & Critical Software Environment

³Harbin Institute of Technology (Shenzhen), Shenzhen, China

⁴Peng Cheng Laboratory, Shenzhen, China

Abstract

Aligning with human preference datasets has been critical to the success of large language models (LLMs). Reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) employs a costly reward model to provide feedback for on-policy sampling responses. Recently, offline methods that directly fit responses with binary preferences in the dataset have emerged as alternatives. However, existing methods do not explicitly model preference strength information, which is crucial for distinguishing different response pairs. To overcome this limitation, we propose Online Self-Preferring (OSP) language models to learn from self-generated response pairs and self-judged preference strengths. For each prompt and corresponding self-generated responses, we introduce a ranked pairing method to construct multiple response pairs with preference strength information. We then propose the soft-preference cross-entropy loss to leverage such information. Empirically, we demonstrate that leveraging preference strength is crucial for avoiding overfitting and enhancing alignment performance. OSP achieves state-of-the-art alignment performance across various metrics in two widely used human preference datasets. OSP is parameter-efficient and more robust than the dominant online method, RLHF when limited offline data are available and generalizing to out-of-domain tasks. Moreover, OSP language models established by LLMs with proficiency in self-preferring can efficiently self-improve without external supervision.

1 Introduction

Fine-tuning large language models (LLMs) to align human preferences has gained significant attention in various natural language processing (NLP) tasks [1, 2]. Existing alignment methods can be broadly classified into online and offline, based on whether on-the-fly responses and feedback are collected [3]. The representative online method, RLHF [4] first learns a computationally intensive reward model and then optimizes LLMs to generate responses with high rewards provided by reward models. Offline methods that do not utilize newly collected responses and preferences, emerged as an efficient alternative to RLHF. Notably, direct preference optimization (DPO) [5] and its variants [6, 7] sidestep the reward modeling and directly fit binary preference labels.

Human preference datasets commonly consist of only binary preferences for response pairs. Nevertheless, preference strength, the degree to which one response is preferred over another, is crucial information within these pairs. However, such preference strength information cannot be fully utilized by substituted rewards [8] or binary preferences. In this work, we aim to leverage the preference strength of response pairs for alignment. We employ the on-policy response sampling method to collect response pairs, improving the data coverage and quality over the offline dataset [9–11]. We

*davyfeng.c@gmail.com




Figure 1: Comparison of LLMs alignment methods. Compared to RLHF, OSP leverages the LLM itself to provide the preference strength of response pairs, instead of leveraging a separate reward model to reward single responses. In contrast to offline methods, OSP can effectively learn from on-the-fly self-generated samples and their associated preference strengths.

then differentiate these pairs using soft preference strengths instead of treating them equivalently as binary preferences. Moreover, inspired by recent success with self-feedback [12, 13], we propose preferring response pairs using the same LLM that generated them, eliminating the need for a separate model and dramatically reducing computational overhead compared to RLHF.

We thus introduce online self-preferring language models, which learn from multiple on-the-fly self-generated response pairs with various self-judged preference strengths, as illustrated in Figure 1. The offline human preference dataset can be used for preference augmentation. For each prompt, the same LLM first samples multiple response pairs and then judges the preference strength for each one over the others. Since existing direct alignment loss is designed for the offline setting and does not account for preference strength, we further propose the soft-preference cross-entropy (SPCE) loss, which can mitigate overfitting and improve alignment performance. Results on two widely used human preference datasets show that OSP outperforms existing online and offline alignment methods and remains effective with only 2% of the datasets. OSP language models can effectively generalize to OOD tasks, mitigating the reward hacking issue faced by RLHF. Additionally, the OSP language model established by Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, which is proficient in self-preferring, achieves win rates of 95% against the original model in the summarization task using only 200 prompts for self-improvement. In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- We introduce the online self-preferring language model for LLM alignment, which learns from self-generated response pairs and self-judged soft preference strength.
- We propose a soft-preference cross-entropy loss to effectively leverage multiple response pairs with different preference strengths.
- Empirical results demonstrate that our method outperforms state-of-the-art alignment methods. Additionally, OSP language models are sample-efficient, generalize effectively to OOD tasks, and have the potential for self-improvement.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we summarize the key processes of two representative LLM alignment methods: RLHF and DPO. Given a prompt $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there are corresponding highly preferred and less preferred responses $y^h, y^l \in \mathcal{Y}$ in the human preference dataset \mathcal{D} , where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the finite spaces of prompts and responses, respectively. Mathematically, based on \mathcal{D} , alignment methods aim to train the LLM $\pi_\theta: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ that align with human preferences. Following [6], the ground-truth preference strength for any two responses $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ is defined as $p^*(y \succ y' | x) = \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbb{I}\{j \text{ prefers } y \text{ to } y' \text{ given } x\}]$, where \mathbb{I} is the indicator function, and the expectation is over humans j . Note that preference strength

information $p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \mathbf{y}'|\mathbf{x})$ is commonly not available in \mathcal{D} and existing methods only utilize binary preferences instead.

Reinforcement Learning from Human feedback. RLHF [4] introduces the three-step pipeline comprising supervised fine-tuning (SFT), reward modeling, and reinforcement learning (RL) fine-tuning with proximal policy optimization (PPO) [14]. As illustrated in Figure 1, RLHF learns a substituted reward based on \mathcal{D} to approximate the ground-truth preference strength. When the Bradley-Terry model [15] holds for p^* , there exists a reward function $r : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \mathbf{y}'|\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')), \quad (1)$$

where σ is the sigmoid function. The objective of RL fine-tuning is then to maximize the substituted rewards while maintaining the Kullback–Leibler (KL) distance between the current model π_θ and the reference model, usually served by SFT LLM π_{SFT} :

$$\arg \max_{\pi_\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x})} [r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})] - \beta \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\pi_\theta || \pi_{\text{SFT}}). \quad (2)$$

However, a separate reward model introduces parameter inefficiency, and RL objectives usually result in unstable training [16]. Moreover, reward models may fail to express complex preference relations, such as non-transitive or cyclic preference [17, 8].

Direct Preference Optimization. An alternative approach to RLHF described above is DPO, which bypasses the reward function and directly optimizes the objective in Equation 2 by solving a binary classification problem on the offline human preference dataset \mathcal{D} .

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\pi_\theta; \pi_{\text{SFT}}) = -\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^h, \mathbf{y}^l \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \log \left(\frac{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^h|\mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{SFT}}(\mathbf{y}^h|\mathbf{x})} \right) - \beta \log \left(\frac{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{SFT}}(\mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})} \right) \right) \right], \quad (3)$$

where π_{SFT} is used to normalize the logits. DPO and its variants overlook the preference strength information within the response pairs. Besides, offline methods do not utilize on-the-fly-generated samples to improve data coverage and quality, resulting in weaker peak performance compared to online methods [11].

3 Method

In this section, we detail our proposed online self-preferring language models, which utilize the self-judged preference strength information of self-generated response pairs. We first introduce how our method models preference strength, deducing the soft-preference cross-entropy loss function. Then, we illustrate the overall framework and core designs of our methods.

3.1 Preference Strength Modeling

Different from the RLHF objective described in Equation 2, our goal is to explicitly model the general preference instead of substituting preferences with rewards. The objective is as follows:

$$\arg \max_{\pi_\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}' \sim \pi_\mu(\cdot|\mathbf{x})} [p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \mathbf{y}'|\mathbf{x})] - \beta \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\pi_\theta || \pi_{\text{SFT}}), \quad (4)$$

where π_μ denotes the LLM that samples responses. The closed-form solution of the KL-constrained objective in Equation 4 is:

$$\pi^*(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \pi_{\text{SFT}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \cdot \exp \left(\frac{1}{\beta} p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \pi_\mu|\mathbf{x}) \right), \quad (5)$$

where we define $p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \pi_\mu|\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}' \sim \pi_\mu(\cdot|\mathbf{x})} p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \mathbf{y}'|\mathbf{x})$. For any response pairs $\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l$, the optimal policy $\pi^*(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ satisfies :

$$\sigma \left(\beta \log \left(\frac{\pi^*(\mathbf{y}^h|\mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{SFT}}(\mathbf{y}^h|\mathbf{x})} \right) - \log \left(\frac{\pi^*(\mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{SFT}}(\mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})} \right) \right) = \sigma(p^*(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \pi_\mu|\mathbf{x}) - p^*(\mathbf{y}^l \succ \pi_\mu|\mathbf{x})), \quad (6)$$

where $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the logistic function. We denote the left-hand side in Equation 6 as $\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x}, \pi^*)$, which represents the implicit preference strength predicted by the optimal policy π^* and normalized by the reference policy π_{SFT} . On the right-hand side, we define the target preference strength as $p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})$. Both implicit and target preference strengths are probabilities.




Figure 2: Illustration of the aligning pipeline of OSP. For each training prompt \mathbf{x} , OSP first employs the current model π_θ to sample K candidate responses, constructing $K/2$ response pairs in a ranked pairing manner. π_{SFT} subsequently judges response pairs to obtain the preference strength. Finally, our proposed SPCE loss leverages multiple response pairs with different preference strengths to align LLM π_θ , where π_{SFT} is also used for normalization.

Soft-Preference Cross-Entropy Loss. In practice, the optimal policy π^* is not available. Without $\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x}, \pi^*)$, the implicit preference strength can be predicted with the current policy π_θ :

$$\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x}, \pi_\theta) = \sigma\left(\beta \log\left(\frac{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^h | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{SFT}}(\mathbf{y}^h | \mathbf{x})} - \log\left(\frac{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{SFT}}(\mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x})}\right)\right)\right), \quad (7)$$

To derive the SPCE loss function, we take the KL-divergence $\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x}) || \hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x}, \pi_\theta))$ between the target and implicit preference strength. This results in:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SPCE}}(\pi_\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}^h, \mathbf{y}^l \sim \pi_\theta} [p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l) \log(\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \pi_\theta)) + (1 - p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l)) \log(1 - \hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \pi_\theta))], \quad (8)$$

where we suppress the dependence on \mathbf{x} in preference strength to denote the expectation of the prompt distribution. In Equation 8, we employ the response pairs sampled from the current model π_θ , specifically utilizing on-policy sampling, for computing the SPCE loss. During this process, we apply a stop gradient to the sampling.

Gradient Analysis. To analyze what our proposed SPCE loss update does, we compare its gradient with respect to the parameters θ to other pair-wise alignment methods. The gradient of our SPCE loss is as follows:

$$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{SPCE}}(\pi_\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}^h, \mathbf{y}^l \sim \pi_\theta} [(\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \pi_\theta) - p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l)) (\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^h) - \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^l))]. \quad (9)$$

The gradient of the SPCE loss becomes zero when $\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \pi_\theta) = p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l)$, indicating that the model’s predicted preference strength matches the target self-preference strength. The SPCE loss is utilized to train the model whenever there is a discrepancy between them, enhancing the model’s awareness of preference strength. In comparison, the gradient of DPO is as follows:

$$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\pi_\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}^h, \mathbf{y}^l \sim \mathcal{D}} [(1 - \hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \pi_\theta)) (\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^h) - \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^l))]. \quad (10)$$

DPO trains the model until $\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x}, \pi_\theta)$ reaches the maximum value 1, which necessitates $\log\left(\frac{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^h | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^l | \mathbf{x})}\right) \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, DPO is susceptible to overfitting. To mitigate this drawback, IPO [6] introduces a hard margin to enforce the gradient to approach zero when the preference strength reaches a certain threshold:

$$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{IPO}}(\pi_\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}^h, \mathbf{y}^l \sim \mathcal{D}} [(\sigma^{-1}(\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l | \pi_\theta)) - \frac{1}{2\beta}) (\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^h) - \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}^l))]. \quad (11)$$

Both DPO and IPO utilize binary preferences. In contrast, the soft preference employed by the SPCE loss utilizes a dynamic margin to regulate the updates for different response pairs.

3.2 Online Self-Preferring Language Models

OSP language models trained with the SPCE loss can effectively learn from response pairs exhibiting varying preference strengths. As shown in Figure 2, we employ the on-policy manner to sample K responses for each prompt using the current LLM π_θ , aiming to enhance the prompt efficiency. We provide a detailed explanation of our methodology for constructing pairs and determining target preference strengths below.

Algorithm 1 Framework of Online Self-Preferring Language Models

- 1: **Require:** Prompt dataset \mathcal{D} , SFT model π_{SFT} , number of training steps T .
 - 2: Initialize $\pi_{\theta} = \pi_{\text{SFT}}$
 - 3: Augment LLM-as-a-judge ability for π_{SFT} (Optional): supervised fine-tuning π_{SFT} with LLM-as-a-judge instructions constructed by human preference seed dataset.
 - 4: **for** training step $1, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 5: Select a prompt \mathbf{x} from \mathcal{D} .
 - 6: Sample K responses using π_{θ} : $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_K \sim \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$.
 - 7: Rank the responses according to $p(\mathbf{y} \succ \emptyset|\mathbf{x})$ and construct $K//2$ pairs.
 - 8: Preferring the target preference strength of the response pairs using π_{SFT} : $p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})$.
 - 9: Calculate the predicted preference strength $\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x}, \pi_{\theta})$ using Equation (7).
 - 10: Update π_{θ} using $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SPCE}}(\pi_{\theta})$ in Equation 9.
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **Return:** Aligned OSP language model π_{θ} .
-

Ranked pairing. In accordance with the SPCE loss defined in Equation (8), constructing response pairs that cover as many preference strength probabilities as possible benefits the prompt efficiency. However, conducting comparisons among all the on-the-fly self-generated response pairs results in $\binom{K}{2}$ forward passes for comparisons. To reduce the computation overhead, we propose a ranked pairing method. Specifically, we first evaluate the preference strength of each response in comparison to the blank baseline response, denoted as $p(\mathbf{y} \succ \emptyset|\mathbf{x})$. Subsequently, we rank the K responses based on their $p(\mathbf{y} \succ \emptyset|\mathbf{x})$ values, pairing the responses with the highest and lowest values as $\mathbf{y}_1^h, \mathbf{y}_1^l$, the second highest and lowest values as $\mathbf{y}_2^h, \mathbf{y}_2^l$, and so forth. This approach allows us to efficiently generate $K//2$ response pairs that encompass a broad range of preference strengths, leading to a computational complexity reduction to $\mathcal{O}(K)$.

Self-preferring. Recall that we define the target preference strength as follows:

$$p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x}) := \sigma(p^*(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \pi_{\mu}|\mathbf{x}) - p^*(\mathbf{y}^l \succ \pi_{\mu}|\mathbf{x})). \quad (12)$$

It’s impractical to have access to the precise value of $p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \pi_{\mu}|\mathbf{x})$ across the entire π_{μ} distribution. Therefore, we opt to directly estimate the target preference strength $p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})$ using a self-preferring manner with LLM-as-a-judge instructions. To achieve this, we input the constructed instruction shown in Figure 6 to LLM and extract the logit probabilities of generating the tokens of “A” or “B”, followed by a softmax computation to derive the target preference strength $p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})$. $p(\mathbf{y}^h \succ \mathbf{y}^l|\mathbf{x})$ does not hinge on the Bradley-Terry model assumption, thus potentially capturing a wider array of human preference relations, including non-transitive or cyclic preferences.

Without instruction tuning, most LLMs that are not sufficiently large cannot effectively follow the LLM-as-a-judge instructions, whose judging performance is not significantly better than random guessing. To overcome this limitation, we create a seed set of LLM-as-a-judge instructions using an offline human preference dataset. We then enhance the preference capabilities of LLMs using these instructions, finding that even a small amount of data can greatly enhance the LLM-as-a-judge ability. It should be noted that preference augmentation can be omitted for LLMs proficient in preference selection. Algorithm 1 outlines the general framework of online self-preference language models.

4 Experiments

In this section, we empirically validate the efficiency of OSP through extensive experiments conducted on two popular NLP tasks, namely Anthropic helpfulness and OpenAI summarization.

4.1 Experimental Setups

We primarily evaluate OSP and baselines built on the popular LLM TinyLlama². Additionally, we extend Mistral-7B-Instruct³ that is proficient in preferring. We leverage two distinct datasets tailored

²<https://huggingface.co/TinyLlama/TinyLlama-1.1B-intermediate-step-1431k-3T>

³<https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2>

Table 1: We compare the performance of OSP with baselines established by TinyLlama using model-based evaluation metrics. Specifically, we consider scores of SteamSHP-flan-t5-xl [20] score for the helpfulness task and fine-tuned GPT-J-6B [21] along with automatic metrics ROUGE for the summarization task. We highlight the best-performing values. All experiments are repeated four times with different seeds, and we report the average scores and standard deviations.

Method	Venue	Online Method	Preference Type	HH Score	TL;DR	
					Score	ROUGE
SFT	-	No	N.A.	0.919±0.001	1.93±0.01	0.271±0.004
DPO	NeurIPS 2023 [5]	No	Binary	0.896±0.041	2.24±0.09	0.273±0.007
IPO	arXiv 2023 [6]	No	Binary	0.925±0.004	2.44±0.03	0.290±0.012
RLHF	NeurIPS 2022 [4]	Yes	Reward	0.932±0.007	2.78±0.11	0.210±0.003
OSP	Ours	Yes	Soft	0.958±0.006	2.97±0.06	0.275±0.007

for different tasks. For the helpful dialogue task, we employ the Anthropic Helpful (HH) dataset [18]. In this dataset, x signifies a segment of conversation involving interactions between a human and a digital assistant. The goal is to train the model to generate a helpful response y in the subsequent turn. For summarization, our experiment uses the Too Long; Didn't Read (TL;DR) dataset [19] proposed by OpenAI. Here, x represents a forum post, while y corresponds to its summary. Hyper-parameters and other experimental details are detailed in Appendix B.

4.2 Alignment Performance Evaluations

We compare OSP with state-of-the-art alignment baselines named SFT, DPO, IPO, and RLHF. The SFT baseline utilizes prompts and exclusively human-preferred answers for supervised learning. DPO [5] employs the contrastive loss of pairwise responses and binary preference labels to align with human preferences. IPO [6] incorporates a constant margin into the DPO loss function to prevent overfitting to offline datasets. Unlike DPO and IPO directly fine-tuning LLMs with offline datasets, RLHF [4] firstly learns a reward model and then uses the online RL algorithm PPO [14] to optimize LLMs. It is important to note that RLHF requires an additional reward model to be maintained, while OSP maintains the same parameter efficiency as offline methods.

OSP is a strong alignment method. Model-based and automatic evaluation results are presented in Table 1. It is observed that DPO experiences slight overfitting on the full dataset even after just one epoch, resulting in responses that are verbose and repetitive, as demonstrated in Table 7. Conversely, IPO avoids overfitting and consistently enhances the performance of DPO. RLHF achieves competitive performances compared to offline baselines except for the ROUGE metric. This discrepancy arises because online methods do not directly fit the offline dataset and instead encourage exploration, whereas ROUGE measures the similarity between a generated summary and a reference summary from the dataset. OSP language models significantly surpass both online and offline baselines across all model-based metrics and improve ROUGE scores over RLHF in the summarization task.

To further assess alignment performance, we evaluate the responses of LLMs trained with different methods using GPT-4 [22], which has been shown to be consistent with human preferences. Results in Figure 3 demonstrate that OSP is a strong alignment method, consistent with the conclusions drawn from model-based metrics. Case studies are available in Appendix C.3. Notably, although the ROUGE scores of summaries generated by OSP are lower than those of IPO, GPT-4 prefers 74 out of 100 OSP summaries over those from IPO. This indicates that OSP language models generate higher-quality summaries than the offline dataset, highlighting the advantages of online methods.




Figure 3: Head-to-head comparison on HH (left) and TL;DR dataset (right), where win rates (%) are evaluated by GPT-4. The winning rate indicates the percentage of samples of methods on the vertical axis that outperform those on the horizontal axis.

Table 3: Comparison of accuracy between preference and reward models with various dataset portions.

	0% Data		2% Data		10% Data		50% Data		100% Data	
	HH	TL;DR	HH	TL;DR	HH	TL;DR	HH	TL;DR	HH	TL;DR
Preference Model	45%	52%	57%	62%	61%	67%	66%	71%	70%	71%
Reward Model	41%	44%	53%	57%	56%	60%	62%	65%	62%	70%




Figure 4: (a~b) Alignment of LLMs established by TinyLlama on OOD generalization tasks. (c) Alignment of LLMs established by Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 without using a human preference dataset. All curves are averaged across 4 seeds, and the shaded area indicates the standard deviation.

OSP language models are sample efficient. Online methods can generate on-the-fly responses and preferences for alignment, reducing the need for extensive and high-quality data coverage. We first ablate portions of the dataset to examine its impact on the accuracy of reward models and self-preference models. Results in Table 3 show that preference models consistently outperform reward models across various portions of both datasets, suggesting that preference models with LLM-as-a-judge are more sample efficient than reward models.

We also evaluate the alignment models of RLHF and OSP when only a small portion of data (2%) is available, corresponding to 1525 samples in the HH dataset and 1850 samples in the TL;DR dataset. For preference augmentation, we utilize 1% human preference samples to construct LLM-as-a-judge instructions, where response A is deemed better than response B, and utilize another 1% by swapping the positions of responses.

Table 2: Alignment performance with 2% data.

	HH	TL;DR	
	Score	Score	ROUGE
RLHF	0.924 ± 0.005	1.82 ± 0.50	0.209 ± 0.029
OSP	0.955 ± 0.002	3.01 ± 0.19	0.257 ± 0.012

Surprisingly, we do not observe a significant performance degradation when the amount of data is reduced to 2%, even when the accuracies of self-preferring decrease. However, RLHF is ineffective with such a small dataset, especially in the summarization task. This is because the accuracy of the reward model learned with 2% TL;DR dataset is only 53%, which is insufficient for RL fine-tuning.

OSP language models can effectively generalize to out-of-domain tasks. RLHF and OSP leverage the generalization abilities of LLMs in both generation and judgment, enhancing OOD tasks without relying on new human preferences. The self-preferring and reward models are trained on the HH dataset. We then evaluate their OOD generalization ability on two SHP datasets [23] from the domains named “askbaking” and “askacademia”. Since SteamSHP-flan-t5-x1 is fine-tuned on both HH and SHP datasets, we can still utilize it to proxy human preferences.

In Figure 4(a) and Figure 4(b), methods with 2% dataset achieve better generalization than ones with the full dataset. Notably, RLHF using the reward model trained with the full HH dataset encounters serious reward hacking problems [24], where optimizing an LLM to pursue maximal training rewards provided by the reward model results in high-reward yet low-quality LLMs that do not align with genuine human preferences. (please refer to Appendix C.1 for curves of training rewards). In comparison, OSP language models do not suffer from overoptimization in these two OOD tasks, confirming the hypothesis that modeling general preferences instead of substituted rewards can potentially avoid reward hacking [25].

OSP language models can self-improve efficiently without preference augmentation. Table 3 indicates that preference augmentation is crucial for TinyLlama. Once the LLM reaches a certain level of proficiency, it becomes possible to bypass preference augmentation and proceed directly




Figure 5: Ablations of OSP language models established by TinyLlama trained on 2% HH dataset with different loss functions, response sampling, and pair construction methods.

to self-preferring and self-improvement. We verify this assumption by conducting experiments on summarization tasks with Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, which achieves an accuracy of 67% on the TL;DR test set without any external training data.

Both offline and online methods mentioned above, except for OSP, cannot perform alignment without high-quality responses or human preferences. Therefore, we compare OSP with Self-Rewarding [12], where the LLM selects the highest and least preferred self-generated response to update LLM itself using DPO. For a fair comparison, we re-implement Self-Rewarding in an online on-policy manner, using the same LLM-as-a-judge instruction as OSP. As shown in Figure 4(c), OSP can significantly improve the summarization ability of fine-tuned Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2. Additionally, OSP is more prompt-efficient than Self-Rewarding, especially when we sample more responses for each prompt, i.e., a larger sample number K . We evaluate the win rate of the OSP language model using 200 prompts with $K = 21$ against fine-tuned Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 via GPT-4. We observe significant self-improvement and the win rate is 95%. Case studies can be found in Appendix Appendix C.4.

4.3 Ablation Studies

SPCE loss avoids overfitting and improves performance. To leverage the preference strength data embedded in self-assessed soft preference labels, we introduce the SPCE loss for OSP language models. When translating soft preference labels into binary format, the SPCE loss reduces to the DPO loss, which is adopted by recent works such as OAIF [10] and SELF-JUDGE [13]. We refer to this baseline as OSP (DPO). As shown in Figure 5(a), the DPO loss is not effective in the online self-preferring setting. This indicates that the online setting is more vulnerable to overfitting (please refer to Figure 9 for loss curves). Compared to DPO, IPO is more suitable for online learning. Our proposed SPCE loss can bring further performance gains than the IPO loss due to utilizing the preference strength information.

Ranked pairing is effective and stable for training. We propose the ranked pairing pair construction method for OSP language models, which aims to cover as many preference strengths as possible. We set a random baseline which pairs responses randomly. RAFT [26] collects multiple response pairs for each prompt and fine-tunes the LLM with the highest self-preferred response. SPIN [27] requires additional SFT datasets and constructs pairs by always regarding self-generated responses as y^l and responses in SFT datasets as y^h .

Figure 5(b) shows that random pairing can work because SPCE loss is aware of complementary preference strength, i.e., $p(y > y'|x) = 1 - p(y' > y|x)$. Our proposed ranked pairing manner is more effective and stable for training due to its broader coverage of preference strength probabilities. RAFT converges to a lower performance because it does not utilize the less preferred responses. We note that the performance of the SFT model surpasses that of the SFT dataset itself. Since a drawback of SPIN is its tendency to converge toward the distribution of the SFT dataset, constructing response pairs in SPIN’s manner is ineffective in this setting.

Effectiveness of online on-policy response sampling. OSP language models adopt the on-policy response sampling. We also compare this on-policy approach with various sampling methods. SFT sampling involves using samples exclusively from the SFT model for updating, which is adopted by SLIC-HF [7]. RSO [28] samples responses via the optimal policy, achievable through rejected

sampling from SFT sampling. Additionally, we establish an offline baseline, which assigns soft preferences to response pairs in the offline dataset and utilizes the SPCE loss to align the LLM.

From Figure 5(c), it is observed that on-policy sampling is more effective than SFT sampling. We hypothesize that exploring broader data coverage benefits online SPCE loss. On-policy sampling promotes exploration compared to SFT sampling and offline datasets. Furthermore, after rejected sampling, RSO’s exploration is further constrained, rendering it ineffective.

5 Related Work

5.1 LLMs Alignment Methods

Based on whether on-the-fly responses and feedback are collected, LLM alignment methods can be classified into online and offline categories. The current dominant approach, RLHF [4] is categorized under online training. Many explorations have been undertaken on this path, aiming to improve training algorithm [29–31], reduce computational overhead [32], learn robust reward models [33] to mitigate overoptimization [24]. Offline methods [5–7, 34] emerged as an efficient alternative to RLHF, bypassing the reward modeling and directly fitting response pairs with binary preferences.

Several studies apply the loss functions of offline methods to the online setting, differing in how to sample responses and construct response pairs. With the help of reward models, RAFT [26] samples multiple responses from the SFT model and selects the responses with the highest rewards to align LLMs using SFT, while RSO [28] proposes to sample responses from the optimal policies to construct response pairs and adopt either DPO or SLiC loss [7]. SPIN [27] does not rely on reward models, treating responses in SFT datasets as preferred and self-generated responses as less preferred to align LLMs using DPO loss. Online on-policy response sampling has been demonstrated to be more effective for aligning LLMs [8, 35, 10, 11]. We adopt the online on-policy manner and propose a ranked pairing method according to preference strengths to construct response pairs.

5.2 Alignment from AI Feedback

Given the high cost of human feedback, one promising strategy involves leveraging feedback from LLMs for supervision through LLM-as-a-judge instructions [36]. RLCAI [37] substitutes human feedback with feedback from a proficiency LLM conditioned solely on a set of written principles. RLAIIF [38] also leverages “off-the-shelf” LLMs to construct training datasets, and then follow the three-step RLHF pipeline to fine-tune LLMs. OAIF [10] applies DPO to the online on-policy scenario, where online AI feedback is sourced from a more robust LLM annotator.

Recognizing that external LLMs are not always accessible, recent studies demonstrate the potential of utilizing feedback from the training LLM itself. RLC [39] employs self-evaluation feedback as rewards and optimizes LLMs with RL. In the context of alignment, self-rewarding language models [12] provide rewards for the generated offline dataset and then optimize LLMs with iterative DPO [40]. More recently, Self-JUDGE [13] fine-tuning LLMs to augment the judging ability to judge self-generated responses and also utilize DPO for optimization. However, all methods mentioned above do not utilize the preference strength information that can be provided via LLM-as-a-judge.

6 Conclusion and Limitations

We proposed online self-preferring language models to align with human preferences using self-generated response pairs and self-judged preference strengths. We design a novel SPCE loss function for OSP language models to leverage such preference strength information for alignment. OSP inherits the advantages of online methods such as generalizing to OOD tasks and self-improving in a more parameter-efficient manner due to self-preferring. Moreover, we demonstrate that modeling preference strengths contribute to mitigating overfitting, improving alignment performance, and enhancing sample efficiency.

Our work has limitations. OSP is more computationally intensive than offline algorithms due to the need for sampling responses and self-preferring. Additionally, we observe that LLM-as-a-judge tends to favor longer responses, resulting in increased output length in OSP language models. Furthermore, OSP language models established by LLMs larger than 7B can be evaluated in future work.

References

- [1] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [2] Jiaming Ji, Tianyi Qiu, Boyuan Chen, Borong Zhang, Hantao Lou, Kaile Wang, Yawen Duan, Zhonghao He, Jiayi Zhou, Zhaowei Zhang, et al. Ai alignment: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19852*, 2023.
- [3] Sergey Levine, Aviral Kumar, George Tucker, and Justin Fu. Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01643*, 2020.
- [4] 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.
- [5] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [6] Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Bilal Piot, Daniel Guo, Daniele Calandriello, Michal Valko, and Rémi Munos. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12036*, 2023.
- [7] Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J Liu. Slic-hf: Sequence likelihood calibration with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10425*, 2023.
- [8] Rémi Munos, Michal Valko, Daniele Calandriello, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Yunhao Tang, Matthieu Geist, Thomas Mesnard, Andrea Michi, et al. Nash learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00886*, 2023.
- [9] Nathan Lambert, Markus Wulfmeier, William Whitney, Arunkumar Byravan, Michael Bloesch, Vibhavari Dasagi, Tim Hertweck, and Martin Riedmiller. The challenges of exploration for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11861*, 2022.
- [10] Shangmin Guo, Biao Zhang, Tianlin Liu, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Felipe Llinares, Alexandre Rame, Thomas Mesnard, Yao Zhao, Bilal Piot, et al. Direct language model alignment from online ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04792*, 2024.
- [11] Yunhao Tang, Daniel Zhaohan Guo, Zeyu Zheng, Daniele Calandriello, Yuan Cao, Eugene Tarassov, Rémi Munos, Bernardo Ávila Pires, Michal Valko, Yong Cheng, et al. Understanding the performance gap between online and offline alignment algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08448*, 2024.
- [12] Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. Self-rewarding language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10020*, 2024.
- [13] Sangkyu Lee, Sungdong Kim, Ashkan Yousefpour, Minjoon Seo, Kang Min Yoo, and Youngjae Yu. Aligning large language models by on-policy self-judgment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11253*, 2024.
- [14] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [15] Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.
- [16] Rui Zheng, Shihan Dou, Songyang Gao, Wei Shen, Binghai Wang, Yan Liu, Senjie Jin, Qin Liu, Limao Xiong, Lu Chen, et al. Secrets of rlhf in large language models part i: Ppo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04964*, 2023.

- [17] Quentin Bertrand, Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, and Gauthier Gidel. On the limitations of the elo, real-world games are transitive, not additive. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2905–2921. PMLR, 2023.
- [18] 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.
- [19] Michael Völske, Martin Potthast, Shahbaz Syed, and Benno Stein. Tl; dr: Mining reddit to learn automatic summarization. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 59–63, 2017.
- [20] Kawin Ethayarajh, Yejin Choi, and Swabha Swayamdipta. Understanding dataset difficulty with \mathcal{V} -usable information. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5988–6008. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022.
- [21] CarperAI. Openai summarize tl;dr reward model checkpoint, 2023. https://huggingface.co/CarperAI/openai_summarize_tldr_rm_checkpoint.
- [22] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [23] Kawin Ethayarajh, Yejin Choi, and Swabha Swayamdipta. Understanding dataset difficulty with \mathcal{V} -usable information. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5988–6008. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022.
- [24] Leo Gao, John Schulman, and Jacob Hilton. Scaling laws for reward model overoptimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10835–10866. PMLR, 2023.
- [25] Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. Concrete problems in ai safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565*, 2016.
- [26] Hanze Dong, Wei Xiong, Deepanshu Goyal, Rui Pan, Shizhe Diao, Jipeng Zhang, Kashun Shum, and Tong Zhang. Raft: Reward ranked finetuning for generative foundation model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06767*, 2023.
- [27] Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01335*, 2024.
- [28] Tianqi Liu, Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, Peter J Liu, and Jialu Liu. Statistical rejection sampling improves preference optimization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [29] Rajkumar Ramamurthy, Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, Kianté Brantley, Jack Hessel, Rafet Sifa, Christian Bauckhage, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Yejin Choi. Is reinforcement learning (not) for natural language processing: Benchmarks, baselines, and building blocks for natural language policy optimization. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [30] Banghua Zhu, Hiteshi Sharma, Felipe Vieira Frujeri, Shi Dong, Chenguang Zhu, Michael I Jordan, and Jiantao Jiao. Fine-tuning language models with advantage-induced policy alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02231*, 2023.
- [31] Tianhao Wu, Banghua Zhu, Ruoyu Zhang, Zhaojin Wen, Kannan Ramchandran, and Jiantao Jiao. Pairwise proximal policy optimization: Harnessing relative feedback for llm alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00212*, 2023.

- [32] Ziniu Li, Tian Xu, Yushun Zhang, Yang Yu, Ruoyu Sun, and ZhiQuan Luo. Remax: A simple, effective, and efficient method for aligning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10505*, 2023.
- [33] Yuanzhao Zhai, Han Zhang, Yu Lei, Yue Yu, Kele Xu, Dawei Feng, Bo Ding, and Huaimin Wang. Uncertainty-penalized reinforcement learning from human feedback with diverse reward lora ensembles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00243*, 2023.
- [34] Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01306*, 2024.
- [35] Corby Rosset, Ching-An Cheng, Arindam Mitra, Michael Santacrose, Ahmed Awadallah, and Tengyang Xie. Direct nash optimization: Teaching language models to self-improve with general preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03715*, 2024.
- [36] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- [37] Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, et al. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- [38] Harrison Lee, Samrat Phatale, Hassan Mansoor, Kellie Lu, Thomas Mesnard, Colton Bishop, Victor Carbune, and Abhinav Rastogi. Rlaif: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00267*, 2023.
- [39] Jing-Cheng Pang, Pengyuan Wang, Kaiyuan Li, Xiong-Hui Chen, Jiacheng Xu, Zongzhang Zhang, and Yang Yu. Language model self-improvement by reinforcement learning contemplation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14483*, 2023.
- [40] Jing Xu, Andrew Lee, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason Weston. Some things are more cringe than others: Preference optimization with the pairwise cringe loss. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16682*, 2023.
- [41] Paul Pu Liang, Chiyu Wu, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Towards understanding and mitigating social biases in language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6565–6576. PMLR, 2021.
- [42] Zhewei Yao, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Olatunji Ruwase, Samyam Rajbhandari, Xiaoxia Wu, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jeff Rasley, Minjia Zhang, Conglong Li, Connor Holmes, et al. Deepspeed-chat: Easy, fast and affordable rlhf training of chatgpt-like models at all scales. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01320*, 2023.

Table 4: Hyper-parameters for our experimental results.

		Helpful Dialogue		Summarization	
		TinyLlama-1.1B	TinyLlama-1.1B	TinyLlama-1.1B	Mistral-7B
generation	sampling method	top- p ($p=0.9$)	top- p ($p=0.9$)	top- p ($p=0.9$)	top- p ($p=0.9$)
	generation temperature	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
	max length for samples	512	768	768	768
	max length for LLM-as-a-judge instructions	768	1124	1124	1124
training	batch size	16	16	8	8
	learning rate	2e-6	2e-6	2e-5	2e-5
	LoRA dimension	-	-	64	64
	LoRA alpha	-	-	32	32
	β	0.001	0.02	0.1	0.1
	sampling number K	7	7	7	7
	epoch	1	1	1	1

A Impact Statements

The focus area of this paper, aligning LLMs with human preferences, is interconnected with a significant line of research aimed at mitigating social bias in LLMs [41]. Given the recent work in the areas moving towards offline methods, our work demonstrates the clear advantage of online methods using self-provided responses and preferences, which is a promising avenue to be further explored. However, as AI systems become more capable, self-preferring for improvement may induce problematic AI behaviors such as power-seeking or other unseen risks.

B Experimental Setup Details

B.1 Hyper-parameters

All experiments were conducted using a single Nvidia A40 GPU. Detailed hyperparameters are provided in Table 4. The only exception is that we observed weaker discrimination of self-preference when only a 2% portion of the HH dataset was available. Consequently, we increased β to 0.02 and K to 9 for this particular setting.

For all baselines, we adhered to the same general hyperparameters unless explicitly stated otherwise. Specifically, we adhere to the hyper-parameters outlined in the DPO paper [5], where $\beta = 0.1$ for the helpful dialogue task and $\beta = 0.5$ for the summarization task. For IPO, we set $\beta = 0.1$ for both tasks. We align LLMs with DPO and IPO for 1 epoch. For the RLHF baseline, the coefficient for the KL penalty is set to 0.05.

We implemented all methods in the paper using DeepSpeed-Chat [42] and adopted most hyperparameters, including the Adam optimizer, learning rate schedule, etc. Note that we modified the supervised fine-tuning step by masking the next-token prediction loss for the prompt sections. Following [42], we fine-tune TinyLlama and Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 in a supervised manner before alignment. Methods presented in Table 1 start from the SFT model fine-tuned with the preferred responses of the full dataset. Methods in Table 2, where only a 2% portion of datasets is available, involved fine-tuning LLMs with the preferred responses of the 2% dataset. For evaluation without preference augmentation (Figure 4(c)), we fine-tuned Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 with 20% prompts and preferred responses from the TL;DR dataset for warm-up before alignment.

B.2 LLM-as-a-judge Instructions

To achieve self-preferring, we delineate the principles embodying human preferences and craft instructions by populating the placeholders highlighted in red. To mitigate position bias [36], we create two instructions for each pair by interchanging the position of the responses.

You are an expert rater of helpful and honest assistant responses. Given the context and the two responses, choose the most helpful and honest response.

Context: <Prompt>

RESPONSE A:<Response A>

RESPONSE B:<Response B>

Which response is better? RESPONSE <A/B>

Figure 6: The LLM-as-a-judge instruction in the helpful dialogue task.

A good summary is a shorter piece of text that has the essence of the original. It tries to accomplish the same purpose and conveys the key information from the original post. Below we define four evaluation axes for summary quality: coherence, accuracy, coverage, and overall quality.

Coherence: This axis answers the question “how coherent is the summary on its own?” A summary is coherent if it’s easy to understand when read on its own and free of English errors. A summary is not coherent if it’s difficult to understand what the summary is trying to say. Generally, it’s more important that the summary is understandable than it being free of grammar errors.

Accuracy: This axis answers the question “does the factual information in the summary accurately match the post?” A summary is accurate if it doesn’t say things that aren’t in the article, it doesn’t mix up people, and generally is not misleading.

Coverage: This axis answers the question “how well does the summary cover the important information in the post?” A summary has good coverage if it mentions the main information from the post that’s important to understand the situation described in the post. A summary has poor coverage if someone reading only the summary would be missing several important pieces of information about the situation in the post. A summary with good coverage should also match the purpose of the original post (e.g. to ask for advice).

Overall quality: This axis answers the question “how good is the summary overall at representing the post?” This can encompass all of the above axes of quality, as well as others you feel are important. If it’s hard to find ways to make the summary better, the overall quality is good. If there are lots of different ways the summary can be made better, the overall quality is bad.

You are an expert summary rater. Given a piece of text and two of its possible summaries, choose the summary that best meets the definitions above for coherence, accuracy, coverage, and overall quality.

Text: <Prompt>

SUMMARY A:<Summary A>

SUMMARY B:<Summary B>

Which summary is better? SUMMARY <A/B>

Figure 7: The LLM-as-a-judge instruction in the summarization task.

C Additional Experimental Results

C.1 Reward Hacking of RLHF on OOD Generalization Tasks

The reward hacking problem, also known as overoptimization [24], primarily arises from imperfect reward models trained on a limited human preference dataset. Specifically, reward models may assign high rewards to certain low-quality out-of-distribution samples, thereby leading to the optimization of LLMs toward learning these undesirable behaviors.

Table 3 shows that the reward model trained on the full HH dataset achieves an accuracy of 62% on the test dataset, while the accuracy of the reward model trained on a 2% portion of the dataset is only 53%. We observe the reward hacking problem when aligning LLMs using RLHF in OOD




Figure 8: Training curves of RLHF with different reward models trained on 2% portion and full HH dataset. The scores of SteamSHP-flan-t5-xl are in blue while the training rewards provided by reward models are in yellow.




Figure 9: Training curves of OSP with different loss functions.

generalization tasks, particularly with reward models trained on the full HH dataset. This could be attributed to the fact that reward models trained on only a 2% portion of the dataset cannot optimize LLMs effectively.

C.2 Loss Curves for OSP Language Models with Different Loss Functions.

In Figure 5(a), it is observed that OSP with DPO loss suffers from severe overfitting in the online setting. To further analyze this issue, we visualize the loss values in this section.

Overall, we observe a slight decrease in training losses in the online self-preferring setting. This is because y^h and y^l are generated by the same LLM π_θ . A small decrease in the DPO loss value can improve the evaluation performance, as shown in Figure 9(a). However, as the DPO loss continues to decrease, overfitting occurs. In contrast, IPO and SPCE loss can mitigate this issue, consistent with our gradient analysis in Section 3.1.

C.3 Case Studies of GPT-4 Evaluations on the Helpful Dialogue Task

In Figure 3, we present the win rates of GPT-4 evaluations of LLMs established by Tiny-Llama and aligned with different methods on the HH dataset. The corresponding case studies are detailed in this section.

For each evaluation, we randomly select 50 prompts from the test sets and have two LLMs aligned with different methods generate corresponding responses. We then use the response pairs to fill in the prompt templates in Figure 6 and impose additional restrictions on the output format. To mitigate position bias, we interchange the positions of responses, resulting in 100 prompts for GPT-4 evaluations of the two methods.

Table 5: GPT-4 prefers OSP over RLHF. For clarity, we include post-hoc annotations in bold, formatted as **[annotation]**. These annotations are not inherent to the model generations.

<p>Prompt</p>	<p>For the following query to a chatbot, which response is more helpful? Query: Human: I like to host guests at my home from time to time, and I am gathering recipes of different dishes and drinks to keep things interesting. I am interested in trying some Mongolian dishes. Can you give me a recipe for Uuz? Assistant: Sure, what are you looking for? Do you want a recipe for a hot, cooked uuz dish? A dip, or condiment? A side dish? A drink? Human: I am looking for a recipe for Uuz. If I understand correctly it is slow cooked mutton. Is that correct? Assistant: Answer A [RLHF]: Patchouli can be grown from seeds or from root cuttings. If you want to grow patchouli from seeds, you'll want to start with seeds that have been grown on a seed-starting tray and have been cooled to 55 degrees Fahrenheit. You'll want to wait a few weeks to a month before you plant them, and then you'll want to plant them in a warm, moist soil. Good luck!</s> Answer B [OSP]: That's correct! Uuz is a traditional Mongolian dish made from slow-cooked mutton, as well as spices like garlic and onions. It's often served with rice or noodles, and is often accompanied by vegetables and side dishes. Uuz is a very popular dish in Mongolian cuisine, and is also often considered a delicacy. Overall, uuz is a really flavorful and beautiful dish, and is a great choice for any party or gathering.</s> FIRST provide a one-sentence comparison of the two answers and explain which you feel is more helpful. SECOND, on a new line, state only "A" or "B" to indicate which answer is more helpful. Your response should use the format: Comparison: <one-sentence comparison and explanation > More helpful: <"A" or "B"></p>
<p>Judgment</p>	<p>While both answers confirm that uuz is a slow-cooked mutton dish, Answer B provides more relevant details about the dish's ingredients, accompaniments, and cultural significance in Mongolian cuisine. More helpful: B [OSP]</p>

Table 6: GPT-4 prefers OSP over SFT. Evaluations involving the interchanging of response positions consistently yield judgments. For clarity, we include post-hoc annotations in bold, formatted as **[annotation]**. These annotations are not inherent to the model generations.

Prompt	<p>For the following query to a chatbot, which response is more helpful?</p> <p>Query: Human: I like to host guests at my home from time to time, and I am gathering recipes of different dishes and drinks to keep things interesting. I am interested in trying some Mongolian dishes. Can you give me a recipe for Uuz? Assistant: Sure, what are you looking for? Do you want a recipe for a hot, cooked uuz dish? A dip, or condiment? A side dish? A drink? Human: I am looking for a recipe for Uuz. If I understand correctly it is slow cooked mutton. Is that correct? Assistant: Answer A [OSP]: That’s correct! Uuz is a traditional Mongolian dish made from slow-cooked mutton, as well as spices like garlic and onions. It’s often served with rice or noodles, and is often accompanied by vegetables and side dishes. Uuz is a very popular dish in Mongolian cuisine, and is also often considered a delicacy. Overall, uuz is a really flavorful and beautiful dish, and is a great choice for any party or gathering.</s> FIRST provide a one-sentence comparison of the two answers and explain which you feel is more helpful. SECOND, on a new line, state only "A" or "B" to indicate which answer is more helpful. Answer B [SFT]: I think that’s right.</s> Your response should use the format: Comparison: <one-sentence comparison and explanation > More helpful: <"A" or "B"></p>
Judgment	<p>Answer A provides more detailed and helpful information about what uuz is, including the main ingredients, how it’s typically served, and its popularity in Mongolian cuisine, while Answer B simply agrees with the query without adding any new information. More helpful: A [OSP]</p>
Prompt (interchanging positions)	<p>For the following query to a chatbot, which response is more helpful?</p> <p>Query: Human: I like to host guests at my home from time to time, and I am gathering recipes of different dishes and drinks to keep things interesting. I am interested in trying some Mongolian dishes. Can you give me a recipe for Uuz? Assistant: Sure, what are you looking for? Do you want a recipe for a hot, cooked uuz dish? A dip, or condiment? A side dish? A drink? Human: I am looking for a recipe for Uuz. If I understand correctly it is slow cooked mutton. Is that correct? Assistant: Answer A [SFT]: I think that’s right.</s> Answer B [OSP]: That’s correct! Uuz is a traditional Mongolian dish made from slow-cooked mutton, as well as spices like garlic and onions. It’s often served with rice or noodles, and is often accompanied by vegetables and side dishes. Uuz is a very popular dish in Mongolian cuisine, and is also often considered a delicacy. Overall, uuz is a really flavorful and beautiful dish, and is a great choice for any party or gathering.</s> FIRST provide a one-sentence comparison of the two answers and explain which you feel is more helpful. SECOND, on a new line, state only "A" or "B" to indicate which answer is more helpful. Your response should use the format: Comparison: <one-sentence comparison and explanation > More helpful: <"A" or "B"></p>
Judgment	<p>Answer B provides more detail and context about the dish, making it more informative and helpful for the person asking the question. More helpful: B [OSP]</p>

Table 7: GPT-4 prefers OSP over DPO. For clarity, we include post-hoc annotations in bold, formatted as **[annotation]**. These annotations are not inherent to the model generations.

<p>Prompt</p>	<p>For the following query to a chatbot, which response is more helpful? Query: Human: I like to host guests at my home from time to time, and I am gathering recipes of different dishes and drinks to keep things interesting. I am interested in trying some Mongolian dishes. Can you give me a recipe for Uuz? Assistant: Sure, what are you looking for? Do you want a recipe for a hot, cooked uuz dish? A dip, or condiment? A side dish? A drink? Human: I am looking for a recipe for Uuz. If I understand correctly it is slow cooked mutton. Is that correct? Assistant: Answer A [DPO]: Yes, you should plant patchouli every year. It's really important to keep it growing, because it's a plant that needs a lot of water and nutrients. When you're growing it in the ground, you'll want to keep it in warm soil, and also make sure it gets plenty of water. You'll also want to make sure it's not too cold or too hot, and also make sure it gets plenty of sunlight. If you're growing it in a container, you'll want to make sure it gets plenty of water, and also make sure it gets plenty of sunlight. Make sure the soil is warm and not too hot or cold, and also make sure it gets plenty of water. You'll want to make sure it gets plenty of water, and also make sure it gets plenty of sunlight. You'll want to make sure it gets plenty of water, and also make sure it gets plenty of sunlight. You'll also want to make sure it gets plenty of water, and also make sure it gets plenty of sunlight. Make sure it gets plenty of water, and also make sure it gets plenty of sunlight. Answer B [OSP]: That's correct! Uuz is a traditional Mongolian dish made from slow-cooked mutton, as well as spices like garlic and onions. It's often served with rice or noodles, and is often accompanied by vegetables and side dishes. Uuz is a very popular dish in Mongolian cuisine, and is also often considered a delicacy. Overall, uuz is a really flavorful and beautiful dish, and is a great choice for any party or gathering.</s> FIRST provide a one-sentence comparison of the two answers and explain which you feel is more helpful. SECOND, on a new line, state only "A" or "B" to indicate which answer is more helpful. Your response should use the format: Comparison: <one-sentence comparison and explanation > More helpful: <"A" or "B"></p>
<p>Judgment</p>	<p>Answer B provides more context and detail about what uuz is and how it's typically served, while Answer A simply confirms the dish and asks a clarifying question. More helpful: B [OSP]</p>

Table 8: GPT-4 prefers OSP over IPO. For clarity, we include post-hoc annotations in bold, formatted as **[annotation]**. These annotations are not inherent to the model generations.

<p>Prompt</p>	<p>For the following query to a chatbot, which response is more helpful? Query: Human: I like to host guests at my home from time to time, and I am gathering recipes of different dishes and drinks to keep things interesting. I am interested in trying some Mongolian dishes. Can you give me a recipe for Uuz? Assistant: Sure, what are you looking for? Do you want a recipe for a hot, cooked uuz dish? A dip, or condiment? A side dish? A drink? Human: I am looking for a recipe for Uuz. If I understand correctly it is slow cooked mutton. Is that correct? Assistant: Answer A [IPO]: No, you can grow patchouli in the ground as long as you keep it watered and make sure it gets enough light. You can also grow patchouli in containers, and you can start with a small container of potting soil or directly in the ground in warm soil. Once the seeds start to grow you'll want to transplant them into individual pots or containers and make sure they get plenty of water. This plant is really all about the ground where they grow and also the care they get when they are growing. You can grow patchouli in the ground in a warm soil, or you can grow it in a container in a cooler climate. You can also grow patchouli in a container in a warmer climate if you live in a cooler climate, but you may need to grow it in a warmer climate in order to get the best growth. You can also start with a small container of potting soil or directly in the ground in warm soil, but the seeds will need to be started in warm soil. Once the seeds start to grow you'll want to transplant them into individual pots or containers and make sure they get plenty of water. This plant Answer B [OSP]: That's correct! Uuz is a traditional Mongolian dish made from slow-cooked mutton, as well as spices like garlic and onions. It's often served with rice or noodles, and is often accompanied by vegetables and side dishes. Uuz is a very popular dish in Mongolian cuisine, and is also often considered a delicacy. Overall, uuz is a really flavorful and beautiful dish, and is a great choice for any party or gathering.</s> FIRST provide a one-sentence comparison of the two answers and explain which you feel is more helpful. SECOND, on a new line, state only "A" or "B" to indicate which answer is more helpful. Your response should use the format: Comparison: <one-sentence comparison and explanation > More helpful: <"A" or "B"></p>
<p>Judgment</p>	<p>While both answers confirm that uuz is a slow-cooked mutton dish, Answer B provides more detail about the ingredients, accompaniments, and cultural significance, making it more informative and helpful for someone looking to understand and prepare the dish. More helpful: B [OSP]</p>

C.4 Case Studies of GPT-4 Evaluations on the Summarization Task

We compare the summaries generated by the fine-tuned Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model with its self-improving version using the checkpoint aligned with 200 prompts via OSP in Figure 4(c).

Table 9: GPT-4 prefers OSP over SFT. For clarity, we include post-hoc annotations in bold, formatted as **[annotation]**. These annotations are not inherent to the model generations.

Prompt	SUBREDDIT: r/AskReddit TITLE: Have I been friendzoned? POST: Before I begin, let me tell you that I am a girl to avoid any confusion later. Also, this is the boy I consider(ed?) my best friend. So me and this boy have been friends for 6 years and we're really close. We are both seniors in high school. He asked me out in October and dumped before Christmas. He gave me reasons like "I don't want to be in a relationship that will have to end when we part for college", "I'm done with high school dating", "I need to focus on myself right now" and the infamous "I just don't want to ruin our friendship". As much as it sucked to hear, I accepted it. He kept sending me messages about how much he wanted me but couldn't have me. Fast forward to yesterday when he tells me he's dating someone. An ex-girlfriend. What? We still hang out and talk like we did before we were dating. TL;DR:
Summary of SFT model	Senior ex-boyfriend dumped me, then wanted to go back to just as friends, ignored how hurt I'd been. Recently found out he has a new girlfriend.</s>
Summary of OSP model	My ex-boyfriend dumped me before Christmas and is now dating an ex-girl friend. He still wants me and keeps telling me he does. Have I been friendzoned?</s>
GPT-4 judgement	Summary B [OSP] more accurately reflects the original post's situation of feeling friendzoned and includes important emotional details of the ex-boyfriend's actions, while Summary A [SFT] omits the detail of the ex-boyfriend dating an ex-girlfriend and the continued communication. Preferred: B [OSP]

Table 10: GPT-4 prefers OSP over SFT. For clarity, we include post-hoc annotations in bold, formatted as **[annotation]**. These annotations are not inherent to the model generations.

Prompt	SUBREDDIT: r/loseit TITLE: The moment I've dreaded my entire weight loss journey is finally here. POST: I got some interesting news today. I was getting new tires put on my car and the mechanic told me it would take an hour to do so I walked down the street to get some water. I passed this laser liposuction/skin tightening spa and decided since I have an hour to kill and a some skin sag from losing 130lbs I'd see what that's all about. During my consultation the doctor looked at my stomach and said verbatim "My technique will do nothing for you, you need a tummy tuck. " The way he explained it was that there is not enough fat on my stomach to make his technique viable. So in short... this actually may all be skin on me and I may be DONE losing weight. The only places he said he knew he could do anything were my love handles and chest. I'm going to get a real medical BMI scan before I make any moves on this so I have hard numbers as to what is actually where but like I said earlier, those numbers could reveal that I'm done with weight loss and it's time to start managing my skin better. I'd just like to point out that I'm not going to do a tummy tuck, down time from that could cost me my job and is just unmanageable (Not to mention invasive surgery scares the shit out of me). This could be a big turning point in my journey and I don't want to take it blindly. Does anyone know anything I could be doing short term to help this out? or any techniques I am overlooking? If I can avoid surgery of any kind I'd like to but if not this seems like the best option right now. TL;DR:
Summary of SFT model	lost my skin gets tighter, more weight, not tummy tuck; still more to do.</s>
Summary of OSP model	Down 130lbs but still have excess skin, doctor suggested tummy tuck but I'm not willing to go under the knife. Need advice on how to manage my skin better.</s>
GPT-4 judgement	Summary B [OSP] accurately and coherently captures the essence of the original post, reflecting the individual's weight loss journey and concerns regarding excess skin, while Summary A [SFT] is fragmented and lacks clarity. Preferred: B [OSP]