

# SIMPER: SIMPLE PREFERENCE FINE-TUNING WITHOUT HYPERPARAMETERS BY PERPLEXITY OPTIMIZATION

Anonymous authors

Paper under double-blind review

## ABSTRACT

Preference optimization has made significant advances in aligning large language models with preference data. However, existing preference optimization objectives require additional hyperparameters that must be extensively manually adjusted to achieve optimal performance, increasing the complexity and time required for fine-tuning large language models. In this paper, we propose a simple yet effective hyperparameter-free preference optimization algorithm for alignment. We observe that we can achieve promising performance simply by optimizing inverse perplexity, which is computed as the inverse of the exponentiated average log-likelihood of the chosen and rejected responses in the preference dataset. The resulting simple learning objective, SimPER, is easy to implement and eliminates the need for expensive hyperparameter tuning and a reference model, making it both learning and memory efficient. We show theoretically that SimPER can avoid overestimation of rejected responses in preference data and is closely related to the total variation distance, encouraging promising mode-seeking behavior for alignment. Extensive experiments on widely used real-world benchmarks: MT-Bench, AlpacaEval 2, and 10 key benchmarks of the Open LLM Leadboard with 5 base models show that SimPER consistently and significantly outperforms existing approaches even without any hyperparameters and the reference model. For instance, despite its simplicity, SimPER outperforms state-of-the-art methods by up to 5.7 points on AlpacaEval 2 and achieves the highest average ranking across 10 benchmarks on the Open LLM Leaderboard. Code for SimPER is publicly available at [this link](#).

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Learning from preference data plays a crucial role in fine-tuning large language models to ensure that pretrained LLMs are aligned with human or societal values and preferences (Bai et al., 2022; Ouyang et al., 2022; Stiennon et al., 2020). In recent years, reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) (Ouyang et al., 2022; Christiano et al., 2017) has been proposed for fine-tuning language models based on human preferences. In the RLHF pipeline (Ouyang et al., 2022), a reward model is first fit to a dataset of human preferences in the form of a classifier between chosen and rejected responses. Next, an LLM policy is trained using RL algorithms such as proximal policy optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017) to generate responses given the input prompts with high reward.

While RLHF produces models with impressive capabilities across diverse tasks, ranging from programming to creative writing, it introduces notable complexities into the training process (Engstrom et al., 2020; Rafailov et al., 2024), involving inefficient and unstable optimization, as well as training on separate reward and policy models. This potentially worsens the sample complexity and compromises efficient convergence. To address these issues, offline preference fine-tuning (Tajwar et al., 2024) methods, such as DPO (Rafailov et al., 2024), IPO (Azar et al., 2024), and KTO (Ethayarajh et al., 2024a), have been proposed to replace RLHF with supervised learning on human preference data. More recently, SimPO (Meng et al., 2024) eliminates the need for a reference model, making DPO more compute and memory efficient. These methods eliminate the need for explicit reward modeling by directly using the *likelihood* of language model policy to define a *implicit reward* fitted to the preference data, while achieving notable competitive performance (Tajwar et al., 2024).

However, these methods require additional hyperparameters that must be carefully tuned as shown in Table 1, and the performance of current preference optimization methods, such as DPO, KTO, IPO,




Figure 1: Evaluation on the MT-Bench Score (1-10) of SimPO and our SimPER across different large language models reveals the high sensitivity and instability of SimPO with respect to its hyperparameter  $\gamma$  across models. In contrast, our SimPER, which operates without any hyperparameters in the objective function, consistently and significantly outperforms SimPO across a wide range of models. Additional experimental evidence on other widely used benchmarks is provided in Section 4.

and others, is highly sensitive to these hyperparameters across different LLMs, as already shown by (HuggingFace, 2023; Liu et al., 2024a; Meng et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024c; Wu et al., 2024a). In Figure 1, we also show that tuning hyperparameters is also crucial to achieve optimal performance with the recent state-of-the-art algorithm SimPO, which eliminates the need for a reference model. This challenge largely prevents us from aligning large language models in large-scale real-world applications, given that a single post-training process for alignment is usually very expensive and takes a long time (Dubey et al., 2024). To this end, we ask a novel and important question: *Can we design an efficient and effective hyperparameter-free preference fine-tuning method for alignment?*

In this paper, we answer this question affirmatively for the first time. We propose SimPER, a simple yet effective offline preference optimization objective that eliminates the need for a reference model and any tunable hyperparameters required by previous works. The key to SimPER is directly optimizing the reverse perplexity of chosen and rejected responses within the preference dataset. Perplexity (Jelinek et al., 1977) is a well-known evaluation metric for language modeling, commonly used to assess a model’s ability to process long text. It is calculated as the inverse of the exponentiated average log-likelihood of the responses. SimPER achieves alignment by solving a reverse perplexity optimization problem, minimizing perplexity over the chosen response while maximizing perplexity over the rejected response, enabling the model to better align with user preferences. For the first time, our simple SimPER validates that perplexity is also an effective optimization indicator for aligning large language models with preference data.

Moreover, our further analysis proves that, unlike optimizing Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD) in SimPO, our algorithm effectively minimizes the Total Variation distance (TVD). From a gradient perspective, the robust nature of TVD balances gradients from positive and negative responses, which ensures that the contribution from negative samples does not overshadow those from its positive counterpart, thereby mitigating the issue of decreasing the likelihood of chosen response during preference optimization as noticed by recent works (Meng et al., 2024; Pal et al., 2024).

We empirically demonstrate that SimPER enjoys promising performance on extensive benchmarks such as the Open LLM Leaderboard (Beeching et al., 2023a), MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2023), and AlpacaEval 2 (Li et al., 2023b). Despite its simplicity, our results show that SimPER consistently and significantly outperforms existing approaches across various large language models, without the need for any hyperparameters and a reference model in the objective function for alignment.

## 2 RELATED WORK

Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) is an effective technique designed to align LLMs with human preferences (Christiano et al., 2017). The training process for RLHF includes

Table 1: State-of-the-art preference fine-tuning losses are compared in terms of properties: hyperparameters, the number of hyperparameters, and the elimination of the reference model (see Appendix B.2 for details of these methods and hyperparameters).

Method	Hyperparameters	#Hyperparameters	w/o Reference Model
DPO	$\beta$	1	$\times$
IPO	$\beta$	1	$\times$
KTO	$\lambda_t, \lambda_w, \beta$	3	$\times$
CPO	$\lambda, \beta$	2	$\checkmark$
SLiC	$\delta, \lambda$	2	$\checkmark$
SimPO	$\gamma, \beta$	2	$\checkmark$
SimPER	-	0	$\checkmark$

three stages: initial supervised fine-tuning (Zhou et al., 2024; Xia et al., 2024), training of the reward model from human preference data (Gao et al., 2023a), and policy optimization using reinforcement learning, notably Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017). While RLHF provides significant benefits in various domains, such as instruction-following (Ouyang et al., 2022), safety alignment (Bai et al., 2022), and truthfulness enhancement (Tian et al., 2023), it requires a more complex training pipeline compared to traditional supervised learning methods.

Recent literature highlights the inherent complexity of online preference optimization algorithms, driving the exploration of more efficient offline alternatives. A notable advancement is Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2024), which eliminates the need for explicit reward modeling by directly using the likelihood of policy to define an implicit reward fitted to the preference data. Inspired by DPO, various methods such as IPO (Azar et al., 2024), KTO (Ethayarajh et al., 2024b), and others (Zhao et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2024a; Xu et al., 2024; Hong et al., 2024) have been proposed. While these approaches are effective, they typically necessitate an extensive search for one or more hyperparameters, as well as the use of a reference model. Recently, SimPO (Meng et al., 2024) removed the need for a reference model in DPO, yet introduced two additional hyperparameters: the reward scaling factor and the target reward margin, which require significant manual tuning. Tuning hyperparameters often entails an iterative trial-and-error process, resulting in substantial computational overhead, particularly for large-scale language models. In this paper, we introduce SimPER, a simple yet effective objective that eliminates the need for costly hyperparameter tuning and a reference model, thus enhancing both learning and memory efficiency in practice. **Although the technique of LoRA (Hu et al., 2021; Dettmers et al., 2024) can also make preference fine-tuning less expensive, this line of work is orthogonal to our approach and studied problem, and they could serve as complementary techniques to further reduce the cost of preference alignment on LLMs.**

Also worth mentioning is a body of work on perplexity (Jelinek et al., 1977) in language modeling. Researchers use perplexity, an evaluation metric aligned with the causal language modeling objective of LLMs, to assess whether a test input falls within the LLM’s expertise and how it relates to the LLM’s pretraining data (Chen et al., 2024b; Marion et al., 2023; Gonen et al., 2023). A lower perplexity indicates that the model’s predictions are generally more accurate, while a higher perplexity suggests that the model finds the content more unpredictable. Recent work (Ankner et al., 2024; Muennighoff et al., 2024) also uses perplexity to identify high-quality subsets of large-scale text datasets that improve performance. Perplexity has also been used to fuse knowledge from multiple models (Mavromatis et al., 2024). As perplexity provides a sequence-length normalized expression of the model’s confidence, recent works have utilized the inverse perplexity score to detect hallucinations (Valentin et al., 2024) and for confidence estimation (Liu et al., 2024b). In contrast to these works, we propose a simple yet effective alignment objective based on perplexity, demonstrating that perplexity is also a surprisingly effective indicator for achieving alignment on preference data.

### 3 THE PROPOSED METHOD

#### 3.1 BACKGROUND

**Notations.** We consider the problem of preference fine-tuning: Let the text sequences  $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots]$  denote the prompt, and  $\mathbf{y}_w = [y_1, y_2, \dots]$  and  $\mathbf{y}_l = [y_1, y_2, \dots]$  denote two responses, sampled from the reference policy  $\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$ . The response pairs are then presented to an oracle who expresses preferences for responses given the prompt, denoted as  $\mathbf{y}_w \succ \mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}$ , where  $\mathbf{y}_w$  and  $\mathbf{y}_l$  denote chosen and rejected responses, respectively. Given dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , containing preference  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l)$ , the goal is to learn a language model policy  $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$  parameterized by  $\theta$  for aligning human preference.

**DPO.** DPO (Rafailov et al., 2024) is one of the most popular offline preference optimization methods. Instead of learning an explicit reward model like RLHF, DPO uses the log-likelihood of the policy to implicitly represent the reward function via a closed-form expression with the optimal policy:

$$r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \beta (\log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) - \log \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})) + \beta \log Z(\mathbf{x}). \quad (1)$$

DPO aims to optimize  $\pi_\theta$  based on the Bradley-Terry (BT) preference model (Bradley & Terry, 1952),  $p(\mathbf{y}_w \succ \mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) = \sigma(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w) - r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_l))$ , and with the following maximum likelihood objective:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ -\log \sigma(\beta \log \frac{\pi(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})} - \beta \log \frac{\pi(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}) \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $\beta$  is a tunable hyperparameter controlling the deviation from the reference model.

**IPO.** The Identity Preference Optimization (IPO) (Azar et al., 2024) also avoids a reward learning process and potentially unstable RL training. Specifically, IPO chooses to directly minimize the following squared loss regression problems by defining an alternative reward function:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{IPO}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \left( \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})} - \frac{1}{2\beta} \right)^2 \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $\beta$  is also a hyperparameter. A potential advantage of IPO over DPO is that these methods don't assume a specific preference model, like BT, and can work with general preference probabilities.

**SimPO.** Simple Preference Optimization (SimPO) (Meng et al., 2024) has recently been proposed to eliminate the need for a reference model in DPO while achieving promising performance. SimPO optimizes the length-regularized probability of response pairs with a margin based on the BT model:

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

where  $\gamma$  is an additional hyperparameter indicating a target reward margin. In practice, minimizing the above preference fine-tuning objective, or any other contrastive objectives such as those of KTO (Ethayarajh et al., 2024b) and SLiC (Zhao et al., 2023) (see Appendix B.2), requires extensive hyperparameter tuning. These hyperparameters (e.g.,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ ) play a critical role in alignment performance, as shown by (Bai et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2024a; Meng et al., 2024) (also see Figure 1), and need to be manually adjusted to achieve optimal performance, significantly increasing complexity and time cost. In this paper, we address this limitation by proposing a simple yet effective alignment objective, SimPER, which eliminates the need for a reference model and any tunable hyperparameters required by previous work, making the alignment process on large language model more efficient.

### 3.2 THE LEARNING OBJECTIVE OF SIMPER

In this section, we elaborate on SimPER. The key idea behind SimPER is to encourage the model to minimize the perplexity of the chosen response while simultaneously maximizing the perplexity of the rejected response within the preference dataset. Specifically, we optimize the inverse perplexity, which is calculated as the inverse of the exponentiated average negative log-likelihood of the response. The average log-likelihood of the response under the policy model  $\pi_{\theta}$  is defined as follows:

$$r_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{y}|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{y}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<i}), \quad (5)$$

where  $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})^{\frac{1}{|\mathbf{y}|}}$  is the defined geometric mean over the sequence of token probabilities. The perplexity is defined as the exponentiated its average negative log-likelihood as:

$$\text{Perplexity}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \exp(-r_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{|\mathbf{y}|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})\right), \quad (6)$$

and serves as a metric closely tied to the causal language modeling objective, allowing us to assess whether a new input aligns with the model's knowledge and how it corresponds to the pretraining data. (Jelinek et al., 1977; Marion et al., 2023; Gonen et al., 2023). Leveraging perplexity as a measurement of how well a language model predicts the response given the prompt, we formulate the alignment with preference data as an optimization problem that does not require any hyperparameters and a reference model during training. Formally, our SimPER learning objective is given as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPER}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = -\text{Perplexity}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) + \text{Perplexity}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) \quad (7)$$

$$= -\exp\left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{y}_w|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})\right) + \exp\left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{y}_l|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})\right), \quad (8)$$

where we directly optimize the reverse perplexity of the chosen and rejected response as the reverse perplexity, i.e., the geometric mean over the sequence of token probabilities, effectively quantifies the model confidence as shown in (Valentin et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024b). Intuitively, SimPER increases the likelihood of the chosen response and decreases the likelihood of rejected response by optimizing the reverse perplexity, effectively aligning the language model with the preference data.

In summary, SimPER employs a simple yet effective formulation that directly aligns with the perplexity generation metric, eliminating the need for a reference model. We empirically find that SimPER still achieves a strong performance without requiring any hyperparameters, unlike previous methods.

### 3.3 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we provide a gradient and divergence analysis to further understand our SimPER,

**Gradient Analysis.** We examine the gradients of SimPER and the state-of-the-art method DPO (Rafailov et al., 2024) and SimPO (Meng et al., 2024) and to glean some insight into the optimization process. Note that our analysis also holds for other methods such as IPO (Azar et al., 2024) and SLiC (Zhao et al., 2023). One advantage of the SimPER framework is that the gradients of both chosen and rejected responses are more balanced, thus, we can prevent the model from overfitting the rejected responses. We first analyze the following gradients of DPO and SimPO:

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = -\beta \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ w_{\theta} \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})} - \frac{\nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})} \right) \right] \quad (9)$$

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPO}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = -\beta \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ d_{\theta} \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}{p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})} - \frac{\nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})} \right) \right], \quad (10)$$

where the weights  $w_{\theta} = \sigma(\beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})})$  and  $d_{\theta} = \sigma(\frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_l|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) - \frac{\beta}{|\mathbf{y}_w|} \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) + \gamma)$  represent the gradient weight in DPO and SimPO, respectively.  $p_{\theta}$  is the geometric mean over the sequence of token probabilities defined in Equation (5). It can be seen that the gradient of the model probability weighted by the reciprocal of the model probability on this rejected response. Intuitively, both gradients of DPO and SimPO also increases the likelihood of the chosen response  $\mathbf{y}_w$  and decreases the likelihood of rejected response  $\mathbf{y}_l$ . If the rejection likelihood  $\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow 0$  or  $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow 0$ , the norm of the gradient on rejected response will become very large, which leads to a huge step of parameter update towards decreasing the likelihood of rejected response compared to the increasing of the chosen response. For instance, in DPO, the gradient ratio between the decrease in the probability of rejected responses and the increase in the probability of chosen responses is as follows:  $\frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})} \cdot \frac{\nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}$ , which becomes infinite when  $\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow 0$ . A larger gradient ratio leads to a faster reduction in the probability of a rejected response compared to that of a chosen response, resulting in a more pronounced decrease for rejected responses, which explains why DPO and SimPO tend to push the model to decrease the likelihood of both chosen and rejected responses during training, as shown in Figure 3 and other works (Meng et al., 2024; Pal et al., 2024; Pang et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024a). This occurs because rejected and chosen responses often share some tokens, leading to a decline in performance on reasoning-heavy tasks, such as math and coding, as demonstrated in several recent studies (Meng et al., 2024; Pal et al., 2024; Pang et al., 2024). For comparison, we calculate the gradient of our SimPER with respect to  $\theta$  using Equation (8):

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPER}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) - \nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})], \quad (11)$$

where the gradient weight of rejected response is not the reciprocal of the model probability of the rejected response, thus has a smaller norm than Equation (10). This means that the unlearning on the rejected responses is more conservative and SimPER reduces the gradient imbalance issue for chosen and rejected responses. As shown in Figure 3, our SimPER effectively prevents the likelihood of chosen responses from decreasing significantly compared to SimPO, while still achieving substantial margins between the likelihood of chosen and rejected responses. Our experiments also show our SimPER significantly outperforms SimPO across various reasoning-heavy benchmarks.

**Divergence Analysis.** We next present a theoretical analysis of SimPER, demonstrating its key properties that are advantageous for fine-tuning LLMs with preferences. Recent works (Tajwar et al., 2024; Ji et al., 2024) identify mode-seeking behavior as a crucial property for preference fine-tuning, as it reduces the likelihood of undesirable, rejected responses. In the following sections, we show that the SimPER loss theoretically promotes mode-seeking behavior by optimizing the Total Variation distance (TVD) between the model distribution  $\pi_{\theta}$  and the chosen data distribution, whereas SimPO promotes mass-covering behavior by optimizing the Kullback–Leibler divergence (KLD). For simplicity, we remove the length averaging from both SimPO and SimPER for the following analysis.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Minimizing SimPO with respect to  $\theta$  is approximately minimizing the Kullback–Leibler divergence between  $\pi_{\theta}$  and the distribution of the chosen response in the preference dataset, while*






Figure 3: The training dynamics during training of SimPER and SimPO with different hyperparameters on the Mistral-7B (Results on Llama3-8B can be found in Section 4.2). We can observe that SimPER exhibits the least decline in chosen likelihoods, while still achieving the most significant increase in likelihood margins of rejected and chosen, compared to SimPO across various hyperparameters.

minimizing our SimPER is approximately minimizing the Total Variation distance.

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPO}} \Rightarrow \min_{\theta} \text{KL}(\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \| \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \log \frac{\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})} \quad (12)$$

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPER}} \Rightarrow \min_{\theta} \text{TV}(\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \| \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} |\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) - \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})| \quad (13)$$

The proof is provided in Appendix A. This theorem demonstrates that SimPER asymptotically optimizes the TVD (Van Handel, 2014) between the chosen data distributions and the model distribution. In theory, while SimPER and SimPO aim to discover identical optimal policies, achieving this in practice would require full data coverage and infinite computation. These requirements are not met in practice, and hence, the choice of divergences and the optimization procedure affects performance. TVD measures the average absolute difference between  $\pi_{\text{chosen}}$  and  $\pi_{\theta}$  in all possible text sequences, and SimPER learns to properly allocate its probability mass to best represent the main portion of the distribution of the chosen response, while ignoring outliers. This promotes **mode-seeking** behavior (Ji et al., 2023), which concentrates the probability mass on certain high-reward regions. In contrast, the KLD in SimPO encourages assigning equal probability to all responses in the dataset, leading to an overestimation of the long tail of the target distribution, as illustrated in Figure 2. This phenomenon also matches the gradient analysis above, where the KLD in SimPO pushes the model to cover all training samples, resulting in an unfocused and rejected distribution.




Figure 2: Illustration of the characteristics of KLD and TVD. While SFT exhibits mass-covering behavior by minimizing forward KL, SimPER exhibits mode-seeking behavior, similar to RLHF (Tajwar et al., 2024), by minimizing TVD.

In summary, forward KLD encourages all chosen responses in datasets to have equal probability, leading to an overestimation of the long tail of the target distribution, whereas reverse TVD sharpens the probability mass on certain high-reward regions of chosen response. Thus, alignment commits to generating a certain subset of high-reward responses, which is more effectively realized by promotes mode-seeking behavior as shown in (Tajwar et al., 2024; Ji et al., 2024).

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

**Models.** Following (Meng et al., 2024), we perform alignment with several families of open-source models, Llama3-8B (Base and Instruct.) (Dubey et al., 2024) and Mistral-7B (Base and Instruct.) (Jiang et al., 2023a). We also use Pythia-2.8B (Biderman et al., 2023; Rafailov et al., 2024).

**Datasets.** For the Llama3-8B-Base and Mistral-7B-Base setups, we follow the same training pipeline as Zephyr (Tunstall et al., 2023) and evaluate SimPER on the widely used benchmark dataset for preference fine-tuning: the UltraFeedback Binarized dataset (Cui et al., 2023; Tunstall et al., 2023). For the Llama3-8B-Instruct and Mistral-7B-Instruct setups, we evaluate using the on-policy datasets generated by SimPO (Meng et al., 2024). Specifically, we use prompts from UltraFeedback and regenerates the chosen and rejected response pairs with the SFT models. For each prompt, it generates five responses using the SFT model with sampling. We then use llm-blender/PairRM (Jiang et al.,

Table 2: AlpacaEval 2 (Li et al., 2023a) and MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2023) results under the four settings. LC and WR denote length-controlled and raw win rate, respectively. Our SimPER can achieve surprisingly good performance without any hyperparameters across various settings.

Method	Mistral-7B-Base			Mistral-7B-Instruct			Llama3-8B-Base			Llama3-8B-Instruct		
	AlpacaEval 2		MT-Bench	AlpacaEval 2		MT-Bench	AlpacaEval 2		MT-Bench	AlpacaEval 2		MT-Bench
	LC (%)	WR (%)	GPT-4	LC (%)	WR (%)	GPT-4	LC (%)	WR (%)	GPT-4	LC (%)	WR (%)	GPT-4
SFT	8.4	6.2	6.3	17.1	14.7	7.5	6.2	4.6	6.6	26.0	25.3	8.1
DPO	15.1	12.5	7.3	26.8	24.9	7.6	18.2	15.5	7.7	40.3	37.9	8.0
SLiC	10.9	8.9	7.4	24.1	24.6	<b>7.8</b>	12.3	13.7	7.6	26.9	27.5	8.1
IPO	11.8	9.4	7.2	20.3	20.3	<b>7.8</b>	14.4	14.2	7.4	35.6	35.6	<b>8.3</b>
KTO	13.1	9.1	7.0	24.5	23.6	7.7	14.2	12.4	<b>7.8</b>	33.1	31.8	8.2
CPO	9.8	8.9	6.8	23.8	28.8	7.5	10.8	8.1	7.4	28.9	32.2	8.0
SimPO	21.5	20.8	7.3	32.1	34.8	7.6	22.0	20.3	7.7	44.7	40.5	8.0
SimPER	<b>22.4</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>48.5</b>	<b>45.7</b>	8.2

Table 3: Evaluation results on various tasks from the Huggingface Open Leaderboard show that our simple yet effective SimPER achieves superior or comparable performance to other, more complex preference fine-tuning methods, despite eliminating both hyperparameters and the reference model. Although SimPO (Meng et al., 2024) also eliminates the reference model, our SimPER demonstrates significant improvements over it across various settings without relying on any hyperparameters. **We also report the results of the initial SFT base models prior to applying any preference optimization.**

	Method	MMLU-PRO	IFEval	BBH	GPQA	MUSR	MATH	GSM8K	ARC	TruthfulQA	Winograd	Avg. Rank
Mistral-7B Base	SFT	27.58	3.54	41.26	28.86	41.93	2.34	28.13	58.28	40.35	76.40	-
	DPO	26.73	10.49	43.27	28.44	43.65	1.36	21.76	61.26	53.06	76.80	4.7
	SLiC	26.52	12.45	42.33	27.93	33.74	1.38	33.74	55.38	48.36	77.35	5.0
	IPO	25.87	11.52	40.59	28.15	42.15	1.25	27.14	60.84	45.44	<b>77.58</b>	5.4
	KTO	27.51	12.03	43.66	29.45	43.17	2.34	<b>38.51</b>	62.37	<b>56.60</b>	77.27	2.5
	CPO	27.04	13.32	42.05	28.45	42.15	2.15	33.06	57.00	47.07	76.48	4.5
	SimPO	27.13	10.63	42.94	29.03	39.68	2.49	22.21	62.63	50.68	77.54	3.8
	SimPER	<b>27.84</b>	<b>15.83</b>	<b>43.99</b>	<b>30.12</b>	<b>43.95</b>	<b>2.57</b>	33.02	<b>63.50</b>	53.64	76.25	<b>2.0</b>
LLama3-8B Base	SFT	31.00	28.27	46.16	31.21	41.27	3.70	46.32	60.15	45.33	75.77	-
	DPO	31.58	33.61	47.80	32.23	40.48	4.53	38.67	64.42	53.48	76.80	4.2
	SLiC	31.11	32.37	46.53	33.29	40.55	3.92	48.82	61.43	54.95	<b>77.27</b>	4.5
	IPO	30.18	31.52	46.78	32.61	39.58	4.02	22.67	62.88	54.20	72.22	6.4
	KTO	31.16	37.10	47.98	33.72	40.21	4.14	38.97	63.14	55.76	76.09	4.0
	CPO	30.95	38.57	47.17	33.15	41.59	4.25	46.93	61.69	54.29	76.16	4.2
	SimPO	31.61	37.55	48.38	33.22	40.08	4.23	31.54	65.19	59.46	76.32	3.4
	SimPER	<b>31.99</b>	<b>41.78</b>	<b>48.62</b>	<b>33.80</b>	<b>46.03</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>51.02</b>	<b>67.06</b>	<b>62.59</b>	76.24	<b>1.3</b>
Mistral-7B Instruct	SFT	27.18	41.52	45.65	28.69	43.19	1.74	40.49	63.57	66.81	76.64	-
	DPO	26.81	22.89	45.46	28.19	<b>46.43</b>	1.89	35.25	66.89	68.40	76.32	3.8
	SLiC	25.69	29.53	45.24	27.04	43.90	1.95	39.65	59.90	65.30	76.32	5.3
	IPO	25.75	27.85	43.81	26.61	43.55	2.02	39.42	63.31	67.36	75.85	5.8
	KTO	27.46	35.42	45.34	28.19	45.77	2.35	38.80	65.72	68.43	75.91	3.2
	CPO	26.85	36.81	45.01	28.15	43.28	2.28	38.74	63.23	67.38	<b>76.80</b>	4.4
	SimPO	27.10	37.52	45.70	28.04	44.71	2.19	35.25	<b>66.89</b>	68.40	76.32	3.3
	SimPER	<b>27.85</b>	<b>39.84</b>	<b>46.17</b>	<b>28.36</b>	44.92	<b>2.51</b>	<b>40.11</b>	66.13	<b>68.78</b>	76.40	<b>1.5</b>
LLama3-8B Instruct	SFT	35.85	47.25	48.86	30.37	38.36	8.38	68.69	61.01	51.66	74.35	-
	DPO	35.86	44.57	48.31	31.04	39.02	8.23	49.81	<b>63.99</b>	59.01	74.66	3.0
	SLiC	33.25	44.01	47.55	30.52	38.10	8.29	66.57	61.26	53.23	<b>76.16</b>	4.6
	IPO	32.97	43.27	46.31	30.95	38.58	8.02	58.23	61.95	54.64	73.09	5.5
	KTO	35.00	40.12	47.15	29.70	38.10	7.63	57.01	63.57	58.15	73.40	5.2
	CPO	34.56	44.08	48.51	30.08	38.81	7.75	67.40	62.29	54.01	73.72	4.4
	SimPO	35.09	43.05	48.95	31.29	39.15	8.16	50.72	62.80	<b>60.70</b>	73.32	3.5
	SimPER	<b>36.68</b>	<b>46.06</b>	<b>49.51</b>	<b>31.71</b>	<b>39.35</b>	<b>8.99</b>	<b>68.61</b>	62.37	55.71	75.72	<b>1.7</b>

2023b) to score the five responses, selecting the highest-scoring one as the chosen response and the lowest-scoring one as the rejected response. For Pythia-2.8B, Anthropic-HH dataset (Bai et al., 2022) is used for dialogue generation to produce helpful and harmless responses (Rafailov et al., 2024).

**Evaluation benchmarks.** Following previous work (Rafailov et al., 2024; Tunstall et al., 2023), we evaluate methods fine-tuned on the benchmarks on HuggingFace Open LLM Leaderboard v1 and v2 (Gao et al., 2023b) and instruction-following benchmarks (AlpacaEval2, MT-Bench). For evaluation on Anthropic-HH, we use GPT-4 for zero-shot pair-wise evaluation, consistent with human judgments (see prompts in Appendix B.1). The task and evaluation details are given in Appendix B.1.




Figure 5: The training dynamics during training of SimPER and SimPO with different hyperparameters on the Llama3-8B-Base. We can observe that SimPER exhibits the least decline in chosen likelihoods, while still achieving the most significant increase in likelihood margins of rejected and chosen, compared to SimPO across various hyperparameters, and better performance as shown in Table 2.

**Baselines.** We compare SimPER with the following preference optimization methods: DPO (Rafailov et al., 2024), SLiC (Zhao et al., 2023), IPO (Azar et al., 2024), KTO (Ethayarajh et al., 2024b), CPO (Xu et al., 2024), ORPO (Hong et al., 2024) and SimPO (Meng et al., 2024). As shown in (Meng et al., 2024), hyperparameter tuning is crucial for achieving optimal performance of preference optimization methods. We thoroughly tuned the hyperparameters for each baseline and reported the best performance. In cases where the baselines are fully tuned and publicly available as outlined in (Meng et al., 2024), we adopt the results they reported. More details of baselines and the hyperparameter search space can be found in Appendix B.2.

#### 4.1 MAIN RESULTS ON BENCHMARKS

**Results on Instruction-following Benchmarks.** In Table 2, we report the performance on the widely-used instruction-following benchmarks: MT-Bench and AlpacaEval 2. A notable improvement in the performance of SimPER on MT-Bench, as well as on AlpacaEval 2, is observed. Notably, the Llama3 fine-tuned by SimPER surpassed the performance of best baseline by 4.9 to 5.2 points on the AlpacaEval 2 win rate across base and instruct settings, demonstrating that SimPER, while eliminating the need for hyperparameters and a reference model, still achieves strong performance. Moreover, SimPER consistently achieves superior performance on LC win rate, demonstrating that it can generate high-quality response without substantially increasing response length. We find that MT-Bench exhibits poor separability across different methods, likely due to the limited scale of its evaluation data and its single-instance scoring protocol. This finding aligns with observations reported in (Meng et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024). Nevertheless, on MT-Bench, SimPER can still consistently achieves superior or comparable performance across various models. Additionally, we provide examples generated by both SimPO and SimPER in Appendix D. These examples demonstrate that SimPER shows strong promise in aligning language models, ensuring that the generated responses are not only high-quality but also better structured and more reasonable.




Figure 4: The win rates, computed by GPT-4, in comparison to the chosen responses of test prompts in the Anthropic-HH dataset.

**Results on Downstream Tasks.** In Table 3, we present a comparative analysis of performance gains in downstream tasks on the HuggingFace Leadboard, along with a comparative ranking across all tasks. As shown in the table, SimPER, despite its simplicity, achieves remarkable improvements over SimPO and DPO, particularly on challenging reasoning benchmarks such as IFEval, MMLU-PRO and Math. Our results demonstrate that SimPER is highly effective in improving performance across various models. Notably, SimPER outperforms the best baseline by 1.48 to 4.2 points on IFEval across various models. The average improvements over SimPO are especially notable in Mistral-Base and Llama3-Base. SimPER, despite its simplicity, achieves the best overall performance. These consistent and significant improvements highlight the robustness and effectiveness of SimPER. In particular, SimPER outperforms the recent SimPO by 19.48 points in GSM8K and 4.23 points in IFEval on Llama3-Base. On GSM8K, SimPER consistently achieves superior performance, though it is occasionally surpassed by CPO on Mistral-Base. We hypothesize that these improvements






Figure 6: Analyzing perplexity density and response length correlation on Mistral-7B-Base and Llama-3-8B-Base. SimPER not only achieves lower perplexity but also does not exploit length bias.

Table 4: Ablation Study Results on Mistral-7B-Base and Llama3-8B-Base: Evaluating the Effects of Removing Length Normalization (w/o LN) and Incorporating a Reference Model (w/ Ref.).

	Method	Open LLM Leaderboard v2						Open LLM Leaderboard v1			
		MMLU Pro	IFEval	BBH	GPQA	MUSR	MATH	GSM8K	ARC	TruthfulQA	Winograd
Mistral-7B Base	SimPER	<b>27.84</b>	15.83	<b>43.99</b>	30.12	<b>43.95</b>	2.57	<b>31.92</b>	<b>63.50</b>	<b>53.64</b>	76.25
	- w/o LN	25.37	1.66	41.76	29.87	44.84	<b>3.25</b>	28.73	59.81	40.57	<b>77.03</b>
	- w/ Ref.	27.31	<b>16.32</b>	<b>43.99</b>	<b>30.54</b>	40.74	2.11	26.91	61.86	43.62	76.72
Llama3-8B Base	SimPER	31.99	<b>41.78</b>	48.62	<b>33.80</b>	<b>46.03</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>51.02</b>	<b>67.06</b>	<b>62.59</b>	76.24
	- w/o LN	30.08	36.31	48.62	32.05	45.37	3.17	44.28	60.58	46.87	<b>76.64</b>
	- w/ Ref.	<b>32.06</b>	36.71	<b>49.30</b>	31.71	41.53	<b>4.61</b>	45.19	63.40	50.84	75.77

over SimPO can be attributed to the reduced decrease in the likelihood of chosen responses; As the likelihood of a chosen response decreases, it results in suboptimal performance, particularly in mathematical reasoning and coding tasks, where the chosen responses are very likely ground-truth answers, as also shown in (Pal et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024b). These observations suggest the strong potential of SimPER in real-world applications due to the elimination of hyperparameters and the reference model in the loss function, making it more computationally and memory efficient.

**Results on Safety Alignment.** The benchmarks used above focus mainly on helpfulness. To further evaluate the effectiveness of SimPER in safety alignment on Pythia-2.8B following (Rafailov et al., 2024), we use the Anthropic-HH dataset. Figure 4 shows the win rates computed by GPT-4 over the chosen responses in the test set of Anthropic-HH. Remarkably, SimPER aligns better with human preferences than SimPO, DPO, and IPO, achieving win rates of approximately 60% against the chosen responses, indicating that SimPER shows strong promise in terms of aligning language models and can ensure that the generated responses are not only high-quality but also safe and harmless.

## 4.2 ABLATIONS AND FURTHER ANALYSIS

**Results on Ablation Study.** In Table 4, we evaluated the effects of removing length normalization (w/o LN) and incorporating a reference model (w/ Ref.) in SimPER on the Open LLM Leaderboard. Removing length normalization generally leads to a decline in performance across most tasks, except for a slight improvement in the Winograd. Incorporating a reference model typically results in a performance decrease. However, it does lead to slight improvements in specific tasks such as IFEval, GPQA, and BBH for the Mistral-7B-Base model, and in MMLU Pro, BBH, and MATH for the Llama3-8B-Base model. Based on this ablation study, we can conclude that maintaining length normalization and removing the reference model generally enhances the performance of our method.

**Analysis on Perplexity Density.** As shown in Figure 6, the analysis of perplexity density on the held-out test set indicates that SimPER consistently achieves a lower perplexity compared to SimPO. Specifically, on Mistral-7B-Base, the density peak of SimPER is reduced by approximately 1 relative to SimPO, and on the Llama-3-8B-Base, it is reduced by approximately 2. These suggest that SimPER is capable of generating more predictable and coherent responses by directly optimizing the perplexity.

**Analysis on Response Length Correlation.** Spearman correlation between response length and log probabilities in Figure 6 shows that SimPER exhibits a significantly lower correlation compared to DPO, and is comparable to SimPO, suggesting that SimPER does not exploit length bias and generate longer sequences. In contrast, SimPER results in a spearman correlation coefficient similar to the

Table 5: The comparisons with various reference model-free objectives, such as ORPO, show that SimPER achieves better performance than other methods, despite eliminating hyperparameters. Additionally, we provide additional results on Arena-Hard, the ablation by removing the exponential operation and also report the average generation length on AlpacaEval 2 as suggested by reviewers.

Method	AlpacaEval 2			MT-Bench	Arena-Hard	LLM Leadboard			
	LC (%)	WR (%)	Length	GPT-4	WR (%)	GPQA	MATH	TruthfulQA	
Mistral-7B Base	SFT	8.4	6.2	914	6.3	1.3	28.86	2.34	40.35
	DPO	15.1	12.5	1477	7.3	10.4	28.44	1.36	53.06
	ORPO	14.7	12.2	1475	7.3	7.0	28.78	2.21	47.91
	CPO	9.8	8.9	1827	6.8	6.9	28.45	2.15	47.07
	SimPO	21.4	20.8	1868	7.3	16.6	29.03	2.49	50.68
	SimPER	<b>22.4</b>	<b>21.3</b>	1520	<b>7.5</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>30.12</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>53.64</b>
Llama3-8B Base	- w/o Exp	7.3	11.4	8353	5.2	4.7	29.70	0.98	46.44
	SFT	6.2	4.6	1082	6.6	3.3	31.21	3.70	45.33
	DPO	18.2	15.5	1585	<b>7.7</b>	15.9	32.23	4.53	53.48
	ORPO	12.2	10.6	1628	7.6	10.8	32.47	4.08	56.11
	CPO	10.8	8.1	2495	7.4	5.8	33.15	4.25	54.29
	SimPO	22.0	20.3	1795	<b>7.7</b>	23.4	33.22	4.23	59.46
	SimPER	<b>25.2</b>	<b>22.9</b>	1757	<b>7.7</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>33.80</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>62.59</b>
	- w/o Exp	10.2	18.6	11230	5.7	2.1	31.53	2.34	54.33

SimPO (Meng et al., 2024). Our results demonstrate that SimPER, despite its simplicity, consistently and significantly outperforms existing approaches without substantially increasing response length.

**Analysis on Response Length Correlation.** Spearman correlation between response length and log probabilities in Figure 6 shows that SimPER exhibits a significantly lower correlation compared to DPO, and is comparable to SimPO, suggesting that SimPER does not exploit length bias and generate longer sequences. In contrast, SimPER results in a spearman correlation coefficient similar to the SimPO (Meng et al., 2024). Our results demonstrate that SimPER, despite its simplicity, consistently and significantly outperforms existing approaches without substantially increasing response length.

**Iterative Preference Learning.** Although our work focuses exclusively on offline settings and does not consider any iterative training processes (Wu et al., 2024b; Zhang et al., 2024; Dong et al., 2024). It would be interesting to explore how SimPER performs in the iterative learning scenario. Specifically, we alternate between generating online preference optimization data and training the Mistral-7B-Instruct model with labeled preference data using the PairRM reward model, following the instruct setup described in the experimental setup. From Table 6, we can see that the iterative version of SimPER generally continues to improve performance with more additional iterations.

Table 6: The results of iterative learning strategy: SimPER generates the preference data from its previous iterations. We found that SimPER consistently improve along with the alignment iteration

Mistral-7B-Instruct	AlpacaEval 2		MT-Bench	LLM Leadboard		
	LC (%)	WR (%)	GPT-4	GPQA	MATH	TruthfulQA
SimPO	32.1	34.8	7.6	28.04	2.19	68.40
SimPER Iter 1	37.8	39.5	7.8	28.36	2.51	68.78
SimPER Iter 2	38.5	41.1	<b>7.9</b>	28.52	2.62	<b>68.92</b>
SimPER Iter 3	<b>40.2</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>29.37</b>	<b>2.65</b>	68.41

## 5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a simple yet effective alignment method for large language models, named SimPER. SimPER eliminates the need for both hyperparameters and a reference model while achieving strong performance. The key idea of SimPER is to directly optimize the reverse perplexity of both the chosen and rejected responses in the preference dataset. Specifically, we minimize the perplexity over the chosen response while maximizing the perplexity over the rejected response, ensuring that the model produces responses with high preference scores. We also provide a theoretical understanding of SimPER, demonstrating that it can mitigate the problem of gradient imbalance between the chosen and rejected responses during optimization. Furthermore, we show that SimPER implicitly exhibits mode-seeking behavior, leading to strong alignment performance. Extensive experiments on widely used benchmarks demonstrate that SimPER significantly outperforms state-of-the-art methods.

## REFERENCES

- Zachary Ankner, Cody Blakeney, Kartik Sreenivasan, Max Marion, Matthew L Leavitt, and Mansheej Paul. Perplexed by perplexity: Perplexity-based data pruning with small reference models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20541*, 2024.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Bilal Piot, Remi Munos, Mark Rowland, Michal Valko, and Daniele Calandriello. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. In *AISTATS*, pp. 4447–4455, 2024.
- 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.
- Edward Beeching, Cl  mentine Fourier, Nathan Habib, Sheon Han, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Omar Sanseviero, Lewis Tunstall, and Thomas Wolf. Open llm leaderboard. *Hugging Face*, 2023a.
- Edward Beeching, Cl  mentine Fourier, Nathan Habib, Sheon Han, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Omar Sanseviero, Lewis Tunstall, and Thomas Wolf. Open llm leaderboard (2023-2024). <https://huggingface.co/spaces/open-llm-leaderboard-old/open-llm-leaderboard>, 2023b.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O’Brien, Eric Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, et al. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. In *ICML*, pp. 2397–2430, 2023.
- Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, pp. 324–345, 1952.
- Huayu Chen, Guande He, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. Noise contrastive alignment of language models with explicit rewards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05369*, 2024a.
- Yukang Chen, Shengju Qian, Haotian Tang, Xin Lai, Zhijian Liu, Song Han, and Jiaya Jia. Longlora: Efficient fine-tuning of long-context large language models. *ICLR*, 2024b.
- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *NeurIPS*, 30, 2017.
- 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 preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Ning Ding, Guanming Yao, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Ultrafeedback: Boosting language models with high-quality feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01377*, 2023.
- Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Hanze Dong, Wei Xiong, Bo Pang, Haoxiang Wang, Han Zhao, Yingbo Zhou, Nan Jiang, Doyen Sahoo, Caiming Xiong, and Tong Zhang. Rlhf workflow: From reward modeling to online rlhf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07863*, 2024.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Logan Engstrom, Andrew Ilyas, Shibani Santurkar, Dimitris Tsipras, Firdaus Janoos, Larry Rudolph, and Aleksander Madry. Implementation matters in deep policy gradients: A case study on ppo and trpo. In *ICLR*, 2020.

- Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. *ICML*, 2024a.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. *ICML*, 2024b.
- Cl  mentine Fourier, Nathan Habib, Alina Lozovskaya, Konrad Szafer, and Thomas Wolf. Open llm leaderboard v2. [https://huggingface.co/spaces/open-llm-leaderboard/open\\_llm\\_leaderboard](https://huggingface.co/spaces/open-llm-leaderboard/open_llm_leaderboard), 2024.
- Leo Gao, John Schulman, and Jacob Hilton. Scaling laws for reward model overoptimization. In *ICML*, pp. 10835–10866, 2023a.
- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation, 12 2023b. URL <https://zenodo.org/records/10256836>.
- Hila Gonen, Srinu Iyer, Terra Blevins, Noah A Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Demystifying prompts in language models via perplexity estimation. *EMNLP*, 2023.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*, 2021a.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset, 2021b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.03874>.
- Jiwoo Hong, Noah Lee, and James Thorne. Orpo: Monolithic preference optimization without reference model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07691*, pp. 5, 2024.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- HuggingFace. Preference tuning: Fine-tuning language models with human feedback. <https://huggingface.co/blog/pref-tuning>, 2023.
- Fred Jelinek, Robert L Mercer, Lalit R Bahl, and James K Baker. Perplexity—a measure of the difficulty of speech recognition tasks. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, pp. S63–S63, 1977.
- Haozhe Ji, Pei Ke, Zhipeng Hu, Rongsheng Zhang, and Minlie Huang. Tailoring language generation models under total variation distance. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- Haozhe Ji, Cheng Lu, Yilin Niu, Pei Ke, Hongning Wang, Jun Zhu, Jie Tang, and Minlie Huang. Towards efficient and exact optimization of language model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00856*, 2024.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023a.
- Dongfu Jiang, Xiang Ren, and Bill Yuchen Lin. Llm-blender: Ensembling large language models with pairwise ranking and generative fusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02561*, 2023b.
- Diederik P Kingma. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Hector Levesque, Ernest Davis, and Leora Morgenstern. The winograd schema challenge. In *Thirteenth international conference on the principles of knowledge representation and reasoning*, 2012.

- Tianle Li, Wei-Lin Chiang, Evan Frick, Lisa Dunlap, Banghua Zhu, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. From live data to high-quality benchmarks: The arena-hard pipeline, april 2024. *URL* <https://lmsys.org/blog/2024-04-19-arena-hard>, 2024.
- Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models. *GitHub repository*, 2023a.
- Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models, 2023b.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (eds.), *ACL*, pp. 3214–3252, 2022.
- Tianlin Liu, Shangmin Guo, Leonardo Bianco, Daniele Calandriello, Quentin Berthet, Felipe Llinares-López, Jessica Hoffmann, Lucas Dixon, Michal Valko, and Mathieu Blondel. Decoding-time realignment of language models. *ICML*, 2024a.
- Xin Liu, Muhammad Khalifa, and Lu Wang. Litcab: Lightweight language model calibration over short-and long-form responses. *ICLR*, 2024b.
- Yixin Liu, Pengfei Liu, and Arman Cohan. Understanding reference policies in direct preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.13709*, 2024c.
- Max Marion, Ahmet Üstün, Luiza Pozzobon, Alex Wang, Marzieh Fadaee, and Sara Hooker. When less is more: Investigating data pruning for pretraining llms at scale. *ArXiv*, 2023.
- Costas Mavromatis, Petros Karypis, and George Karypis. Pack of llms: Model fusion at test-time via perplexity optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11531*, 2024.
- Yu Meng, Mengzhou Xia, and Danqi Chen. Simpo: Simple preference optimization with a reference-free reward. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14734*, 2024.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Alexander Rush, Boaz Barak, Teven Le Scao, Nouamane Tazi, Aleksandra Piktus, Sampo Pyysalo, Thomas Wolf, and Colin A Raffel. Scaling data-constrained language models. *NeurIPS*, 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. *NeurIPS*, pp. 27730–27744, 2022.
- Arka Pal, Deep Karkhanis, Samuel Dooley, Manley Roberts, Siddhartha Naidu, and Colin White. Smaug: Fixing failure modes of preference optimisation with dpo-positive. *Arxiv*, 2024.
- Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, Kyunghyun Cho, He He, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason Weston. Iterative reasoning preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19733*, 2024.
- 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. *NeurIPS*, 36, 2024.
- David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R. Bowman. Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark, 2023. *URL* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.12022>.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, pp. 99–106, 2021.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.



- Zayne Sprague, Xi Ye, Kaj Bostrom, Swarat Chaudhuri, and Greg Durrett. Musr: Testing the limits of chain-of-thought with multistep soft reasoning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.16049>.
- Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. Learning to summarize with human feedback. *NeurIPS*, pp. 3008–3021, 2020.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Denny Zhou, and Jason Wei. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.09261>.
- Fahim Tajwar, Anikait Singh, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Jeff Schneider, Tengyang Xie, Stefano Ermon, Chelsea Finn, and Aviral Kumar. Preference fine-tuning of llms should leverage suboptimal, on-policy data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14367*, 2024.
- Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Huaxiu Yao, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Fine-tuning language models for factuality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08401*, 2023.
- Lewis Tunstall, Edward Beeching, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Kashif Rasul, Younes Belkada, Shengyi Huang, Leandro von Werra, Cl  mentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, et al. Zephyr: Direct distillation of lm alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16944*, 2023.
- Simon Valentin, Jinmiao Fu, Gianluca Detommaso, Shaoyuan Xu, Giovanni Zappella, and Bryan Wang. Cost-effective hallucination detection for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21424*, 2024.
- Ramon Van Handel. Probability in high dimension. *Lecture Notes (Princeton University)*, pp. 2–3, 2014.
- Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, Tianle Li, Max Ku, Kai Wang, Alex Zhuang, Rongqi Fan, Xiang Yue, and Wenhui Chen. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01574>.
- Yuqiao Wen, Zichao Li, Wenyu Du, and Lili Mou. f-divergence minimization for sequence-level knowledge distillation. In *ACL*, pp. 10817–10834, 2023.
- Junkang Wu, Yuexiang Xie, Zhengyi Yang, Jiancan Wu, Jinyang Gao, Bolin Ding, Xiang Wang, and Xiangnan He. beta-dpo: Direct preference optimization with dynamic beta. *Arxiv*, 2024a.
- Yue Wu, Zhiqing Sun, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, Yiming Yang, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play preference optimization for language model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00675*, 2024b.
- Mengzhou Xia, Sadhika Malladi, Suchin Gururangan, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. Less: Selecting influential data for targeted instruction tuning. In *ICML*, 2024.
- Haoran Xu, Amr Sharaf, Yunmo Chen, Weiting Tan, Lingfeng Shen, Benjamin Van Durme, Kenton Murray, and Young Jin Kim. Contrastive preference optimization: Pushing the boundaries of llm performance in machine translation. In *ICML*, 2024.
- Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Chuanqi Tan, Wei Wang, Songfang Huang, and Fei Huang. Rrhf: Rank responses to align language models with human feedback. *NeurIPS*, 2024a.
- Lifan Yuan, Ganqu Cui, Hanbin Wang, Ning Ding, Xingyao Wang, Jia Deng, Boji Shan, Huimin Chen, Ruobing Xie, Yankai Lin, et al. Advancing llm reasoning generalists with preference trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02078*, 2024b.
- Shenao Zhang, Donghan Yu, Hiteshi Sharma, Han Zhong, Zhihan Liu, Ziyi Yang, Shuohang Wang, Hany Hassan, and Zhaoran Wang. Self-exploring language models: Active preference elicitation for online alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19332*, 2024.
- 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.

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. In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2023.

Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinivasan Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *NeurIPS*, 36, 2024.

Jeffrey Zhou, Tianjian Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Siddhartha Brahma, Sujoy Basu, Yi Luan, Denny Zhou, and Le Hou. Instruction-following evaluation for large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07911>.

## A PROOFS OF THEOREM 3.1

To prove Theorem 3.1 in the main paper, we first present the following Lemmas:

**Lemma A.1.** *Given the model conditional distribution  $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<i})$  and data distribution  $\pi_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<i})$ , then we have the following relationship between the sequence-level TVD objective and its token-level factorization:*

$$\text{TV}(\pi_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}), \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim \pi_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \text{TV}(\pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i), \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)) \right], \quad (14)$$

where  $\pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)$  and  $\pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)$  are shorts for  $\pi_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<i})$  and  $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<i})$ , respectively.

*Proof.* We start by re-writing the TVD loss in the following recursive form:

$$\text{TV}(\pi_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}), \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} |\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}) - \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})| \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{|\mathbf{y}|}} \left| \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<i}) - \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<i}) \right| \quad (16)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{|\mathbf{y}|}} \left| \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i) - \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i) \right| \quad (17)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_i} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \pi_{\text{data}}^{<j}(\mathbf{y}_j) \left| \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i) - \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i) \right| \sum_{\mathbf{y}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{|\mathbf{y}|}} \prod_{t=i+1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_\theta^{<t}(\mathbf{y}_t) \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_i} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \pi_{\text{data}}^{<j}(\mathbf{y}_j) |\pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i) - \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)| \quad (19)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_i} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{<i} \sim \pi_{\text{data}}} \left[ |\pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i) - \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)| \right] \quad (20)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim \pi_{\text{data}}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \text{TV}(\pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i), \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)) \right], \quad (21)$$

where Equation (16) breaks the sequence-level summation into the steps and Equation (18) applies the following triangle inequality (Wen et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2023):

$$\left| \prod_{t=1}^T a_t - \prod_{t=1}^T b_t \right| \leq \sum_{t=1}^T |a_t - b_t| \cdot \left( \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} a_i \right) \cdot \left( \prod_{j=t+1}^T b_j \right), \quad (22)$$

and Equation (19) marginalizes out variables  $\mathbf{y}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{|\mathbf{y}|}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** *Minimizing the SimPO objective in Equation (4) with respect to  $\theta$  reduces the Kullback–Leibler divergence between  $\pi_\theta$  and the distribution of chosen response in preference dataset:*

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPO}} \Rightarrow \min_{\theta} \text{KL}(\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}) \parallel \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}) \log \frac{\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})}{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})} \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* Recall that the objective of SimPO without hyperparameters is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPO}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ -\log \sigma(\log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_w \mid \mathbf{x}) - \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}_l \mid \mathbf{x})) \right]. \quad (24)$$

We connect this objective to a distribution matching problem by defining an energy-based model:

$$\pi(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \exp(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) / Z(\mathbf{x}), \quad (25)$$

where  $Z(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y}} \exp(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$ . We then frame the task as minimizing the KL divergence between the policy  $\pi$  and the distribution  $\pi_{\text{chosen}}$  that generates the chosen response. The goal is to learn the reward model  $r$  such that the model distribution imitates the chosen data distribution:

$$\min_r \text{KL}(\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \| \pi(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})). \quad (26)$$

Minimizing the above forward KL divergence with the chosen responses on preference data gives us:

$$\min_r \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ -\log \frac{\exp(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w))}{Z(\mathbf{x})} \right] = \quad (27)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ -r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w) + \log \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})} \left[ \frac{\exp(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))}{q(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})} \right] \right]. \quad (28)$$

The equality follows due to importance sampling under distribution  $q$ . A choice that simplifies the above expression is  $q(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{Y} = \mathbf{y}_l) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{Y} = \mathbf{y}_w)$ . In this case, the sample-based approximation of Equation (28) gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_r \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} & \left[ -r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w) + \log(\exp(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w)) + \exp(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_l))) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ -\log \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_l) - r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w))} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

One can easily see that the above loss is exactly the same as the reward loss function in RLHF (Rafailov et al., 2024). By optimizing this loss function, one can directly obtain the optimal policy via Equation (25). Unfortunately, even if we use the estimate  $r$ , it is still expensive to estimate the partition function  $Z(\mathbf{x})$ , which makes this representation hard to utilize in practice and significantly higher inference cost (Rafailov et al., 2024). To address this problem, we apply the following knowledge distillation loss, which distills the optimal policy in Equation (25) into an analytical policy:

$$\min_{\pi_\theta} \text{KL}(\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \| \exp(r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) / Z(\mathbf{x})), \quad (30)$$

This gives the following loss after removing multiplicative and additive constants:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})} [r_\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})], \quad (31)$$

One can observe that this knowledge distillation objective directly corresponds to the RL objective in RLHF, as shown in (Rafailov et al., 2024). Similar to the derivation in (Rafailov et al., 2024), which uses an analytical mapping from reward functions to optimal policies in Equation (31), combining Equation (29) results in the SimPO objective in Equation (24). Therefore, performing distribution matching over the chosen responses using KL divergence  $\text{KL}(\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \| \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}))$  is equivalent to solving an entropy-regularized RLHF problem, as well as the SimPO objective.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Minimizing SimPO with respect to  $\theta$  is approximately minimizing the Kullback–Leibler divergence between  $\pi_\theta$  and the distribution of the chosen response in the preference dataset, while minimizing our SimPER is approximately minimizing the Total Variation distance.*

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPO}} \Rightarrow \min_{\theta} \text{KL}(\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \| \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \log \frac{\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})} \quad (32)$$

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPER}} \Rightarrow \min_{\theta} \text{TV}(\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \| \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} |\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) - \pi_\theta(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})| \quad (33)$$

*Proof.* Given that  $\mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}}(\mathbf{y}_i) = \pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)$ , where  $\mathbf{y}_i$  represents the observed one-hot distribution with only the  $w$ -th index of the observed token being 1 and the others being 0, we have

$$\text{TV}(\pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i), \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_i} |\pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i) - \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)| \quad (34)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_i} |\mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}}[\mathbf{y}_i] - \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)| \quad (35)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}} \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{y}_i} |\mathbf{y}_i - \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)| \right] = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}} \left[ \text{TV}(\mathbf{y}_i, \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)) \right] \quad (36)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}} \left[ 1 - \sum_{\mathbf{y}_i} \min(\mathbf{y}_i, \pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)) \right] = -\pi_\theta^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i). \quad (37)$$

Combing the above with Lemma A.1, we have:

$$\text{TV}(\pi_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}), \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim \pi_{\text{data}}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \text{TV}(\pi_{\text{data}}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i), \pi_{\theta}^{<i}(\mathbf{y}_i)) \right] \quad (38)$$

$$= -\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim \pi_{\text{data}}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<i}) \right]. \quad (39)$$

Recall that the objective of SimPER, without length-averaging, is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SimPER}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = -\exp(\log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w \mid \mathbf{x})) + \exp(\log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l \mid \mathbf{x})) \quad (40)$$

$$\geq -\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w \mid \mathbf{x}) \geq \text{TV}(\pi_{\text{chosen}}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}), \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x})). \quad (41)$$

Combining Equation (41) and Lemma A.2 completes the whole proof.  $\square$

## B EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

### B.1 DOWNSTREAM TASK EVALUATION

This section is for the detailed introduction to the evaluation of downstream tasks. For models fine-tuned on UltraFeedback Binarized, following previous works (Rafailov et al., 2024; Tunstall et al., 2023), we evaluated them on HuggingFace Open LLM Leaderboard v1<sup>1</sup> and v2<sup>2</sup> (Beeching et al., 2023b; Fourier et al., 2024), encompassing ten tasks: MMUL-PRO (Wang et al., 2024), IFEval (Zhou et al., 2023), BBH (Suzgun et al., 2022), GPQA (Rein et al., 2023), MUSR (Sprague et al., 2024), MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021b), GSM8k (Cobbe et al., 2021), ARC (Clark et al., 2018), TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2022) and Winogrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2021) provided by the Language Model Evaluation Harness library (Gao et al., 2023b). In addition to the leaderboard, we also evaluated them on two instruction-following benchmarks AlpacaEval2 (Li et al., 2023b) and MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2023). For models fine-tuned on Anthropic-HH for safety alignment, following previous works (Rafailov et al., 2024), we use GPT-4 for zero-shot pair-wise evaluation, which is shown to be consistent with human judgments.

**Massive Multitask Language Understanding Professional:** MMUL-PRO is an enhanced version of the MMLU dataset (Hendrycks et al., 2021a), addressing previous shortcomings by increasing choice options in multiple-choice questions and refining question quality through expert review, making it more challenging and less prone to data contamination.

**Instruction-Following Evaluation:** IFEval is a benchmark evaluating a model’s ability to follow explicit instructions, emphasizing adherence to formatting over content generation.

**Big Bench Hard:** BBH is a selection of 23 challenging tasks from the BigBench, focusing on areas like multistep arithmetic, algorithmic reasoning, language understanding, and world knowledge.

**Graduate-Level Google-Proof Q&A:** GPQA is a challenging benchmark composed of advanced questions developed by PhD-level experts across various fields like biology, physics, and chemistry.

**Multistep Soft Reasoning:** MUSR is a challenging benchmark consisting of algorithmically generated complex scenarios requiring integrated reasoning and long-range context understanding ability.

**MATH:** MATH is a benchmark consisting of high-school level competition problems gathered from multiple sources, consistently formatted with LaTeX for equations and Asymptote for diagrams.

**GSM8K:** GSM8K is a benchmark consisting of diverse grade school math word problems designed to evaluate a model’s capability in solving multi-step mathematical reasoning problems.

**AI2 Reasoning Challenge:** ARC is a benchmark consists of grade-school science questions.

**TruthfulQA:** TruthfulQA is a benchmark fore the truthfulness of a model in generating responses to questions, including 817 questions across 38 categories such as health, law, finance, and politics.

<sup>1</sup>[https://huggingface.co/spaces/open-llm-leaderboard-old/open\\_llm\\_leaderboard](https://huggingface.co/spaces/open-llm-leaderboard-old/open_llm_leaderboard)

<sup>2</sup>[https://huggingface.co/spaces/open-llm-leaderboard/open\\_llm\\_leaderboard](https://huggingface.co/spaces/open-llm-leaderboard/open_llm_leaderboard)



**Winogrande:** Winogrande is a large-scale benchmark for commonsense reasoning, inspired by WSC benchmark (Levesque et al., 2012), but adjusted to improve both the scale and the hardness.

**AlpacaEval 2.0:** AlpacaEval 2.0 is a LLM-based automatic evaluator for instruction-following language models, which is fast, cheap, replicable, and validated against 20K human annotations.

**MT Bench:** MT-bench is an evaluator featuring challenging, multi-turn, open-ended questions to assess chat assistants, which automates the evaluation process by using advanced LLMs as judges.

**Safety Evaluation:** To evaluate the safety of the Anthropic HH trained model, the Anthropic HH test set is used as the evaluation dataset. The preferred responses within this test set serve as the baseline. GPT-4 is then employed to determine the winner, which is shown to be consistent with human judgments. We use gpt-4-0314 for all our experiments. The specific prompts used for the GPT-4 evaluation are detailed below.

---

For the following dialogue history to a chatbot, which response is more helpful and harmless?

Dialogue history:  
{dialogue history}

Response 1:  
{Response 1}

Response 2:  
{Response 2}

FIRST provide a one-sentence comparison of the two responses and explain which you feel is more helpful and harmless. SECOND, on a new line, state only "1" or "2" to indicate which response is more helpful and harmless. Your response should use the format:  
Comparison: <one-sentence comparison and explanation>  
More helpful: <"1" or "2">

---

Table 7: Prompt for GPT-4 evaluation for the safety alignment task on the Anthropic-HH dataset. {dialogue history}, {Response 1} and {Response 2} are placeholders.

## B.2 BASELINE METHODS

This section provides a detailed introduction to state-of-the-art baselines for preference fine-tuning, with an emphasis on the usage of hyperparameters in their loss functions.

**DPO** Direct Preference Optimization (Rafailov et al., 2024) uses log-likelihood differences to implicitly represent the reward function, eliminating the need for explicit reward model like RLHF. DPO involves one tunable hyperparameter,  $\beta$ , which controls the deviation from the reference model.

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

**IPO** Identity Preference Optimization (Azar et al., 2024) minimizes a squared loss regression problem by defining an alternative reward function, avoiding unstable RL training. IPO involves one hyperparameter,  $\beta$ , to adjust the reward margin.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{IPO}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_w, \mathbf{y}_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \left( \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x}) \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})} - \frac{1}{2\beta} \right)^2 \right].$$

**CPO** Contrastive Preference Optimization (Xu et al., 2024) uses log-likelihood as the reward and is trained alongside a Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) objective. CPO involves two hyperparameters:  $\beta$ , which scales the log probabilities, and  $\lambda$ , which weights the SFT component.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CPO}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = -\log \sigma(\beta \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) - \beta \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})) - \lambda \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}).$$

Table 8: The performance comparison without pairwise preference data. A ratio of 50% indicates that in half of the preference pairs, one chosen response or rejected response is randomly discarded.

Llama3-8B-Base	AlpacaEval 2		LLM Leadboard		
	LC (%)	WR (%)	ARC	TruthfulQA	GSM8K
SimPO	22.0	20.3	65.19	59.46	31.54
KTO	14.2	12.4	63.14	55.76	38.97
KTO (50%)	12.7	10.5	65.52	58.73	45.31
SimPER	25.2	22.9	67.06	62.59	51.02
SimPER (50%)	23.5	21.3	68.31	63.25	49.16

**SLiC** Sequence Likelihood Calibration (Zhao et al., 2023) directly uses log-likelihood and includes a SFT objective. SLiC involves two hyperparameters:  $\delta$ , which sets the margin for the ranking loss, and  $\lambda$ , which weights the SFT component.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SLiC}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = \max(0, \delta - \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}) + \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})) - \lambda \log \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x}).$$

**SimPO** Simple Preference Optimization (Meng et al., 2024) eliminates the need for a reference model and optimizes a length-regularized probability of response pairs. SimPO involves two hyperparameters:  $\beta$  to scale the log probabilities and  $\gamma$  to adjust the reward margin.

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

**KTO** Kahneman-Tversky Optimization (Ethayarajh et al., 2024b) learns from non-paired preference data. KTO involves three hyperparameters:  $\beta$ , which controls the deviation from the reference model;  $\lambda_w$  and  $\lambda_l$ , which weight the preference components for winning and losing responses, respectively.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{KTO}}(\theta; \mathcal{D}) = -\lambda_w \sigma \left( \beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_w | \mathbf{x})} - z_{\text{ref}} \right) + \lambda_l \sigma \left( z_{\text{ref}} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y}_l | \mathbf{x})} \right), \quad (42)$$

$$\text{where } z_{\text{ref}} = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \beta \text{KL}(\pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) || \pi_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})) \right].$$




Figure 7: The training dynamics during the training of DPO and SimPER without the exponential operation (SimPER w/o exp) on the Mistral-7B-Base similar to Figure 3. We observe that in both DPO and SimPER w/o exp, the likelihood for the chosen response continues to decrease, while our SimPER can alleviate this issue, as shown in Figure 3.

### B.3 IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

**Training Hyperparameters.** For general hyperparameters, we adhered strictly to the settings used in SimPO. We applied the following hyperparameters: For the SFT stage, we use a learning rate of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ . For both the SFT and the preference optimization stages, we use a batch size of 128, a maximum sequence length of 2048, and a cosine learning rate schedule with 10% warmup steps for one epoch, all through the Adam optimizer (Kingma, 2014). We maintain these settings consistently to ensure uniformity and comparability across experiments.

For method-specific hyperparameters, we also followed the search strategy from SimPO, noting that our method does not require any additional hyperparameters beyond the learning rate. Specifically, for different baseline methods, each with its own set of additional hyperparameters, the search strategy is in Table 9. Each method is individually search for the learning rates in  $[3e-7, 5e-7, 6e-7, 1e-6]$ .

**Evaluation Hyperparameters.** The hyperparameters for evaluation on AlpacaEval 2 adhere to SimPO, with a temperature of 0.7 for the Mistral-Base setting, a temperature of 0.5 for the Mistral-Instruct setting, and a temperature of 0.9 for both Llama3 settings. The hyperparameters for evaluation on MT-Bench are set according to the official decoding configuration, which specifies distinct sampling temperatures for various categories.

Table 9: Search ranges for hyperparameters across baseline methods

Method	Hyperparameter Search Range	Method	Hyperparameter Search Range
DPO	$\beta \in [0.01, 0.05, 0.1]$	SLiC	$\lambda \in [0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 10.0]$ $\delta \in [0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0]$
IPO	$\tau \in [0.01, 0.1, 0.5, 1.0]$	KTO	$\lambda_t = \lambda_w = 1.0$ $\beta \in [0.01, 0.05, 0.1]$
CPO	$\lambda = 1.0$ $\beta \in [0.01, 0.05, 0.1]$	SimPO	$\beta \in [2.0, 2.5]$ $\gamma \in [0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6]$

**Computation Resources.** All the training experiments in this paper were conducted on  $4 \times$  NVIDIA A100 (80G) GPUs with 128 batchsize, based on the alignment-handbook repo.<sup>3</sup>




Figure 8: Sensitivity of various baseline methods such as DPO, KTO and IPO to hyperparameter  $\beta$  across Mistral-7B-Base and Mistral-7B-Instruct on MT-Bench.

## C ADDITIONAL RESULTS

Different from the pairwise contrastive preference losses (Rafailov et al., 2024; Azar et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024a), the objective of SimPER in Equation (8) only requires either single chosen or rejected samples without the need for pairwise preference data. To test this, we randomly discarded the chosen responses or rejected responses in increasingly large fractions of pairwise data for aligning the Llama3-8B-Base model. These additional results in Table 8 demonstrate that even without pairwise data (e.g., discarding up to 50% of the chosen or rejected responses), SimPER still outperforms SimPO and performs better than the baseline KTO, which also does not require pairwise data.

Table 10: Performance comparison on Qwen2-1.5B-Instruct and Gemma2-9B-Instruct models.

	Method	AlpacaEval 2		Arena-Hard	LLM Leadboard	
		LC (%)	WR (%)	WR (%)	GSM8K	TruthfulQA
Qwen2-1.5B Instruct	SFT	5.42	3.55	2.5	59.32	28.37
	DPO	8.71	6.05	4.0	65.31	34.59
	SimPO	10.11	7.52	4.9	68.21	39.37
	SimPER	<b>12.59</b>	<b>9.31</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>72.75</b>	<b>40.33</b>
Gemma2-9B Instruct	SFT	51.15	38.19	40.8	68.63	50.27
	DPO	67.82	58.31	57.3	75.41	54.21
	SimPO	72.44	65.90	59.1	88.02	55.19
	SimPER	<b>73.85</b>	<b>67.21</b>	<b>60.8</b>	<b>89.75</b>	<b>55.28</b>

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/huggingface/alignment-handbook>

## D CASE STUDY

In this section, we present examples of comparisons between SimPER and the baseline SimPO.

<b>Prompt</b>	Does the 5 second rule actually exist?
<b>SimPER</b>	<p>The "5 second rule" is an urban legend that claims that if food falls on the floor, it is still safe to eat as long as you pick it up within 5 seconds. However, this rule is not a scientifically proven fact, and there is no evidence to support it. Here are some reasons why the 5-second rule is not a reliable method for determining food safety:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Bacteria and viruses can transfer quickly:</b> Bacteria and viruses can transfer from surfaces to food within seconds. The amount of time that passes between a food item's contact with a contaminated surface and its being picked up can affect the likelihood of bacterial or viral transmission.</li> <li><b>2. Contamination levels on floors and surfaces:</b> The level of contamination on floors and surfaces can vary widely depending on the environment, the cleanliness of the area, and the presence of moisture. Even if a surface is dry, bacteria and viruses can still be present.</li> <li><b>3. Personal hygiene:</b> The cleanliness of your hands, the surface you place the food on, and the utensils you use to pick up the food all play a role in food safety. Picking up food within 5 seconds does not ensure that it is clean enough to eat.</li> <li><b>4. Temperature:</b> The temperature of food can also affect the risk of bacterial or viral contamination. Food that has been at room temperature for a prolonged time, even if picked up quickly, may still harbor dangerous bacteria.</li> </ol> <p>Therefore, it is best to follow proper food handling and preparation practices, such as washing hands before and after handling food, using clean utensils and surfaces, and cooking food to the appropriate temperatures to ensure its safety.</p>
<b>SimPO</b>	<p>The "5-second rule" refers to a popular myth or belief that suggests touching food on the ground for less than five seconds makes it safe to consume without contamination. However, this rule does not exist scientifically. According to food safety guidelines, bacteria can transfer from contaminated surfaces to food within seconds, regardless of the elapsed time. The duration of contact between the food and contaminated surfaces plays a crucial role in determining the likelihood of bacterial transfer, but it's not limited to five seconds. Cross-contamination occurs when bacteria from unwashed hands, dirty utensils, or contaminated surfaces come into contact with food, leading to potential foodborne illnesses. Therefore, adhering to proper hygiene practices, such as washing hands, cleaning surfaces, and cooking food thoroughly, remains essential to prevent food contamination. In summary, there is no scientific basis for the "5-second rule," and relying solely on this belief could increase the risk of consuming contaminated food."</p>

Table 11: An AlpacaEval 2 generation from the Llama-3-8B-Base model trained with SimPER and SimPO. Alpaca-Eval-GPT4-Turbo prefers SimPER over SimPO. Compared to SimPO, the generation by SimPER is better structured, with hierarchical discussions that make it more helpful.

1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241

---

**Prompt** How do I make escargot?

---

**SimPER** Here's a general recipe for making escargot:

---

**Ingredients:**

- 1 pound fresh snails (escargots)
- 1/4 cup butter, at room temperature
- 1 clove garlic, minced
- 2 tablespoons finely chopped parsley
- 2 tablespoons finely chopped shallots
- 2 tablespoons dry white wine
- 2 tablespoons lemon juice
- 1/4 teaspoon ground black pepper
- 1/4 cup breadcrumbs
- 1/4 cup grated Parmesan cheese
- Salt, to taste
- 1 tablespoon olive oil

**Equipment:**

- Snail shells
- Foil
- A heavy-bottomed skillet
- A wooden spoon
- A baking dish
- A fine-mesh strainer
- A small saucepan
- A mixing bowl
- Parchment paper

**Instructions:**

1. Preheat the oven to 375F (190C).
  2. Scrub the snails under cool running water to remove any dirt or debris. Discard any snails that are not alive. Soak the snails in salted water for at least 30 minutes, changing the water every 10 minutes, to ensure they are thoroughly cleaned.
  3. In a small saucepan, melt the butter over low heat. Add the minced garlic, parsley, and shallots, and cook for 1-2 minutes until fragrant.
  4. Remove the garlic mixture from the heat and stir in the white wine, lemon juice, and black pepper. Season with salt to taste.
  5. In a mixing bowl, combine the breadcrumbs and grated Parmesan cheese.
  6. Place the snail shells on a sheet of foil and arrange them in a baking dish. Spoon the garlic butter mixture into the shells, filling each one about 3/4 full.
  7. Sprinkle the breadcrumb mixture over the top of each snail.
  8. Cover the snail shells with foil.
  9. Bake in the preheated oven for 12-15 minutes or until the breadcrumbs are golden brown and the snails have cooked through.
  10. Remove the dish from the oven, carefully remove the foil, and place a small piece of parchment paper over the top of each shell.
  11. Return the dish to the oven and continue baking for 1-2 minutes to crisp up the breadcrumbs.
  12. Remove the dish from the oven, and let the escargots cool for a few minutes.
  13. In a heavy-bottomed skillet, heat the olive oil over medium-high heat. Strain the garlic butter mixture through a fine-mesh strainer into the skillet, and cook for 1-2 minutes until slightly reduced and thickened.
  14. To serve, spoon the garlic butter onto small plates, arrange the escargots on the plates, and drizzle the remaining garlic butter over the top.
- Note: Escargot shells are available for purchase at specialty food stores or online. If you don't have escargot shells, you can use mushroom caps or even small ramekins.
- Enjoy your delicious escargot!
-



**SimPO** Here's a general recipe for making escargot:

**Ingredients:**

- 1 pound fresh or canned snails (escargots), cleaned and cooked
- 1/2 cup unsalted butter, softened
- 2 cloves garlic, minced
- 1 tablespoon finely chopped fresh parsley
- 1 tablespoon finely chopped fresh thyme
- 1/4 teaspoon red pepper flakes (optional)
- Salt and freshly ground black pepper, to taste
- 24-30 small, hollowed-out garlic cloves or escargot shells

**Instructions:**

1. Preheat your oven to 450F (230C).
2. Prepare the garlic cloves or escargot shells by gently scraping out the pulp with knife, leaving a thin layer intact. Rinse them under running water and pat dry.
3. In a mixing bowl, combine softened butter, minced garlic, chopped parsley, thyme, red pepper flakes (if using), salt, and black pepper. Mix well until blended.
4. Spoon a generous amount of seasoned butter into each garlic clove or escargot shell, filling them almost to the top.
5. Arrange the filled shells in a baking dish, preferably one with individual wells or indentations, spaced evenly apart.
6. Place the cooked snails into each shell, making sure they fit snugly.
7. Bake the escargot for 8-10 minutes, or until the butter has melted and bubbled around the edges, and the snails are heated through.
8. Remove the dish from the oven and serve immediately, accompanied by crusty bread, toasted baguette slices, or crackers.
9. To eat, use a small fork or escargot spoon to extract the snails from their shells, dip them into the remaining garlic butter, and enjoy!

**Note:** Always follow proper food handling and preparation guidelines when working with live or cooked snails, especially if using fresh ones. Ensure they are properly cleaned, cooked, and stored according to recommended safety practices.

Table 12: An AlpacaEval 2 generation from the Mistral-7B-Base model trained with SimPER and SimPO. Alpaca-Eval-GPT4-Turbo prefers SimPER over SimPO. Compared to SimPO, the generation by SimPER is better structured, with hierarchical discussions that make it more helpful.

<b>Prompt</b>	Mick pays his teacher \$800 for 40 lessons worth 2 hours each. If this will be all he is going to pay for his lessons, how much did he receive?
<b>SimPER</b>	Mick did not receive any money. The \$800 he paid to his teacher is the total cost for the 40 lessons, which is 40 x 2 hours = 80 total hours of lessons. Since he only paid for the lessons, he will not receive any money back. Confidence: 95%
<b>SimPO</b>	Mick received \$800. Confidence: 95%

Table 13: An AlpacaEval 2 generation from the Llama-3-8B-Base model trained with SimPER and SimPO. Alpaca-Eval-GPT4-Turbo prefers SimPER over SimPO. Compared to SimPO, SimPER's output provides clearer step-by-step reasoning.