Lecture 23: More on Large Language Models and RLHF

Recall: RL in an LLM training loop



Some notation:

s_t : state
r_t : reward
a_t : action
$a_t \sim \pi_\theta(s_t)$: policy

Recall: RLHF training phases

base model (instruction, helpful, chatty etc.)



Vaswani et al. 2017

preference collection & training



RL optimization



Pretrain+SFT, get preferences and fit reward model, do RL!

Supervised fine-tuning (SFT): Same as imitation learning!

- We have (s, a) pairs, where s is a prompt and a is a generation corresponding to that prompt (consisting of several tokes
- These are taken from already existing data (eg internet docs, QA, solved problems...)
- Train a policy π_{sft} that maximizes the likelihood of the observed data:

$$J_{\text{sft}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a)\sim P_{\text{sft}}} \left[\frac{1}{|a|} \sum_{k=1}^{|a|} \log \pi_\theta(a_k | s, a_{i<k}) \right]$$

  Training is done by gradient ascent
- Aka teacher forcing

Better version: Rejection sampling (aka Best-of-N)



- Generate N answers from the model, reinforce the correct/top one(s)
- Train a policy π_{sft} that maximizes the likelihood of the *top data*:

$$J_{\text{rft}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{s\sim P_{\text{sft}}, a\sim\pi_{\text{sft}}(\cdot|s)} \left[\frac{1}{|a|} \mathbf{1}_{a \text{is at the top}} \sum_{k=1}^{|a|} \log \pi_\theta(a_k|s, a_{i<k}) \right]$$

  Training is done by gradient ascent
- *Online* rejection sampling finetuning: $a \sim \pi_\theta$ instead of $a \sim \pi_{\text{sft}}$

Recall: Training a reward model

input pair:

selected prompt +completion

rejected prompt +completion



The Transformer - Vaswani et al. 2017

output:
scalar rewards

loss: increase difference of predicted reward

Recall: Bradely-Terry loss function

- Collect data from human raters: prompt s, pairs of a_w, a_l responses
- Optimize the expected value of:

$$-\log(\sigma(r_\phi(s, a_w) - r_\theta(s, a_l)))$$

  wrt reward parameter vector ϕ
- Cf. Ouyang et al, InstructGPT (2022)
- Corresponds to maximum likelihood fitting of binomial preference function if reward is linear over the variables

Recall: reward model almost as good as a single human

Evaluate RM on predicting outcome of held-out human judgments



Large enough RM trained on enough data approaching single human perf

[Stiennon et al., 2020]

RLHF finetuning



PPO for RLHF



- Train a policy π_θ that maximizes advantage:

$$J_{\text{PPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{s\sim P_{\text{sft}}, a\sim\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\cdot|s)} \left[\frac{1}{|a|} \sum_{k=1}^{|a|} \frac{\pi_\theta(a_k|s, a_{i<k})}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(a_k|s, a_{i<k})} A_i \right]$$

  where A_i is the advantage function
- Reward function uses a penalty per token for straying from reference policy: $r_t = r_\phi(s, a_{<t}) - \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(a_t|s, a_{<t})}{\pi_{\text{sft}}(a_t|s, a_{<t})}$
- Value function/advantage needs to be estimated!

GRPO (DeepSeek, 2025)



Instead of estimating value, use a group (non-parametric approach)

Notation: $q = s, o = a$

GRPO Objective (DeepSeek, 2025)

- Generate G answers and estimate their reward (no regularization towards reference policy)
- Compute a normalized advantage based on the mean $\bar{r}_t$ and standard deviation of the rewards:

$$\hat{A}_{i,t} = \frac{r_{i,t} - \bar{r}_t}{std(r_{1,t}, \ldots r_{G,t})}$$

- GRPO objective - very similar to PPO!

$$J_{\text{GRPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{s\sim P_{\text{sft}}, a_i \sim \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\cdot|s), i=1,\ldots G} \left[\frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^{G} \frac{1}{|a_i|} \sum_{k=1}^{|a_i|} \frac{\pi_\theta(a_k|s, a_{i<k})}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(a_k|s, a_{i<k})} \hat{A}_{i,t} - \beta D_{KL}(\pi_\theta, \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}) \right]$$

- D_{KL} is also estimated a bit differently (cf Shulman et al, 2020):

$$D_{KL}(\pi_\theta, \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}) = \frac{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(a_k|s, a_{i<k})}{\pi_\theta(a_k|s, a_{i<k})} - \log \frac{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(a_k|s, a_{i<k})}{\pi_\theta(a_k|s, a_{i<k})} - 1$$

The Advantage of RL over SFT (DeepSeek, 2025)



DeepSeek Overall Results (DeepSeek, 2025)





SOTA results back in January!

Direct Preference Optimization



$$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\pi_\theta; \pi_{\text{ref}}) =$$

$$-\beta \mathbb{E}_{(x,y_w,y_l)\sim\mathcal{D}}\Big[\underbrace{\sigma(\hat{r}_\theta(x,y_l) - \hat{r}_\theta(x,y_w))}_{\text{higher weight when reward estimate is wrong}}\Big[\underbrace{\nabla_\theta \log \pi(y_w \mid x)}_{\text{increase likelihood of } y_w} - \underbrace{\nabla_\theta \log \pi(y_l \mid x)}_{\text{decrease likelihood of } y_l}\Big]\Big],$$

$$\hat{r}_\theta(x,y) = \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}$$

- You can replace the complex RL part with a very simple weighted MLE objective
- Other variants (KTO, IPO) now emerging too

[Rafailov+ 2023]

Learning with non-transitive preferences: NashLLM

- Objective:find a policy π^* which is preferred over any other policy

$$\pi^* = \arg\max_{\pi} \min_{\pi'} \mathbb{P}(\pi' \preceq \pi)$$

- Think of this as a game: one player picks π the other picks π'
- When both players use π^* this is a *Nash equilibrium* for the game
- For this game an equilibrium exists (even if eg preferences are not transitive)
- Cf. Munos et al, 2024 (https://arxiv.org/pdf/2312.00886.pdf)

NashLLM-style algorithms

- Fit a *two-argument preference function* by supervised learning
- Decide what is the *set of opponent policies*
- Ideally, the max player should play against a mixture of past policies
- *Optimize* using eg online mirror descent, convex-concave optimization...
- A lot of algorithmic variations to explore!

NashLLM results



Using preferences instead of rewards leads to less overfitting

General blueprint of RLHF training

Finally, we have everything we need:

- A pretrained (possibly instruction-finetuned) LM $p^{PT}(s)$
- A reward model $RM_\phi(s)$ that produces scalar rewards for LM outputs, trained on a dataset of human comparisons
- A method for optimizing LM parameters towards an arbitrary reward function.

Now to do RLHF:

- Initialize a copy of the model $p_\theta^{RL}(s)$, with parameters θ we would like to optimize
- Optimize the following reward with RL:

$$R(s) = RM_\phi(s) - \underbrace{\beta \log \left(\frac{p_\theta^{RL}(s)}{p^{PT}(s)} \right)}$$

Pay a price when $p_\theta^{RL}(s) > p^{PT}(s)$

This is a penalty which prevents us from diverging too far from the pretrained model. In expectation, it is known as the **Kullback-Leibler** (**KL**) divergence between $p_\theta^{RL}(s)$ and $p^{PT}(s)$.

RLHF results



[Stiennon et al., 2020]

Problem: reward hacking

- Human preferences are unreliable!
  - ”Reward hacking” is a common problem in RL
  - Chatbots are rewarded to produce responses that *seem* authoritative and helpful, *regardless of truth*
  - This can result in making up facts + hallucinations
- **Models** of human preferences are *even more* unreliable!



$$R(s) = RM_\phi(s) - \beta \log \left(\frac{p_\theta^{RL}(s)}{p^{PT}(s)} \right)$$

More important methods

- Self-improvement
- Chain-of-thought prompting
- Distillation from large models to small
- Utilizing more inference time using search (cool new work)

Open directions

- RLHF is still a very underexplored and fast-moving area!
- RLHF gets you further than instruction finetuning, but is (still!) data expensive.
- Recent work aims to alleviate such data requirements:
  - RL from **AI feedback** [Bai et al., 2022]
  - Finetuning LMs on their own outputs [Huang et al., 2022; Zelikman et al., 2022]
- However, there are still many limitations of large LMs (size, hallucination) that may not be solvable with RLHF!

LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS CAN SELF-IMPROVE

Jiaxin Huang[1]* **Shixiang Shane Gu**[2] **Le Hou**[2†] **Yuexin Wu**[2] **Xuezhi Wang**[2]
Hongkun Yu[2] **Jiawei Han**[1]
[1]University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign [2]Google
[1]{jiaxinh3, hanj}@illinois.edu [2]{shanegu, lehou, crickwu,
xuezhiw, hongkuny}@google.com

[Huang et al., 2022]



Self-Taught Reasoner (STaR)
[Zelikman et al., 2022]

More open directions

- Multi-turm
- Exploration
- .....