
Towards Analyzing and Understanding the Limitations of DPO: A Theoretical Perspective

Duanyu Feng^{1,*}, Bowen Qin², Chen Huang¹, Zheng Zhang^{2,†}, Wenqiang Lei^{1,†}

¹ Sichuan University

² Beijing Academy of Artificial Intelligence

fengduanyu@stu.scu.edu.cn, huangc.scu@gmail.com

{bwqin, zhangzheng}@baai.ac.cn, wenqianglei@scu.edu.cn

Abstract

Direct Preference Optimization (DPO), which derives reward signals directly from pairwise preference data, has shown its effectiveness on aligning Large Language Models (LLMs) with human preferences. Despite its widespread use across various tasks, DPO has been criticized for its sensitivity to the SFT’s effectiveness and its hindrance to the learning capacity towards human-preferred responses, leading to less satisfactory performance. To overcome those limitations, the theoretical understanding of DPO are indispensable but still lacking. To this end, we take a step towards theoretically analyzing and understanding the limitations of DPO. Specifically, we provide an analytical framework using the field theory to analyze the optimization process of DPO. By analyzing the gradient vector field of the DPO loss function, we find that the DPO loss function decreases the probability of producing human dispreferred data at a faster rate than it increases the probability of producing preferred data. This provides theoretical insights for understanding the limitations of DPO discovered in the related research experiments, thereby setting the foundation for its improvement.

1 Introduction

Recent progress in instruction tuning [Ouyang et al., 2022, Longpre et al., 2023] and human preference alignment [Chung et al., 2022] has enabled large language models (LLMs) to exhibit exceptional performance across a wide range of tasks [Touvron et al., 2023, OpenAI, 2023]. Specifically, LLMs that undergo supervised fine-tuning (SFT) across different tasks are anticipated to align with carefully curated human feedback and steer their response behavior accordingly. To achieve this, Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) has emerged as a popular and effective approach [Rafailov et al., 2023], which derives reward signals directly from pairwise preference data, thus bypassing the complexity of learning an additional reward model [Christiano et al., 2017, Bai et al., 2022b]. In the context of DPO, a pairwise preference data takes the form of a triple (x, y_w, y_l) , comprising a specific prompt or question x , the human-preferred response y_w , and the dispreferred response y_l . These pairwise preference data are further used to increase the relative log probability of preferred to dispreferred responses, together with a Bradley-Terry preference model [Bradley and Terry, 1952] based loss function.

Despite its widespread use across various tasks, the limitations of DPO are gradually coming to light, leading to less satisfactory performance as indicated by prior research [Ethayarajh et al., 2023, Xu et al., 2024]. Specifically, **DPO hinders the learning capacity of LLMs to generate**

*Completed during the internship of Beijing Academy of Artificial Intelligence

†Corresponding authors

human-preferred responses, suggesting that LLMs after DPO tend to avoid producing human dispreferred responses but struggle to produce human-preferred responses, especially when training the LLM with the human-preferred response y_w and the dispreferred response y_l are literally similar [Pal et al., 2024]. Furthermore, **DPO has been criticized for its sensitivity to the SFT’s effectiveness** [Xu et al., 2024]. In other words, LLMs without proper and effective SFT typically exhibit subpar DPO performance. An empirical explanation for this is that SFT/instruction tuning are crucial for LLMs to comprehend and adhere to human directives before aligning with curated human feedback [Bai et al., 2022a]. Despite these empirical observations, there is still a lack of theoretical analysis and understanding of the defects in DPO, which hinders insights into future directions for improving DPO.

In this paper, we take a step towards theoretically analyzing and understanding the limitations of DPO. Focusing on the sensitivity to the SFT’s effectiveness and the hindrance to the learning capacity of LLMs to generate human-preferred responses, we provide an analytical framework using the field theory [Butcher, 2016, Mescheder et al., 2017] to provide a comprehensive understanding of optimization process of DPO, which helps reveal the theoretical explanations behind the limitations in a unified manner. To achieve this, we begin with analyzing the gradient vector fields of DPO, which represents the direction and magnitude of the fastest decrease of the loss function of DPO over two variables: *probabilities of generating human preferred and dispreferred data*, i.e., $\pi(y_w|x) \in [0, 1]$ and $\pi(y_l|x) \in [0, 1]$. This helps analyze how LLMs learn to steer their response behavior during the DPO optimization process. Remarkably, our findings suggest that **the DPO loss function decreases the probability of producing human dispreferred data at a faster rate than it increases the probability of producing preferred data**. This provide two theoretical insights for understanding DPO’s limitations:

- *Why does DPO hinder the learning capacity of LLMs to generate human-preferred responses:* In comparison to learning to generate human-preferred responses, the DPO loss function demonstrates a tendency for LLMs to readily learn to avoid generating responses that humans disprefer. This is due to the more significant impact of the DPO loss on $\pi(y_l|x)$ because of the larger gradient, as opposed to its effect on $\pi(y_w|x)$.
- *Why is the DPO sensitive to the SFT’s effectiveness:* The magnitudes and directions in various areas of the gradient vector field of DPO vary, suggesting that the practical optimization process of DPO is sensitive to the initial conditions of the alignment capability of LLMs after SFT, specifically $\pi(y_w|x)$ and $\pi(y_l|x)$. Consequently, in conjunction with the analysis of the first limitation, when SFT’s effectiveness is slightly lacking, the slow increase in the probability of generating preferred responses causes the SFT-ed LLMs to struggle to align with human preferences.

In conclusion, this paper offers a theoretical analysis and comprehension of the limitations of DPO through an analytical framework employing field theory, particularly emphasizing the limitations regarding the sensitivity to the effectiveness of SFT and the impact on the ability to learn human-preferred responses.

2 Preliminaries

Human Preference Alignment. The purpose of human preference alignment is to steer the response behavior of LLMs and align their responses with human preference. Formally, given a specific question or prompt x , an aligned LLM should generate human-preferred response y_w with a greater probability than human-dispreferred one y_l . To achieve this, there are two technological approaches: reinforcement learning based and non-reinforcement learning based methods. As a primary focus within the reinforcement learning approach, Reinforcement Learning Human (or AI) Feedback (RLHF/RLAIF) [Christiano et al., 2017, Bai et al., 2022b] aims to directly evaluate and optimize responses generated by LLM. These methods initially train a reward model (RM) to evaluate human preferences, where the reward model can be iteratively trained to improve its performance [Touvron et al., 2023]. Subsequently, RLHF/RLAIF establish a reinforcement learning framework for LLMs to learn an optimal or nearly-optimal policy that maximizes the reward from the reward model using Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) [Schulman et al., 2017]. While this process significantly ensures the alignment effect of LLMs, the training complexity and convergence of PPO often present practical implementation challenges [Engstrom et al., 2020].

Consequently, non-reinforcement learning based methods have been proposed. For instance, researchers have suggested simplifying the computation of PPO through the use of Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [Rafailov et al., 2023] and its variance such as f -DPO [Wang et al., 2023] and Kahneman-Tversky Optimization (KTO) [Ethayarajh et al., 2023]. Notably, DPO is the first method to eliminate the training phase of the reward model and reinforcement learning, instead directly employing the LLM itself to approximate the reward model and train itself using collected paired human preference and dispreference data.

Limitations of DPO. Researchers have found that several limitations hinder the utilization of DPO, may experiencing negative effects after DPO [Ethayarajh et al., 2023, Xu et al., 2024].

- Empirical evidence suggest that the effectiveness of DPO have strong reliance on the training effect of the LLMs after SFT [Bai et al., 2022a, Ouyang et al., 2022, Anonymous, 2024]. Although existing efforts have tried to solve this limitation, for example, by introducing the contrastive preference optimization (CPO) [Xu et al., 2024], curriculum learning [Xu et al., 2023], and margin-enhanced loss function [Amini et al., 2024, Pal et al., 2024, Qiu et al., 2024], the reason behind this limitation still lacks theoretical explanations.
- Empirical evidence also suggest that LLMs, together with DPO, struggle to learn to generate responses that aligned with human preference [Azar et al., 2023]. This is particularly true when the edit distance of y_w and y_l in the same pairwise preference data are close [Pal et al., 2024]. Furthermore, Azar et al. [2023] try to analyze the loss of DPO via the KL-regularization of the LLM before and after the modification of DPO in its hidden reward model. They find that the strength of the KL-regularisation becomes weaker and weaker the more deterministic the preferences. However, their analysis focus on explain the limitation they have discovered, making it difficult to generalize to other limitations.

Therefore, there is an urgent need for a more comprehensive theoretical analysis of DPO. On one hand, this can deepen our understanding of the role of DPO in aligning with human preferences. On the other hand, we are attempting to unify the explanation of the current limitations of DPO from a higher perspective and indicate potential directions for improvement.

3 Understanding the Limitations of DPO

Previous studies have observed that DPO has been criticized for its sensitivity to the SFT’s effectiveness and hinders the learning capacity of LLMs to generate human-preferred responses. In this section, we take a step towards theoretically analyzing and understanding the limitations of DPO using field theory.

3.1 Analyzing the Loss of DPO

Re-formalizing DPO Loss Function. Given a pairwise preference data $(x, y_w, y_l) \in D$, such as HH Bai et al. [2022a] and SHP Ethayarajh et al. [2022], the purpose of DPO is to make the probability of LLMs generating human preference response y_w given x , denoted as $\pi_\theta(y_w|x)$ higher than the probability of generating human dispreference response y_l , denoted as $\pi_\theta(y_l|x)$, where θ is the parameters of LLMs. Additionally, the DPO loss function introduces π_{ref} , which is the probability of the reference model (usually initiated as the π_θ), to compare the difference between the optimized LLMs and the reference model. According to the origin paper of DPO Rafailov et al. [2023], its loss can be written in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(\pi_\theta; \pi_{ref}) &= -\mathbb{E}_{(x, y_w, y_l) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_w|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_w|x)} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_l|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_l|x)} \right) \right] \\
 &= -\left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_w|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_w|x)} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_l|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_l|x)} \right) \right] \\
 &= -\log \left(\frac{x_1^\beta}{x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta} \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where β is a hyper-parameter³ and σ is the sigmoid function. For easing the calculation, we denote $\frac{\pi_\theta(y_w|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_w|x)} = x_1$ and $\frac{\pi_\theta(y_l|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_l|x)} = x_2$. In this case, to minimize the loss, we could increase x_1 and decrease x_2 .

Gradient Vector Field of DPO. We calculate the respective derivatives of DPO loss function (i.e., Equation (1)) regarding x_1 and x_2 , respectively, and construct the corresponding gradient field $\nabla \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1, x_2)$ to visualize the optimization behavior of DPO, revealing the dynamic features of DPO in an intuitive way.

Theorem 1. *The partial derivatives of Equation (1) with respect to x_1 and x_2 are given by:*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_1} = -\frac{\beta x_2^\beta}{x_1(x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta)}, \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_2} = \frac{\beta x_2^{\beta-1}}{x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta}. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Proof. We leave the detailed proof in Appendix A. □

Corollary 1. *For each pairwise preference data $(x, y_w, y_l) \in D$, the update rate of x_1 in $\mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1, x_2)$ with respect to x_2 , which represents the ratio of the increase in the probability of a human-preferred response to the decrease in the probability of a human-dispreferred response, is $\frac{x_2}{x_1}$.*

$$\left| \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_1} / \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_2} \right| = \frac{x_2}{x_1}. \quad (3)$$

Remark 1. *For any pairwise preference data, the update rate $x_2/x_1 < 1$ holds.*

Given that $x_1 = \frac{\pi_\theta(y_w|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_w|x)}$ and $x_2 = \frac{\pi_\theta(y_l|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_l|x)}$ are two probability ratios, where $\pi_\theta(y|x) \in [0, 1]$ and $\pi_{ref}(y|x) \in [0, 1]$. Assuming $\pi_{ref}(y|x)$ is the probability of the fixed reference model, we can assume $\pi_{ref}(y_w|x) = \frac{1}{a}$ and $\pi_{ref}(y_l|x) = \frac{1}{b}$, where $(a, b \geq 1)$. In this case, we have $x_1 \in [0, a]$ and $x_2 \in [0, b]$. As the DPO optimization progresses, x_1 tends to increase and x_2 tends to decrease. Consequently, $\pi_\theta(y_w|x)$ will be greater than $\frac{1}{a}$, and $\pi_\theta(y_l|x)$ will be smaller than $\frac{1}{b}$. In other words, this implies that $x_1 = \frac{\pi_\theta(y_w|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_w|x)}$ is greater than 1, $x_2 = \frac{\pi_\theta(y_l|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_l|x)}$ is less than 1, and therefore $x_2 < x_1$.

3.2 Analyzing the Optimization Process of DPO

This section aims to investigate the impact regarding generation probabilities of preference and dispreference data, we visualize the optimization plane (loss landscape) and gradient field $\nabla \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1, x_2) = \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_2} \right)$ in Figure 1. Since $\pi_{ref}(y_w|x)$ and $\pi_{ref}(y_l|x)$ are constants determined by the initial reference model, which may cause stretching or compression of the figure, rather than causing formal changes, we omit the denominators in x_1 and x_2 ⁴. We interpret Figure 1 in various scenarios, specifically when x_1 is extremely large or very small, and when x_2 is extremely large or very small.

As depicted in Figure 1, the gradient vector field vanishes in the area of low x_1 and then moves away, but it converges towards the region of low x_2 to vanish there. Consequently, the optimization objective of DPO facilitates LLM in learning how to produce responses aligning with human preferences and refraining from generating responses that do not align with human preferences. However, the magnitudes in different areas of the gradient space vary, which influences the practical optimization process of DPO. In this section, we highlight the following features of the gradient field, which imply that DPO might be sensitive to the initial conditions of variables x_1 and x_2 , which reflect the potential reliance on the alignment capability of LLMs after SFT.

³Usually, $\beta \in [0.1, 0.5]$.

⁴We set both $\pi_{ref}(y_w|x)$ and $\pi_{ref}(y_l|x)$ equal to 1, which simulates the situation where the reference model is absent Xu et al. [2024].




Figure 1: The optimization plane (loss landscape) and gradient field of DPO. Figure (a) illustrates the values of DPO loss under different probabilities of generating prefer and disprefer responses, known as the optimization plane (loss landscape) of DPO. Figure (b) provides a top-down view of the optimization plane (loss landscape) and incorporates the gradient field at different positions using red arrows. The direction of the red arrows represents the gradient-based optimization direction, while the length of the red arrows represents magnitudes.

- When x_1 is extremely small and x_2 is extremely large (this mainly occurs in the initial stages of optimization), as depicted in the top left corner of Figure 1(b), the LLMs essentially lack the capability to produce preferred responses and tend to generate non-preferred responses. In this scenario, the gradient flow of DPO tends to rapidly increase x_1 while causing only minor changes to x_2 .
- When both x_1 and x_2 are extremely large (this also mainly occurs in the initial stages of optimization), as illustrated in the top right corner of Figure 1(b), the LLMs are capable of producing both preferred and non-preferred responses with large probabilities. In this scenario, the gradient flow of DPO tends to concurrently increase x_1 and decrease x_2 , but the overall change is relatively minor, potentially resulting in difficulty escaping saddle points.
- When x_2 is extremely small (this may occur in the any stages of optimization), as depicted in the lower part of Figure 1(b), indicating that the LLMs have limited capability to generate both preferred and non-preferred responses, the gradient flow of DPO tends to rapidly decrease x_2 while causing only minor changes to x_1 .

3.3 Limitation Analysis

Expanding on our previous findings, this section seeks to offer a detailed analysis of the limitations of DPO, setting the foundation for its improvement.

3.3.1 Limitation 1: Hindrance to the learning capacity towards human-preferred responses

Empirical evidence indicates that LLMs, in conjunction with DPO, encounter challenges in learning to produce responses that align with human preference. In the following section, our theoretical findings further support this empirical evidence.

Remark 2. *Compared to learning to generate human-preferred responses, the DPO loss function shows a tendency for LLMs to easily learn how to avoid generating responses that humans disprefer due to the more significant impact of the DPO loss on x_2 .*

According to our Remark 1, the impact of the DPO loss on x_2 is more significant due to the larger gradient $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_2}$ compared to the impact on x_1 , which has a smaller gradient $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_1}$. As x_1 tends to increase and x_2 tends to decrease during optimization, we have $\frac{x_2}{x_1} \rightarrow 0$. At this point, DPO focuses more on updating x_2 to approach 0, while making minimal updates to x_1 (due to larger gradient $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_2}$). In other words, DPO concentrates excessively on indicating to LLMs what constitutes a poor response, while neglecting to guide LLMs on what constitutes a good response that

aligns with human preference. Informally, in extreme scenarios, if the human-preferred response y_w and the dispreferred response y_l are literally similar, the gradient with respect to x_2 would counteract the gradient of x_1 to some extent, thereby weakening the optimization toward x_1 and leading to the hindrance to the learning capacity towards human-preferred responses.

3.3.2 Limitation 2: Sensitivity to SFT’s effectiveness

While SFT has become one of crucial techniques for aligning LLMs with human language, LLMs following SFT may demonstrate differing levels of alignment as a result of factors such as data quality and training strategies. As evidenced by previous studies, the effectiveness of DPO is dependent on the alignment capability of LLMs following SFT, and subpar SFT may result in a reduction of LLM effectiveness after DPO Xu et al. [2024], Ethayarajh et al. [2023]. In the following section, we offer theoretical explanations for this limitation. To start, we uncover characteristics when handling LLMs with various initial positions within the gradient field of DPO.

- When the initial position of LLMs is situated at the lower right corner of Figure 1(b), the focus of DPO shifts to reducing the probability of generating dispreferred responses. In this situation, DPO demonstrates its ability to rapidly diminish this probability and prevent LLMs from generating responses that are dispreferred by humans.
- When the initial position of LLMs is situated at the left side of Figure 1(b), DPO’s focus shifts to enhancing the probability of generating human-preferred responses. However, DPO may not be able to swiftly increase this probability, as the gradient direction favors optimizing x_2 .

Remark 3. *The alignment capability of SFT-ed LLMs may significantly impact DPO, leading to bad initial states for LLM in the optimization plane (loss landscape) of DPO.*

The initial states in the gradient vector field have a significant impact on the final optimization results. As depicted in Figure 1, the optimization plane (loss landscape) and gradient field of DPO in different regions can drive LLM to different optimization results, potentially leading to instability. In such instances, LLMs that have not undergone satisfactory SFT often exhibit limited proficiency in effectively adhering to instructions and responding to human queries. The initial positioning of these SFT-ed LLMs may be situated in the lower-left corner of Figure 1(b), indicating low probabilities for generating both preferred and dispreferred responses, and a gradient direction that does not entirely prioritize the enhancement of human-preferred response probabilities. Alternatively, the initial positioning of these SFT-ed LLMs may be in the upper-right corner of Figure 1(b). In this scenario, the presence of very small gradients in the upper-right corner can lead to sluggish convergence and challenges in escaping local minima. Consequently, this can result in inadequate learning of human preference data.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we focus on offering a theoretical analysis and comprehension of the limitations of DPO through an analytical framework employing field theory. By analyzing the gradient vector fields of DPO, we find that the DPO loss function decreases the probability of producing human dispreferred data at a faster rate than it increases the probability of producing preferred data. This finding can be explained from a unified perspective of DPO regarding the sensitivity to the effectiveness of SFT and the hindrance to the learning capacity of LLMs in generating human-preferred responses. In the future, we will conduct experiments to validate our theory and make improvements to DPO based on our finding.

References

- Afra Amini, Tim Vieira, and Ryan Cotterell. Direct preference optimization with an offset, 2024.
- Anonymous. All knowledge you need about dpo and its variants. *OpenReview*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf/5f960d847ac400b4cda4ea23d4c1e935c4a62522.pdf>.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Bilal Piot, Daniel Guo, Daniele Calandriello, Michal Valko, and Rémi Munos. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12036*, 2023.

- 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*, 2022a.
- Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, et al. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022b.
- Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.
- John Charles Butcher. *Numerical methods for ordinary differential equations*. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*, 2022.
- 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.12729*, 2020.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, Yejin Choi, and Swabha Swayamdipta. Understanding dataset difficulty with \mathcal{V} -usable information. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5988–6008. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. Human-centered loss functions (halos). Technical report, Contextual AI, 2023. <https://github.com/ContextualAI/HALOs/blob/main/assets/report.pdf>.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, et al. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13688*, 2023.
- Lars Mescheder, Sebastian Nowozin, and Andreas Geiger. The numerics of gans. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.
- Arka Pal, Deep Karkhanis, Samuel Dooley, Manley Roberts, Siddartha Naidu, and Colin White. Smaug: Fixing failure modes of preference optimisation with dpo-positive. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13228*, 2024.
- Tianyi Qiu, Fanzhi Zeng, Jiaming Ji, Dong Yan, Kaile Wang, Jiayi Zhou, Han Yang, Josef Dai, Xuehai Pan, and Yaodong Yang. Rethinking information structures in rlhf: Reward generalization from a graph theory perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10184*, 2024.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18290*, 2023.

John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.

Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.

Chaoqi Wang, Yibo Jiang, Chenghao Yang, Han Liu, and Yuxin Chen. Beyond reverse kl: Generalizing direct preference optimization with diverse divergence constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16240*, 2023.

Canwen Xu, Corby Rosset, Luciano Del Corro, Shweti Mahajan, Julian McAuley, Jennifer Neville, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, and Nikhil Rao. Contrastive post-training large language models on data curriculum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02263*, 2023.

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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08417*, 2024.

A The Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 2. *The partial derivatives of $\mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1, x_2) = -\log(\frac{x_1^\beta}{x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta})$ with respect to x_1 and x_2 are given by:*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_1} = -\frac{\beta x_2^\beta}{x_1(x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta)}, \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_2} = \frac{\beta x_2^{\beta-1}}{x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta}. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Proof. For $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_1} &= -\frac{x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta}{x_1^\beta} \left(\frac{\beta x_1^{\beta-1}}{x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta} + \frac{-\beta x_1^{2\beta-1}}{(x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta)^2} \right) \\ &= -\frac{\beta x_1^{\beta-1}(x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta) - \beta x_1^{2\beta-1}}{x_1^\beta(x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta)} \\ &= -\frac{\beta x_1^{\beta-1} x_2^\beta}{x_1^\beta(x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta)} \\ &= -\frac{\beta x_2^\beta}{x_1(x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{DPO}(x_1; x_2)}{\partial x_2} &= \frac{1}{x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta} \beta x_2^{\beta-1} \\ &= \frac{\beta x_2^{\beta-1}}{x_1^\beta + x_2^\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

□