

# Reward Steering with Evolutionary Heuristics for Decoding-time Alignment

Chia-Yu Hung<sup>1</sup>, Navonil Majumder<sup>1</sup>, Ambuj Mehrish<sup>1</sup>, Soujanya Poria<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Singapore University of Technology and Design  
{chiayu\_hung, navonil\_majumder, ambuj\_mehrish, sporia}@sutd.edu.sg

## Abstract

The widespread applicability and increasing omnipresence of LLMs have instigated a need to align LLM responses to user and stakeholder preferences. Many preference optimization approaches have been proposed that fine-tune LLM parameters to achieve good alignment. However, such parameter tuning is known to interfere with model performance on many tasks. Moreover, keeping up with shifting user preferences is tricky in such a situation. Decoding-time alignment with reward model guidance solves these issues at the cost of increased inference time. However, most of such methods fail to strike the right balance between exploration and exploitation of reward—often due to the conflated formulation of these two aspects—to give well-aligned responses. To remedy this we decouple these two aspects and implement them in an evolutionary fashion: exploration is enforced by decoding from mutated instructions and exploitation is represented as the periodic replacement of poorly-rewarded generations with well-rewarded ones. Empirical evidences indicate that this strategy outperforms many preference optimization and decode-time alignment approaches on two widely accepted alignment benchmarks AlpacaEval 2 and MT-Bench. Our implementation will be available at: <https://darwin-alignment.github.io>.

## 1 Introduction

LLMs are increasingly ubiquitous in our personal and work lives alike due to their impressive efficacy at solving many complex problems and more importantly their function as an assistive measure. Such an exposure could be a great blessing, however, LLMs often respond in undesirable ways that do not align with the intent of the stakeholders and may even cause harm to the users. Thus, much of recent LLM research has been focused on this *alignment* problem that teaches an LLM to imbue their responses with certain desired proper-




Figure 1: The stages of DARWIN.

ties, such as adhering to a particular output format, citing sources, not using harmful language, refusing harmful questions, etc. To this end, the most effective and widely used approaches have been reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) (Ouyang et al., 2022) and direct preference optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2024), and their variants. The former uses proximal policy optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017) with a preference reward model and the latter minimizes DPO-loss to tune LLMs to enforce the preferences. Despite their success given good preference data, there could be certain disadvantages to instilling user preferences in the LLM parameters: (i) undesired interference with the prior LLM training and (ii) keeping up with the shifting user preferences, i.e. realignment. At the parametric level, decoding-time alignment essentially decouples the preference modeling from an instruction-tuned LLM. As such, one may up- or down-regulate the contribution of preference modeling to mitigate the first disadvantage. The second disadvantage is naturally avoided

as the preference model can be modified independently without risking jeopardizing the functionalities of the LLM.

The recent works on reward-driven decode-time alignment, such as, ARGS (Khanov et al., 2024) and DeAL (Huang et al., 2024), primarily add an additional strength-regulated signal from a reward model to the conditional probability on the vocabulary at a given decoding step to steer the decoding. However, since reward scores are unbounded, having a fixed reward regulation factor may either overwhelm the LLM score or be dominated by the LLM score in the overall score, leading to generic or unaligned responses, respectively. Another issue could be evaluating the reward score at every decoding step may over-optimize the response toward the reward model, curtailing the expressiveness of the LLM. Moreover, these works are not evaluated on general alignment, but rather on some special cases, such as helpfulness vs harmfulness and toxicity.

To remedy these issues, we tackle the decode-time alignment problem with two key aspects common to many optimization strategies: *exploration* and *exploitation*. We do not enforce reward checks at every decode step, but rather periodically (Figure 1). This allows the LLM to express its innate capabilities, allowing *exploration*. On the other hand, instead of generating only from the given instruction, we also generate from a set of improved and specific instructions, namely mutations, generated by the same LLM from the initial instruction, enforcing even more guided *exploration*. We apply reward-based *exploitation* in every set number of decode steps by replacing the poorly rewarded generations with the well rewarded ones. We also replace the poorly rewarded instructions with new mutated instructions to encourage *exploration*. Notably, this particular flavor of exploration and exploitation heuristics mirrors evolutionary algorithms. Furthermore, our evaluation mirrors the state-of-the-art evaluation of the alignment of methods like ORPO (Hong et al., 2024), SimPO (Meng et al., 2024), etc, making the general comparison with them straightforward. We empirically show that our method DARWIN outperforms the decode-time alignment method ARGS (Khanov et al., 2024) on AlpacaEval 2 (Li et al., 2023) and MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2024) alignment benchmarks.

Overall, our method makes the following contributions: (i) unlike the prior decode-time alignment methods, we decouple and balance exploration and

exploitation to improve model alignment and minimize reward over-optimization; (ii) we propose instruction mutation as a viable way for guided exploration for alignment; (iii) we also propose periodic reward-guided replacement as an effective mode of exploitation for alignment; and (iv) we beat several preference optimization and decoding-time methods including ARGS and best-of-N baselines on a vast majority of the experimental settings on two popular benchmarks – AlpacaEval 2 and MT-Bench.

## 2 Methodology

We frame the decode-time alignment problem as a heuristic-guided tree search problem. In our case, the heuristic is a proxy reward model that simulates human preference. This proxy reward model  $R_\theta(s, I)$  acts as an evaluator of state  $s$ , given instruction  $I$ . The reward models are ranked by RewardBench (Lambert et al., 2024) which made it simple for us to choose one based on the empirical performance.

Formally, each node in the tree is a state representing the decoded tokens:  $s = [o_1, o_2, \dots, o_t]$ , where  $I$  is an instruction and  $o_i$  are the tokens generated by an LLM prompted with instruction  $I$ . We say a state has reached an end if an end-of-sentence token is generated. Given a seed instruction  $I$ , we aim to search for  $s^* = [o_{1^*}, \dots, o_{t^*}]$  that maximizes  $R_\theta(s^*, I)$ . We say that if states  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are reached under the guidance of instructions  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , respectively, and  $R_\theta(s_1, I) > R_\theta(s_2, I)$ , then  $I_1 \succ I_2$ . We investigated two primary strategies: reward exploitation and exploration in tree search. Reward exploitation mutates a given instruction into several instructions, guiding independent search processes. This encourages diverse exploration of state, potentially discovering higher reward states. However, over-exploration can be sub-optimal, so we also employ strategies for exploitation, focusing on leveraging high-reward states discovered during the search process and continuing the search process from there.

**Reward model  $R_\theta(\cdot)$  as a state evaluator.** The reward model  $R_\theta(s, I)$  serves as a state evaluator that assigns a scalar reward  $r$  to each state on how aligned the currently generated sequence  $s$  is based on the instruction  $I$ . This serve as a heuristic to guide our tree search process to find the state that has the highest reward. Suppose, we are given  $(I, o_w, o_l)$  a tuple of an instruction, an aligned re-




Figure 2: An illustration of our proposed framework, DARWIN, for decode-time alignment. It executes the following steps in a sequence: (1) an archive of instructions is initialized with the input instruction, (2) a sample from the archive is sampled and modified to create mutated instructions, (3) decode for a replacement period, (4) evaluate the quality of the new tokens w.r.t. the original instruction with a reward model, (5) replace the worse quality generations with the better ones, and (3) decode for a replacement period, and so on. For brevity, we omitted the factor of replacement period  $m$  in the state superscript. Thus,  $s_j^{(i)}$  in the figure is equivalent to  $s_j^{(im)}$  in §2.2.

sponse, and an unaligned response. Given states  $s_w := o_w$  and  $s_l := o_l$ , we expect  $R_\theta(s_w, I) > R_\theta(s_l, I)$ , where  $R_\theta(s, I)$  assigns higher value to states that represent more aligned output.

## 2.1 Mechanisms of Exploration

We investigate two exploration techniques: (i) Sample  $N$  generations and (ii) Instruction Mutation.

**Sample  $N$  Generations (Sample  $N$ ).** Sampling multiple generations is defined as exploring from the initial state  $s_0 := \emptyset$   $N$  times, guided by instruction  $I$ , reaching states  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N$ , where  $s_i := [o_{i1}, o_{i2}, \dots, o_{it}]$ .

### Instruction Mutation and Response Generation.

The objective of instruction mutation is to improve state exploration by modifying the guidance of the search. This is done through mutating the original instruction  $I$  into multiple instructions  $\{I_1, \dots, I_N\}$ . Instead of exploring  $N$  times with the same guidance instruction  $I$ , we use  $N$  instructions  $\{I_1, \dots, I_N\}$  to guide the search process, reaching  $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\}$  where  $s_i$  represents the state reached that was guided by instruction  $I_i$ . Similarly, the highest valued state

$s^* = \arg \max_{s \in \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\}} R_\theta(s, I)$  is the most aligned response. Do note that the state evaluator  $R_\theta(s, I)$  always evaluates the state with respect to the original instruction  $I$  rather than the mutated instruction since our objective is to find state  $s$  that maximizes  $R_\theta(s, I)$ . This eliminates the need to verify if a mutated instruction deviates too much from the original instruction (e.g., from original instruction *Write me a story about cats* to mutated instruction *Write me a story about dogs*). The key assumption is that the search guided by mutated instruction  $I_{mutated}$  that deviates significantly from the original instruction will reach a state  $s$  such that  $R_\theta(s, I)$  has low-value.

Instruction mutation is performed by the same LLM, that we are aligning, via one-shot prompting (see Appendix B). The LLM is prompted to rephrase a candidate’s instruction or add more details, creating a mutated instruction set that better guides the search process. In our experiments, we prompt it to generate  $n$  mutated instructions based on a given candidate instruction. This process can be applied iteratively similar to (Samvelyan et al., 2024) through a series of sampling, mutating, and state evaluations. In iterative instruc-

tion mutation, an archive  $A$  is initialized with a seed instruction  $I_{seed}$ . We sample a candidate instruction  $I_{candidate}$  from the archive and use it to guide the search process, generating  $s_{candidate} = [o_1, \dots, o_i]$ . The same  $I_{candidate}$  is used to perform mutation, giving us  $\{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$ . Each mutated instruction is used to guide another search process, generating  $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$ . We replace  $I_{candidate}$  from the archive with the new mutated instruction if  $R_\theta(s, I_{seed}) > R_\theta(s_{candidate}, I_{seed})$  for  $s \in \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$ . Since there exists a possibility that we have multiple states having values higher than  $s_{candidate}$ , only the top- $p$  instructions corresponding to the top- $p$  value state will be archived to prevent the archive from being populated with too many instructions. This entire process can be repeated for several iterations, and the archive will always contain instructions that are "equal or better" than  $I_{seed}$  due to the archive update rule in mutation.

## 2.2 Reward Exploitation

We explore two reward exploitation techniques: 1) through best reward selection from  $N$  sampled generations and 2) via reward-guided beam replacement.

**Best Reward Selection from  $N$  Samples (Best-of- $N$ ).** We call this approach Best-of- $N$  akin to (Nakano et al., 2022). At any point with  $n$  different states, Best-of- $N$  selects the highest-valued state based on the reward. Formally, the highest valued state  $s^* = \arg \max_{s \in \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}} R_\theta(s, I)$  is the state that corresponds to the most aligned output.

**Reward-guided Beam Replacement.** Reward-guided beam replacement is an exploitation strategy we employ to replace the low-value states with potentially high-value states. This can be thought of as a variant of tree pruning such that when we arrive at a low-value state, we transition to a high-value state instead, and focus on searching for more promising states. To describe this formally, suppose we have a tuple of states  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n$  ordered by state value such that  $R_\theta(s_1, I) \geq R_\theta(s_2, I) \geq \dots \geq R_\theta(s_n, I)$ , we define the replacement operation  $f$  as

$$f(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) = (s_1, \dots, s_k, r_1, \dots, r_{n-k}),$$

where  $k < n$  and  $r_i \in \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, n - k$ . Note that these states are not necessarily at their ends—*eos* token is not necessarily

decoded. We randomly replace any state that is not among the top  $k$  highest value states with one of the top  $k$  highest value states. We apply this replacement operation to every  $m$  tokens generated until all states reach the end. States that have reached the end will not be replaced. We can succinctly represent this replacement process as

**After replacement cycle  $t$** , all states have length  $tm$ :

$$f(s_1^{(tm)}, \dots, s_n^{(tm)}) = (s_1^{(tm)}, \dots, s_k^{(tm)}, r_1^{(tm)}, \dots, r_{n-k}^{(tm)}),$$

where  $t = 0, \dots, \tau$  and  $r_i^{(tm)} \in \{s_1^{(tm)}, \dots, s_k^{(tm)}\}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n - k$ . States  $s_1^{(tm)}, s_2^{(tm)}, \dots, s_n^{(tm)}$  are ordered by state value such that  $R_\theta(s_1^{(tm)}, I) \geq R_\theta(s_2^{(tm)}, I) \geq \dots \geq R_\theta(s_n^{(tm)}, I)$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, \tau$ , where  $\tau$  is the final replacement cycle.

The intuition is that exploring from a high-value state increases the likelihood of reaching a high-value final state compared to exploring from a low-value state. We also relax this condition a bit by allowing the top- $k$  highest rewarding states to find a balance between exploitation and exploration. Allowing this relaxation helps the algorithm to find paths that give a long-term reward gain despite giving short-term loss. Suppose  $s_1 = [o_1 \dots o_i]$ ,  $s_2 = [o_1 \dots o_{i-1}]$ , where both states differ by a token, we expect  $R_\theta(s_1, I) \approx R_\theta(s_2, I)$ , suggesting high-value states are probabilistically closer to other high-value states. We can control the rate of exploitation by varying the value of  $k$ , where a low value of  $k$  represents frequent exploitation. Frequent exploitation is also more computationally expensive as it requires  $R_\theta(s, I)$  to be computed more frequently.

## 2.3 DARWIN

DARWIN, depicted in Fig. 2 and summarized in Algorithm 1, combines the iterative instruction mutation strategy for exploration and reward-guided beam replacement for exploitation. An illustration of each cycle of DARWIN is shown in Fig. 7. Compared to the sample  $N$  strategy, the instruction mutation strategy potentially explores more states in the search process due to using  $N$  different instructions to guide the search process. Since we are exploring more states, we need a mechanism that can effectively guide the search process into more promising directions (to avoid too much ex-

---

**Algorithm 1** DARWIN.

---

**Require:**  $I$ : Seed Instruction,  $LM$ : Base LLM,  $R_\theta(\cdot)$ : State evaluator,  $m$ : Replacement period,  $N$ : #(mutation cycles) (#MC),  $n$ : #(mutations),  $\tau$ : #(replacement cycles per mutation cycle)

- 1:  $A \leftarrow \{I\}$
- 2: **for**  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  **do**
- 3:    $I_{candidate} \sim A$
- 4:    $S^{(1)} \leftarrow \{s_j | s_j = \phi, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}\}$
- 5:    $I_{mutated} \leftarrow \text{Mutation}(I_{candidate}, n)$
- 6:   **for**  $t = 2, 3 \dots, \tau$  **do**
- 7:      $S^{(t)} \leftarrow \text{Decode}(S^{(t-1)}, I_{mutated}, m)$
- 8:      $S^{(t)} \leftarrow \text{Replacement}(S^{(t)}, R_\theta(\cdot))$
- 9:      $S_{topk}^{(t)} \leftarrow \arg \max_k R_\theta(S^{(t)}, I)$
- 10:      $I_{topk}^{(t)} \leftarrow \{I_{mutated}[s] | s \in S_{topk}^{(t)}\}$
- 11:   **end for**
- 12:    $I_{topk} \leftarrow \text{Top-}k \text{ most frequent elements in } I_{topk}^{(2,3,\dots,\tau)}$
- 13:    $A \leftarrow \{I_i | I_i \succ I_{candidate}, I_i \in I_{topk}\}$
- 14: **end for**

---

ploration) and prunes the search space. Combining iterative instruction mutation and reward-guided beam replacement modifies the search process from a single-instruction guided search to a multi-instruction guided search such that determining the "top- $k$ " instruction after the end of all states becomes nontrivial. Each state  $s \in \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$  can be considered guided by all  $I \in \{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$  simultaneously through the replacement operation  $f$ . To address this, we aim to determine the top  $k$  instructions that have the most influence on guiding the search process to a high reward value state.

Our goal is to find the instructions that emerge as a top- $k$  instruction most frequently by counting their occurrence at each replacement cycle. The intuition is the top- $k$  instructions should guide the search to a high-value state from any state, therefore it should always emerge as the top- $k$  instruction at each replacement cycle. By summing its frequency across different replacement cycles, we estimate a given instruction's influence on the final state reached. To elaborate further on this, if an instruction  $I_j$  representing the  $j$ th instruction from  $I_{mutated}$ , never emerges as top- $k$  instruction across all replacement cycles, it does not affect the final output. This is because every single state  $s$  reached, guided by  $I_j$  is always replaced with another higher value state guided by other instruc-

tions. On the other hand, if  $I_j$  always emerges as top- $k$  instruction across all replacement cycles, all states reached guided by  $I_j$  are never replaced hence, emerging as final state.

### 3 Experiments

**Models and Settings.** We evaluate DARWIN on two instruction-tuned LLMs: meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct<sup>1</sup> and Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2<sup>2</sup>. We did not evaluate a larger model (i.e., Llama-3-70B-Instruct) due to limited compute budget, hence, we picked the smaller-scale state-of-the-art open-source model. We use a reward model trained using Reward rAnked FineTuning (RAFT)<sup>3</sup> (Dong et al., 2023). All inferences are done at half precision. The generation hyperparameters are set to temperature = 0.7, max new tokens = 2048, and top  $k = 40$ . We did not perform any tuning of the generation hyperparameters. Additionally, we use  $n = 5$  for the number of mutations and the replacement period of  $m = 40$  tokens in all our experiments. The value of  $k$  in choosing top- $k$  mutations was set to 3.

#### 3.1 Baselines

**ARGS:** Proposed by Khanov et al. (2024), ARGS adds the reward score to the likelihood of every token for decoding level alignment. The reward score is computed leveraging a pre-trained reward model.

**Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$ :** As explained in §2.1, this baseline first samples  $N$  generations given an instruction,  $I$ , and then exploits (§2.2) the reward model to select the generation with the highest reward value. **Sample  $N$  & Replacement:** This baseline is similar to *Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$*  except, in this case, the replacement exploitation technique is adopted. **Mutation & Best-of- $N$ :** Similar to *Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$* . However, the mutation exploration strategy is used instead of sampling  $N$  generations.

We note that **Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$**  is a simple yet powerful baseline for decode-time alignment that existing papers did not compare to. It was also observed that this method is competitive with RLHF baseline in other scenarios (Nakano et al.,

---

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct>

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

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/sfairXC/FsfairX-LLaMA3-RM-v0.1>

Methods	Llama3-Instruct (8B)				Mistral-Instruct (7B)				
	AlpacaEval 2		MT-Bench		AlpacaEval 2		MT-Bench		
	LC (%)	WR (%)	Len	GPT-4	LC (%)	WR (%)	Len	GPT-4	
SFT <sup>‡</sup>	26.0	25.3	-	8.1	17.1	14.7	-	7.5	
<b>Preference Optimization</b>									
DPO <sup>‡</sup> (Rafailov et al., 2024)	40.3	37.9	1837	8.0	26.8	24.9	-	7.6	
IPO <sup>‡</sup> (Azar et al., 2024)	35.6	35.6	-	8.3	20.3	20.3	-	7.8	
KTO <sup>‡</sup> (Ethayarajh et al., 2024)	33.1	31.8	-	8.2	24.5	23.6	-	7.7	
ORPO <sup>‡</sup> (Hong et al., 2024)	28.5	27.4	-	8.0	24.5	24.9	-	7.7	
R-DPO <sup>‡</sup> (Park et al., 2024)	41.1	37.8	-	8.0	27.3	24.5	-	7.5	
SimPO <sup>‡</sup> (Meng et al., 2024)	44.7	40.5	1825	8.0	32.1	34.8	-	7.6	
<b>Decoding-Time Alignment</b>									
ARGS (Khanov et al., 2024)	22.51	20.36	1789	3.21	18.21	15.14	1623	7.31	
<b>Exploration</b>		<b>Exploitation</b>							
Sample $N = 5$	Best-of- $N = 5$	26.63	26.66	1971	8.49	23.87	20.86	1787	7.76
Sample $N = 10$	Best-of- $N = 10$	28.53	29.68	2016	8.34	26.42	24.11	1807	7.98
Sample $N = 15$	Best-of- $N = 15$	29.91	30.68	2023	<b>8.67</b>	25.44	22.88	1793	7.91
Sample $N = 5$	Replacement ( $m = 40$ )	29.13	25.71	1782	8.10	25.53	18.77	1446	7.80
Sample $N = 10$	Replacement ( $m = 40$ )	32.19	27.42	1727	8.22	26.88	18.99	1384	7.68
Sample $N = 15$	Replacement ( $m = 40$ )	<b>32.55</b>	27.22	1715	8.30	<b>28.56</b>	20.53	1375	7.73
Mutation (cycle/#MC = 1)	Best-of- $N$	25.97	29.79	2294	8.42	20.59	21.95	2101	8.01
Mutation (cycle/#MC = 2)	Best-of- $N$	26.63	31.39	2386	8.45	20.77	23.30	2278	8.15
Mutation (cycle/#MC = 3)	Best-of- $N$	26.67	<u>32.44</u>	2472	8.36	21.23	<u>24.40</u>	2374	8.04
<b>DARWIN</b>									
Mutation (cycle/#MC = 1)	Replacement ( $m = 40$ )	27.02	28.33	2048	8.36	24.42	21.85	1739	8.13
Mutation (cycle/#MC = 2)	Replacement ( $m = 40$ )	28.70	31.47	2140	8.40	25.59	23.82	1831	<u>8.23</u>
Mutation (cycle/#MC = 3)	Replacement ( $m = 40$ )	<u>30.47</u>	<b>33.90</b>	2211	8.40	26.11	<b>25.44</b>	1926	<b>8.24</b>

Table 1: Experiments results for Llama3-Instruct (8B) and Mistral-Instruct (7B) on AlpacaEval 2 and MT-Bench. **WR** and **LC** stand for win-rate and length-controlled win-rate against pre-generated answers by GPT-4, respectively. The results annotated with <sup>‡</sup> are from Meng et al. (2024). #MC represents hereafter the number of mutation cycles.

2022). As indicated by our experimental results, we surmise that this should be treated as a strong baseline for decoding-time alignment research.

### 3.2 Evaluation Benchmarks

We primarily assess DARWIN using two widely recognized open-ended instruction-following benchmarks: MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2024) and AlpacaEval 2<sup>4</sup> (Li et al., 2023). These benchmarks are designed to assess the versatile conversational abilities of models across a diverse range of queries and are widely accepted by the community.

AlpacaEval 2 includes 805 questions sourced from 5 different datasets, whereas MT-Bench consists of 80 questions spanning 8 categories. We adhere to the evaluation protocols of each benchmark to report scores. For AlpacaEval 2, we present both the raw win rate (WR) and the length-controlled win rate (LC) (Dubois et al., 2024), with the LC metric specifically designed to mitigate the effects of model verbosity. We report the average MT-Bench score for MT-Bench, utilizing GPT-4-

Preview-1106 as the judge.

**Fair Comparison.** To ensure a fair comparison among different methods, we compare the performance of each method based on the total number of beams generated for the inference. That means  $N = 5$  for **Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$**  is comparable to DARWIN’s cycle = 1. Similarly,  $N = 15$  for **Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$**  is comparable to DARWIN with cycle = 3.

### 3.3 Main Results

We report the main results of our experiments in Table 1. We deduce several key insights from the results:

**SFT yields Poorer Alignment.** The original Llama3-Instruct and Mistral-Instruct SFT models prove to be significantly inferior, as they are surpassed in performance by all the baseline models and our introduced method, DARWIN.

**Best-of- $N$  Emerges as a Strong Baseline.** Best-of- $N$  is a simple yet effective baseline method for decoding-time alignment. When applied to Mistral-Instruct, it surpasses some preference optimiza-

<sup>4</sup>[https://tatsu-lab.github.io/alpaca\\_eval/](https://tatsu-lab.github.io/alpaca_eval/)

tion techniques on AlpacaEval 2, such as IPO and KTO, and performs similarly to DPO, R-DPO, and ORPO. However, when used with Llama-Instruct, Best-of- $N$  falls short compared to most preference optimization models. Surprisingly, on MT-Bench, Best-of- $N$  outshines all other approaches, including both preference optimization-based and decoding-time alignment techniques. Our analysis revealed a general pattern of improved performance as the number of generations increases. The only exception to this trend was observed with Mistral, where the performance declined when  $N$  was set to 15 and the Best-of- $N$  exploitation method was employed.

**Replacement Exploitation Benefits Length Controlled (LC) Win Rate (WR).** In our study, we employed the replacement exploitation technique in conjunction with the Sample  $N$  exploration approach. The findings presented in Table 1 suggest that replacement has a significant positive impact on the length-controlled (LC) evaluation score on AlpacaEval 2. Upon further investigation into the underlying reasons, we observed that the replacement strategy consistently generates shorter responses compared to other methods, including Best-of- $N$ . When using Llama3-instruct, the average response length for this technique ranges between 1700 and 1750 characters. Interestingly, the responses are even more concise when using Mistral, with lengths varying from 1370 to 1450 characters. Our analysis reveals a clear correlation between the number of explored paths and the LC score. As we increase the value of  $N$ , the LC score improves, and the response lengths become shorter.

An opposite trend is revealed in the regular win rate where Best-of- $N$  appears to be the winner across two models and datasets.

**Mutation Generally Improves Win Rate (WR).** When employing Mutation as an exploration technique, we observe a general improvement in the WR performance (Figure 3), confirming its effectiveness as a robust exploration method. However, we also discover that models using mutations tend to generate lengthier responses compared to the baseline SFT and Sample  $N$  exploration techniques, resulting in lower LC scores. Since shorter responses consistently receive higher LC scores, we plan to investigate the role of this metric more thoroughly in our future research. We find that mutated prompts often seek more informative answers or request step-by-step explanations from the model. Consequently, when presented with

these prompts, the models tend to produce longer responses. This behavior could potentially be managed through prompt engineering, which we intend to explore in our future work. Mutation-based exploration thus produces more detailed and informative responses compared to Sample  $N$  exploration. The helpfulness of these responses is later leveraged by the exploitation techniques which try to maximize the reward of these responses.

We generally find that with more mutation cycles, the performance of DARWIN improves indicating the critical role of evolutionary heuristics in the exploration. This might be attributed to the utilization of rewards across multiple evolutionary rounds (mutations) that enhance the exploration. With comparable exploration sizes such as  $N = 5$  in Sample  $N$  and Mutation size  $n = 5$ , DARWIN in general achieves better performance.

**Decoding-time Alignment is More Effective than Preference Optimization in Conversational Settings.** The MT-bench dataset presents a challenging benchmark for assessing the alignment capabilities of language models in conversational contexts. Our findings reveal that decoding-time alignment approaches consistently yield superior performance compared to preference optimization techniques when evaluated on MT-bench, underscoring the effectiveness of these methods. However, it is worth noting that the variations in scores among the different decoding-time alignment strategies are less pronounced. While Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$  combination tops the chart on MT-Bench with Llama-Instruct, DARWIN enjoys the top position with Mistral-Instruct on this same benchmark. **DARWIN Outperforms the Strong Baselines.** In the preceding paragraphs, we noted that Replacement enhances the LC score, while mutation significantly improves WR. This raises the question: Can we combine these two techniques to simultaneously improve both LC and WR, thereby achieving better alignment overall? We do that with the proposed model, DARWIN, which demonstrates superior performance compared to other strong baselines on the AlpacaEval 2 benchmark and maintains a competitive performance on MT-Bench when using both Llama3-Instruct and Mistral3-Instruct. The model’s success can be attributed to its unique combination of Mutation for exploration and Replacement for exploitation, which strikes a balance between these two essential components of decoding-time alignment. Specifically, Replacement exploitation utilizes the responses

Setting	DPO	SIMPO
Baseline	36.42	36.92
Sample-15 & Best-of-15	42.01	47.93
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=40$ )	47.10	46.20
DARWIN (#MC=2, $m=40$ )	49.30	47.94
DARWIN (#MC=3, $m=40$ )	49.09	49.90
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=80$ )	47.33	47.16
DARWIN (#MC=2, $m=80$ )	49.55	49.33
DARWIN (#MC=3, $m=80$ )	50.59	50.63

Table 2: The results of DARWIN when applied to Llama3-Instruct aligned with DPO and SIMPO. We report the WR score in this table. The baseline scores were reproduced to make parity with DARWIN.

generated from the mutated prompts and guides them towards a new state with enhanced rewards, effectively steering and optimizing their reward outcomes. When using Mistral-Instruct, DARWIN surpasses all preference optimization-based models, except for SimPO. Similarly, when using Llama3-Instruct, the model exhibits strong performance, outperforming all other strong decoding-time baselines, including ARGS and Best-of- $N$ , in terms of win rate (WR) and a few other preference optimization approaches such as KTO, and ORPO. With Mistral-Instruct, DARWIN achieves an 8.24 score on MT-Bench which is 1.4 points higher than the best preference optimization technique, IPO. Overall, both Mutation and Replacement improve the decoding-time alignment under different settings.

**DARWIN Improves over Preference Optimization Methods.** We are interested to find out whether DARWIN can be applied to existing preference optimization techniques such as SIMPO. The results are reported in Table 2. The results demonstrate that DARWIN has the capability to enhance the effectiveness of a model that has already undergone alignment through preference modeling. Therefore, it’s more appropriate to view DARWIN as a complementary approach that augments existing preference alignment techniques, rather than as a rival method.

### 3.4 Analyses

**Asymptotic Time Complexity.** The time complexity of our methods are presented with the following assumptions: (i) the generation LLM has a time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(L^2)$ , where  $L$  is the generated sequence length, assuming the prior token

Setting	Inference Time (sec.)
Sample- $N$ & Best-of- $N = 5$	14.6
Sample- $N$ & Best-of- $N = 15$	18.5
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=40$ , $l = 0$ )	33.9
DARWIN (#MC=2, $m=40$ , $l = 0$ )	62.2
DARWIN (#MC=3, $m=40$ , $l = 0$ )	85.1
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=40$ , $l = 25$ )	46.1
DARWIN (#MC=2, $m=40$ , $l = 25$ )	81.0
DARWIN (#MC=3, $m=40$ , $l = 25$ )	111.2

Table 3: Inference time comparison.  $l$  denotes the look-ahead length for reward computation.

key-value matrices are properly cached. (ii) the reward model has a time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  where  $k$  is the input sequence length, and (iii) the number of transformer layers in an LLM is constant. Assuming  $m$  is the replacement period, there will be  $L/m$  replacement cycles. Let  $n$  denote the number of beams in the generation. The time complexity of reward calculation across all replacement is  $\sum_{s=1}^{s=\frac{L}{m}} \mathcal{O}(nsm) = \mathcal{O}(nm(\frac{L}{m})(1 + \frac{L}{m})/2) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{nL^2}{m})$ . Therefore the time complexity of reward-guided beam search generating length  $L$  and replacement period of  $m$  is given by  $\mathcal{O}(\frac{nL^2}{m} + nL^2) = \mathcal{O}(nL^2)$ . Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$  has a complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(nL^2)$  as well. For DARWIN, each time we perform a replacement, the previous key-value caching assumption becomes invalid due to different instructions for each beam. Consequently, we have to recompute the past key-value every replacement. The complexity for this operation is  $\sum_{s=1}^{s=\frac{L}{m}} \mathcal{O}(ns^2m^2) = \mathcal{O}(nm^2(\frac{L^3}{m^3})) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{nL^3}{m})$ . Hence, the final time complexity for DARWIN is  $\mathcal{O}(\frac{nL^3}{m})$ .

**Inference Time.** In Table 3, we compare the inference time of Sample- $N$  & Best-of- $N$  with DARWIN. We use one A100 with 80GB of GPU memory for this experiment.

Setting	RM	Llama		Mistral	
		LC	WR	LC	WR
Sample-5 & Best-of-5	Gemma-2B	25.62	25.54	20.94	19.15
Sample-5 & Best-of-5	Llama3-8B	26.63	26.66	23.87	20.86
DARWIN (#MC=1)	Gemma-2B	21.15	22.69	17.86	17.00
DARWIN (#MC=1)	Llama3-8B	27.02	28.33	24.42	21.85

Table 4: Impact of weak (Gemma-2B) and strong (Llama3-8B) RMs tested with Llama3-Instruct and Mistral-Instruct.

**Weak vs Strong Reward Model (RM).** In this study, we demonstrate that the choice of reward model significantly impacts the WR and LC perfor-




Figure 3: The impact of Mutation and Replacement on the WR and LC metrics.

mance (Table 4) when used as heuristics to guide the exploration process. We compare two reward models: the Llama3-based 8B RM as explained above and a smaller RM based on Gemma, a 2B parameter-sized model. Our findings indicate that a weaker RM may provide noisy heuristics for the exploitation techniques, leading to poor results. Notably, when using the smaller RM, DARWIN performs worse than the Sample  $N$  & Best-of- $N$  baseline. These results suggest that DARWIN requires a strong RM to outperform the baselines effectively as a weak RM might provide noisy reward scores for truncated responses during replacement-based exploitation. With a strong RM, both these approaches improve their performance the improvement is more prominent with DARWIN as it gains about 6% for both LC and WR.

**Tuning the Replacement Period,  $m$ .** Notably all the reported results with DARWIN are not optimized using a key hyperparameter,  $m$  i.e., the replacement period. Noting the bottleneck of multiple mutation cycles in DARWIN, we thought of running an experiment to find whether only one mutation cycle can match the performance of Sample  $N = 15$ . In Table 5, we show the results of different tested values of  $m$  ranging from 20 to 100, incrementing by 20 in each step. As we increase the replacement period, we observe a consistent improvement in the results up to  $m = 80$ . Beyond this point, the performance drops. This pattern could be the result of exploration-exploitation trade-off, where infrequent exploitation leads to a lower final score. Striking the right balance between both strategies is the key to yield optimal results. The performance gain from increasing  $m$

Setting	LC	WR
Sample-5 & Best-of-5	26.63	26.66
Sample-15 & Best-of-15	29.91	30.68
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=20$ )	26.80	28.39
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=40$ )	27.01	28.33
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=60$ )	27.66	29.62
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=80$ )	28.97	30.95
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=100$ )	26.84	29.36

Table 5: The effect of changing replacement period,  $m$ , of DARWIN.

can be attributed to the increased stability of the reward calculation process associated with longer replacement periods. Although single-round mutation does not directly allow for iterative improvement, leveraging the RM score as guidance across multiple mutation cycles, it can still be beneficial if it outperforms other methods.

#### Why to Choose top- $k$ Mutated Instructions?

We want to investigate the necessity of selecting multiple top- $k$  mutated instructions, rather than consistently opting for the single most impactful one. Our decision to set  $k$  greater than 1 was influenced by principles from reinforcement learning-based search strategies. These strategies suggest that allowing for some exploration, by considering actions with lower immediate rewards, can potentially lead to higher overall rewards in the long run. This approach acknowledges that some actions, while seemingly less beneficial at time  $t$ , may ultimately prove more valuable at time  $t + n$ . We present our findings of this experiment in Table 6. The results indicate that setting  $k$  to a value greater than 1 enhances overall performance, thus validating our approach of considering multiple top candidates rather than focusing solely on the single best option. Appendix A further delves into the dynamics of these top- $k$  beams.

#### Look-ahead Reward does not Improve DARWIN.

In DARWIN, we focus on the reward score of the current states  $s_i^{tm}$ , where  $t$  represents the number of replacement cycles and  $m$  denotes the replacement period. However, as noted by Huang et al. (2024), calculating state rewards based on the future tokens could be beneficial, as reward models are trained on complete responses rather than partial or truncated ones. We are therefore interested in evaluating our model’s performance when the reward score  $\mathcal{R}_\theta$  is calculated using  $s_i^{(tm+l)}$ , where




Figure 4: The tree search conducted by DARWIN to obtain an aligned output.

Setting	LC	WR
DARWIN (#MC=1, $k=1$ )	26.17	28.16
DARWIN (#MC=2, $k=1$ )	27.69	30.85
DARWIN (#MC=3, $k=1$ )	28.54	32.65
DARWIN (#MC=1, $k=3$ )	27.01	28.33
DARWIN (#MC=2, $k=3$ )	28.70	31.47
DARWIN (#MC=3, $k=3$ )	30.47	33.90

Table 6: Understanding whether choosing top- $k$  mutated instructions is needed.

$l$  represents the look-ahead length. This approach involves generating an additional  $l$  tokens after producing  $tm$  tokens in a replacement cycle  $t$ . We then use this extended sequence to compute the reward,  $\mathcal{R}_\theta(s_i^{(tm+l)}, I)$ , which guides the selection of the most promising beams of length  $tm$  to replace others, as detailed in §2.2. Note that the look-ahead reward computation introduces a computational overhead, slowing down DARWIN. Contrary to the findings of (Huang et al., 2024), our experimental results, presented in Table 7, show that incorporating look-ahead rewards does not improve DARWIN’s effectiveness. We tried varied look-ahead sizes for these experiments such as  $l = 25, 50$ , and  $100$ . The look-ahead length of  $l = 25$  slightly harms the performance. This indicates that the look-ahead

Setting	LC	WR
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=40, l=0$ )	27.01	28.33
DARWIN (#MC=2, $m=40, l=0$ )	28.70	31.47
DARWIN (#MC=3, $m=40, l=0$ )	30.47	33.90
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=40, l=25$ )	25.97	28.11
DARWIN (#MC=2, $m=40, l=25$ )	27.66	31.04
DARWIN (#MC=3, $m=40, l=25$ )	28.62	33.10
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=80$ )	28.97	30.95
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=80, l=25$ )	25.73	28.07
DARWIN (#MC=2, $m=80, l=25$ )	27.88	31.62
DARWIN (#MC=3, $m=80, l=25$ )	28.49	33.56
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=40, l=50$ )	26.68	29.53
DARWIN (#MC=1, $m=40, l=100$ )	26.10	29.15

Table 7: The impact of look-ahead reward calculation. The non-zero value of  $l$  indicates the experiment was conducted with the look-ahead reward computation.

rewards do not have much importance.

**Parallels with Tree Search.** Fig. 4 presents the search process of DARWIN as a fixed-width tree search, where the number of mutations defines the treewidth. The pruning operation is represented by top- $k$  state/node selection followed by a state-replacement operation. This pruning operation eliminates potentially unfruitful states while combining the influence of two distinct instructions in

the subsequent decoding. Thus, the pruning operation allows both exploitation and exploration of states. Another notable difference with a general tree search is the lack of branching from a state. The only branching is achieved via the replacement operation which essentially duplicates the top states. In contrast, [Huang et al. \(2024\)](#) explores multiple branches at the token level to optimize reward, although it lacks any recombination across multiple instructions.

**Putting All of It Together.** To summarize, we list all the key observations below:

- ✓ DARWIN outperforms strong baselines on AlpacaEval 2 and MT-Bench.
- ✓ DARWIN when applied to LLMs aligned with preference modeling techniques improve their performance by 10-13%.
- ✓ Tuning hyperparameters of DARWIN improves the performance. We found more mutation cycles and a larger replacement period are generally helpful.
- ✓ Look-ahead reward computation does not show improved performance with DARWIN.
- ✓ DARWIN requires a strong reward model to excel.

## 4 Related Works

LLM alignment is a well-known research area that tries to align LLMs to human intentions thus making them more helpful.

**Alignment with Reinforcement Learning (RL).** RL-based approaches ([Christiano et al., 2017](#)) are shown to be effective in aligning LLMs with human preferences effectively. Models like Claude ([Bai et al., 2022](#)) and InstructGPT ([Ouyang et al., 2022](#)) use this technique, fitting a reward model to human preferences and optimizing the policy with Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) ([Schulman et al., 2017](#)).

**Alignment without Reinforcement Learning.** The complexity and instability of RLHF have led to the development of alternative alignment methods such as DPO ([Rafailov et al., 2024](#)), ORPO ([Hong](#)

[et al., 2024](#)), and SimPO ([Meng et al., 2024](#)). Instead of relying on a trained reward model, these approaches rely on the LLM under training as the reward provider.

**Decode-time Alignment.** Decoding strategies like Augmented Recurrent Generation Strategies (ARGS) ([Khanov et al., 2024](#)) and Rewindable Auto-regressive Inference Networks (RAIN) ([Li et al., 2024](#)) offer innovative solutions. ARGS dynamically adjusts generation strategies to enhance output, while RAIN ([Li et al., 2024](#)) employs a rewindable auto-regressive alignment technique to reduce harmful outputs at the token level without a reward model. Additionally, [Huang et al. \(2024\)](#) propose DeAL, a heuristic-guided search process to improve adherence to alignment objectives during decoding.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work, we proposed DARWIN, a decoding-time alignment technique that employs evolutionary strategies to implement exploration and exploitation aspects for a more-balanced reward optimization of the generated LLM responses. The empirical results strongly indicate our approach’s supremacy over existing decode-time alignment methods and competitiveness with preference optimization methods.

## 6 Limitations

The experiments conducted in this study utilized the Llama3-Instruct and Mistral-Instruct models with 8B and 7B parameters respectively. Due to computational limitations, the findings may not be applicable to models of larger sizes, as those experiments could not be performed. To enhance its inference speed, DARWIN requires the implementation of inference time optimization techniques.

## 7 Potential Risks

Not applicable.

## 8 Ethical Considerations

Not applicable.

## References

Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Bilal Piot, Remi Munos, Mark Rowland, Michal Valko, and Daniele Calandriello. 2024. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human

- preferences. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4447–4455. PMLR.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. 2022. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*.
- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. 2017. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Hanze Dong, Wei Xiong, Deepanshu Goyal, Yihan Zhang, Winnie Chow, Rui Pan, Shizhe Diao, Jipeng Zhang, Kashun Shum, and Tong Zhang. 2023. Raft: Reward ranked finetuning for generative foundation model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06767*.
- Yann Dubois, Balázs Galambosi, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2024. Length-controlled alpacaeval: A simple way to debias automatic evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04475*.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. 2024. Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01306*.
- Jiwoo Hong, Noah Lee, and James Thorne. 2024. Reference-free monolithic preference optimization with odds ratio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07691*.
- James Y Huang, Sailik Sengupta, Daniele Bonadiman, Yi-an Lai, Arshit Gupta, Nikolaos Pappas, Saab Mansour, Katrin Kirchhoff, and Dan Roth. 2024. Deal: Decoding-time alignment for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06147*.
- Maxim Khanov, Jirayu Burapachee, and Yixuan Li. 2024. [Args: Alignment as reward-guided search](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.01694.
- Nathan Lambert, Valentina Pyatkin, Jacob Morrison, LJ Miranda, Bill Yuchen Lin, Khyathi Chandu, Nouha Dziri, Sachin Kumar, Tom Zick, Yejin Choi, et al. 2024. Rewardbench: Evaluating reward models for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13787*.
- Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models.
- Yuhui Li, Fangyun Wei, Jinjing Zhao, Chao Zhang, and Hongyang Zhang. 2024. Rain: Your language models can align themselves without finetuning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yu Meng, Mengzhou Xia, and Danqi Chen. 2024. Simpo: Simple preference optimization with a reference-free reward. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14734*.
- Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, Xu Jiang, Karl Cobbe, Tyna Eloundou, Gretchen Krueger, Kevin Button, Matthew Knight, Benjamin Chess, and John Schulman. 2022. [Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2112.09332.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Ryan Park, Rafael Rafailov, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Disentangling length from quality in direct preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19159*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Mikayel Samvelyan, Sharath Chandra Raparthy, Andrei Lupu, Eric Hambro, Aram H. Markosyan, Manish Bhatt, Yuning Mao, Minqi Jiang, Jack Parker-Holder, Jakob Foerster, Tim Rocktäschel, and Roberta Raileanu. 2024. [Rainbow teaming: Open-ended generation of diverse adversarial prompts](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.16822.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- William Webber, Alistair Moffat, and Justin Zobel. 2010. [A similarity measure for indefinite rankings](#). *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 28(4).
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2024. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.




Figure 5: An illustration of the average (a) *Jaccard similarity* and (b) *rank-biased overlap* (RBO) between the sets of the top- $k$  rewarded beams in two consecutive replacement cycles, where  $k = 3$ .

## A Dynamics of Reward-guided Beam Replacement in DARWIN

We want to investigate the behavior of reward-guided beam replacement of DARWIN. We calculated the average *Jaccard similarity* and *Rank-Biased Overlap* (RBO) (Webber et al., 2010) of top- $k$  winning beams at each replacement step as shown in Eqs. (2) and (4), where the results are shown in Figs. 5a and 5b respectively. We also compute the average probability of final winning instruction  $I_{\text{win}}$  in top- $k$  rewarded beams at each replacement step for all mutation cycles shown in Eq. (5). The results are shown in Fig. 6a to Fig. 6c. All scores are computed with a smoothing average across 5 timesteps.

$$\text{Jaccard Similarity between sets A and B} = J(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Average Jaccard Similarity at replacement step } t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N J(I_{\text{topk}}^{(t)}, I_{\text{topk}}^{(t+1)}) \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Rank-Biased Overlap between list } S \text{ and } T = \text{RBO}(S, T, p) = (1 - p) \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} p^{d-1} \cdot \frac{|S_{1:d} \cap T_{1:d}|}{d} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Average RBO at replacement step } t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{RBO}(I_{\text{topk}}^{(t)}, I_{\text{topk}}^{(t+1)}, p) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Average probability winning instruction } I_{\text{win}} \text{ in } I_{\text{topk}}^{(t)} \text{ at replacement step } t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{\{I_{\text{win}} \in I_{\text{topk}}^{(t)}\}} \quad (5)$$

**Reward-guided Beam Replacement Converges towards the Latter Replacement Steps.** Fig. 5 shows that both *Jaccard similarity* and *rank-based overlap* have a noticeably-increasing trend towards the latter replacement timesteps across all the mutation cycles. This suggests that replacements become more stable in the latter replacement cycles, with relatively less variation between consecutive top- $k$  winning beams, indicating convergence.




Figure 6: A plot of the probability of the *winning instruction* of a mutation cycle appearing with the top-k beams of a given replacement step in mutation cycle (a) 1, (b) 2, and (c) 3.

**Collaboration through Reward-guided Beam Replacement.** From Table 1, the full DARWIN outperforms DARWIN without replacement across all mutation cycles on both WR and LC, indicating the effectiveness of replacements. Fig. 5b suggests that most of the collaboration across different beams occurs in the middle replacement cycles (roughly from 5 to 15 in Fig. 5)—the decrease in RBO values in the middle cycles indicates rapid change in the ranked order of top-k rewarded beams across cycles, displaying no consistent pattern. This variability suggests that the highest level of inter-beam collaboration occurs in this stage. As the algorithm converges, the RBO value starts to increase, indicating less variability in the top-k rewarded beams and, hence, less collaboration.

**First Few Replacement Cycles are the Most Important.** The *winning instruction* of a mutation cycle is defined as the instruction that emerges the most among the top-k rewarded beams across the replacement cycles of a mutation cycle. We investigate the average probability of these instructions appearing in the top-k rewarded beams of each replacement step for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ . We plot this average probability across three mutation cycles in Figs. 6a to 6c; we apply a smoothing average across five steps. The initial replacement step appears to be the most critical in determining the final winning instruction. This is evidenced by the highest probability of the winning instruction being among the top-k rewarded beams at the initial timestep. The probability decreases as timestep increases, signifying that the latter replacement steps have lesser significance in determining the final winning instruction. This also demonstrates that the importance of individual instruction decreases with each replacement timestep and collaboration becomes more important. One possible reason behind this phenomenon is as the sequence grows in length,

the influence of small variations in the initial instructions diminishes. The previously generated context through replacement becomes increasingly dominant in guiding the algorithm’s subsequent outputs, potentially overshadowing slight differences in each beam’s guiding instruction.

### A.1 Overall Behaviour of DARWIN

DARWIN’s behavior within a mutation cycle seems to have three phases: (i) *Early Phase* – Initial replacement steps are important. They begin steering states towards the eventual winning instruction, setting the overall direction; (ii) *Middle Phase* – Characterized by rapid collaboration across beams. This phase focuses on refining and improving the generated sequences through information exchange; (iii) *Late Phase* – Generation continues with relatively less collaboration across beams, as DARWIN’s behavior starts to resemble Best-of-N approach.

### B Mutator-Prompt Template

You are a professional prompt engineer. You are given an original instruction and your goal is to mutate the instruction into 5 different instruction that will improve the clarity of original instruction. The mutated instruction should not deviate from the original instruction and they should provide the same general intention.

Hint: Think of adding more details, removing details in the instruction or change certain phrasing when mutating the instruction.

Only give the mutated instruction in a list order.

Original instruction: How to make a cake?

1. How to bake a delicious cake?
2. Step-by-step guide to making a perfect cake from scratch
3. How to bake a cake?
4. Detailed instructions for creating a professional-quality cake at home
5. How to prepare a beautiful homemade cake?

Original instruction: {original\_instruction}

### C Sample Output of DARWIN

A sample output of DARWIN using Llama3-Instruct.

Stage	Textual Output
PROMPT	Write a social media post about the call for collaboration on a crowdsourcing project in a persuasive way.

MUTATION  
CYCLE 1

EXCITING OPPORTUNITY ALERT! We're on a mission to create something BIG and we need YOUR help! We're launching a crowdsourcing project to [briefly describe the project and its purpose], and we're calling on all creative minds to join forces and make it happen! As a valued member of our community, we're inviting you to be a part of this groundbreaking initiative. Whether you're a designer, writer, developer, or simply a passionate individual with a great idea, we want to hear from you! By collaborating with us, you'll have the chance to: Contribute to a project that will make a real impact Connect with like-minded individuals from around the world Develop your skills, and showcase your talents Be part of a dynamic and supportive community But that's not all! By participating in this project, you'll also get: Recognition for your work and contributions Access to exclusive updates and behind-the-scenes content A chance to be part of a project that will be showcased to a global audience So, what are you waiting for? Join our crowdsourcing project today and be a part of something truly special! Click the link below to learn more and get started: [Insert link to project page or sign-up form] Don't miss out on this incredible opportunity to make your mark and be part of something BIG! Share with your friends and networks to spread the word! #CrowdsourcingProject #Collaboration #Innovation #Creativity #Impact #CommunityFirst #MakeYourMar

MUTATION  
CYCLE 2

**\*\*Join the Movement: Amplify Your Impact through Collaboration!\*\*** Are you passionate about making a difference in your community or industry? Do you have a great idea that could change the world? We're excited to announce a unique opportunity to collaborate with like-minded individuals and organizations to create something truly remarkable! **\*\*What is this all about?\*** We're launching a crowdsourcing project that brings together experts, innovators, and changemakers to tackle some of the world's most pressing challenges. Our goal is to harness the collective power of our community to drive positive change and create innovative solutions that benefit everyone. **\*\*How can you get involved?\*** Join our project as a contributor, and you'll have the chance to: Collaborate with a diverse group of talented individuals from around the globe Share your skills, expertise, and ideas to co-create something amazing Be part of a dynamic community that's shaping the future Get recognized for your contributions and showcase your work to a global audience **\*\*What kind of projects can you participate in?\*** We're open to any idea that has the potential to make a positive impact. Some examples include: Sustainable energy solutions Mental health initiatives Environmental conservation efforts Education and skills development programs Innovative technologies for social good **\*\*How does it work?\*** 1. Submit your project idea or join an existing one that resonates with you. 2. Collaborate with our community to refine your idea and create a plan. 3. Contribute your skills and expertise to bring your project to life. 4. Share your progress and results with the world through our social media channels. **\*\*Ready to join the movement?\*** Click the link below to learn more and get started! [Insert link to project page or sign-up form] **\*\*Let's make a difference, together!\*\*** Share this post with your network and help spread the word about our crowdsourcing project. Together, we can achieve amazing things! #Crowdsourcing #Collaboration #Innovation #SocialImpact #MakeADifference

MUTATION  
CYCLE 3

**\*\*Unlock Your Creativity and Make a Difference!\*\*** Are you ready to unleash your inner innovator and contribute to a project that can change the world? We're excited to announce the launch of our latest initiative, "CrowdSpark," a platform that empowers individuals to come together and co-create innovative solutions to real-world problems. By joining CrowdSpark, you'll be part of a community that values collaboration, creativity, and inclusivity. Our platform is designed to bring people together from diverse backgrounds and expertise, allowing you to learn from each other, share your ideas, and build something amazing. Here are just a few reasons why you should join us: **\*\*Amplify Your Impact\*\***: By working together, we can achieve more than we could alone. Our collective efforts can lead to groundbreaking discoveries, new perspectives, and meaningful solutions that make a real difference. **\*\*Discover New Connections\*\***: Meet like-minded individuals who share your passions and interests. Build lasting relationships, learn from each other's experiences, and grow as a community. **\*\*Unleash Your Creativity\*\***: Our platform is designed to inspire and empower you to think outside the box. Share your ideas, get feedback, and watch your concepts come to life. **\*\*Be Part of Something Bigger Than Yourself\*\***: Join a movement that's all about creating positive change. Together, we can tackle complex challenges, drive innovation, and make the world a better place. Ready to get started? Here's how you can participate: 1. Follow us on social media to stay updated on the latest news and project updates. 2. Register for our platform to create your profile, share your ideas, and connect with other members. 3. Join our community forums to discuss topics, share resources, and get feedback on your projects. Don't miss this opportunity to be part of something amazing! Join CrowdSpark today and let's make a difference together! **\*\*#CrowdSpark #Teamwork #Innovation #Collaboration #Creativity #PositiveChange\*\***

## D Detailed Illustration of the Steps of DARWIN

A demonstration of the steps of DARWIN is shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7: An illustration of the steps in a mutation cycle of DARWIN. At each mutation cycle, a candidate instruction is sampled from the archive and mutated into  $n$  instructions. Reward-guided replacement is performed for every  $m$  tokens until all the states have reached the end. The top- $k$  instruction is computed and updated in the archive, replacing the candidate instruction if the new output receives a higher reward.