

TEXT2GRAD: REINFORCEMENT LEARNING FROM NATURAL LANGUAGE FEEDBACK

Hanyang Wang^{1,*}, Lu Wang², Chaoyun Zhang², Tianjun Mao³, Si Qin², Qingwei Lin², Saravan Rajmohan², Dongmei Zhang²

¹University of Chicago ²Microsoft ³Fudan University

*Work done during an internship at Microsoft

Correspondence to: Lu Wang, wlu@microsoft.com

ABSTRACT

Traditional RLHF optimizes language models with coarse, scalar rewards that mask the fine-grained reasons behind success or failure, leading to slow and opaque learning. Recent work augments RL with textual critiques through prompting or reflection, improving interpretability but leaving model parameters untouched. We introduce TEXT2GRAD, a reinforcement-learning paradigm that *turns free-form textual feedback into span-level gradients*. Given human (or programmatic) critiques, TEXT2GRAD aligns each feedback phrase with the relevant token spans, converts these alignments into differentiable reward signals, and performs gradient updates that directly refine the offending portions of the model’s policy. This yields precise, feedback-conditioned adjustments instead of global nudges. TEXT2GRAD is realized through three components: (1) a high-quality feedback–annotation pipeline that pairs critiques with token spans; (2) a fine-grained reward model that predicts span-level reward on answer while generating explanatory critiques; and (3) a span-level policy optimizer that back-propagates *natural-language gradients*. Across summarization, code generation, and question answering, TEXT2GRAD consistently surpasses scalar-reward RL and prompt-only baselines, providing both higher task metrics and richer interpretability. Our results demonstrate that natural-language feedback, when converted to gradients, is a powerful signal for fine-grained policy optimization. The code for our method is available at <https://github.com/microsoft/Text2Grad>.

1 Introduction

Free form natural language feedback is abundant in real world applications [1]. Users leave suggestions in reviews, developers comment on code pull requests, and customers critique responses from virtual assistants. Unlike scalar ratings or preference scores, this form of feedback is inherently rich and expressive. It not only identifies which parts of an output are correct or problematic but also explains why, providing detailed signals that can guide model improvement.

Despite its ubiquity and usefulness, most existing learning paradigms fail to fully utilize such feedback. Reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) has become a dominant method for aligning large language models (LLMs) with human preferences [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. RLHF typically




Figure 1: Comparison of PPO and TEXT2GRAD

converts feedback into scalar values derived from preference comparisons, and updates the model using policy optimization algorithms such as Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) [7] and Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [5]. While these methods have led to impressive improvements in model helpfulness and safety, they also introduce limitations. By reducing rich, contextual critiques to a single scalar reward, RLHF discards token-level information about what was right or wrong, and where. This makes credit assignment imprecise, slows convergence, and limits interpretability [8, 9, 10].

An alternative line of research maintains feedback in its natural language form. Methods such as ReAct [11] and Reflexion [12] prompt the model to reflect on its outputs [13], generate critiques, and use them to self-correct in subsequent steps [14]. These approaches are inspired by how humans operate in open-ended tasks through reasoning, explanation, and dialogue, rather than numeric reward [15, 16, 17]. Natural language feedback in this context improves transparency and sometimes leads to better task performance. However, these methods do not update the model parameters, meaning the model does not internalize the feedback it receives. As a result, the same mistakes must be corrected repeatedly, and feedback remains ephemeral [18, 19, 20].

In this paper, we propose **TEXT2GRAD**, a novel framework that transforms free form textual feedback into actionable gradients for policy optimization. As shown in Figure 1, unlike prior work that either compresses feedback into scalar rewards or applies textual critiques only at inference time, TEXT2GRAD brings feedback into the training loop. Given a human or programmatic critique, our method aligns feedback clauses with relevant output token spans, converts these alignments into span-level reward signals, and computes a natural language gradient. This gradient is then used to perform policy updates that precisely adjust the parts of the model responsible for the error. The result is more targeted, efficient, and interpretable learning.

TEXT2GRAD is built on a full pipeline for learning from text. First, we construct a high quality annotation pipeline that uses GPT-4o to label model outputs with both scalar scores and span-level critiques, following recent work in automated feedback generation [21, 22]. Second, we train a dual-headed reward model inspired by generative reward modeling [23] that jointly predicts span-level reward distributions and generates corresponding textual rationales. Third, we apply span-level policy optimization using a variant of Proximal Policy Optimization that integrates these fine-grained reward signals, drawing on advances in token-aware credit assignment [24] and text-based gradients [25].

We evaluate TEXT2GRAD on summarization [26], code generation [27], and open-domain question answering [28]. In all tasks, our method outperforms scalar-reward RLHF and prompt-based reflection baselines, showing stronger alignment with human preferences, higher sample efficiency, and more interpretable learning dynamics. These results suggest that natural language feedback can be more than an interpretability tool—it can be converted into principled gradients to train more capable and aligned models. Overall, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We introduce the problem of learning from natural language feedback via gradient-based optimization and present TEXT2GRAD as the first complete framework to address it.
- We develop a scalable annotation pipeline and a dual-headed reward model that together produce span-level rewards and explanatory critiques, enabling interpretable fine-grained supervision.
- We demonstrate that TEXT2GRAD outperforms strong scalar-reward and prompt-based baselines across summarization, code generation, and question answering benchmarks.

TEXT2GRAD demonstrates that natural language feedback, when properly aligned and grounded, can serve as a direct training signal rather than just auxiliary guidance, opening a new path for building language models that learn from human-like supervision.

2 Related Work

RLHF with scalar rewards Reinforcement learning from human feedback replaces supervised labels with a reward model trained on pairwise human preferences [29, 3]. The reward is a single scalar, and policy optimization methods such as Proximal Policy Optimization and Direct Preference Optimization update the language model toward higher scores [7, 5]. This recipe has advanced instruction following, safety, and summarization; a 1.3B InstructGPT model aligned in this way outperformed 175B GPT 3 on adherence and toxicity [3, 4, 2]. Subsequent work studies reward hacking and data noise [30, 31, 32]. Despite those successes, scalar rewards collapse multidimensional critiques into one number, obscure where an error occurs, and demand careful regularization such as Kullback Leibler penalties to remain stable [10, 9].

Natural language feedback at inference time A complementary line of research keeps feedback in natural language but applies it only while the model is running. ReAct interleaves chain of thought reasoning with tool use to refine

answers in question answering and text games [11]. Reflexion stores self generated critiques between attempts and improves coding and decision tasks [12]. Language Feedback Training incorporates human written refinements during supervised fine tuning [3]. Surveys categorize the many emerging feedback formats [18, 22]. These methods lift interpretability and sometimes quality, yet the model weights stay frozen, so lessons are not retained and error corrections must be rediscovered each time [19, 20].

TEXT2GRAD draws inspiration from both threads yet differs in a crucial way, by training a reward model that generates interpretable textual critiques, uniquely leveraging *natural language gradients* in token-level PPO to drive fast, interpretable policy improvements.

3 Method

This section details TEXT2GRAD, a novel framework for Reinforcement Learning from Natural Language Feedback. We begin by motivating and defining the concept of the natural language gradient, then outline the system architecture. Next, we address two core challenges, constructing a reward model that delivers actionable feedback, and translating this feedback into precise policy updates, to demonstrate how natural language feedback can be directly integrated into gradient.

3.1 Natural Language Gradient: Definition and Motivation

Traditional policy gradient methods optimize an expected scalar return $J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x)}[\mathcal{R}(y)]$, where $\mathcal{R}(y)$ is a sequence-level reward. Such scalar signals obscure which tokens contribute to success or failure, limiting diagnostic insight.

To address this, we introduce the **Natural Language Gradient (NL-Gradient)**, which transforms textual critiques into token-level gradient signals.

Definition 1 (Natural Language Gradient) Given a generated sequence $y = (y_1, \dots, y_T)$ and its textual critique c , let $\{\delta_t\}_{t=1}^T$ denote pseudo-rewards derived from aligning critique content to tokens. The NL-Gradient is defined by

$$\nabla_{\text{NL}}(c \rightarrow y) = \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(y_t | x, y_{<t}).$$

Here, δ_t encodes the critique’s local intensity on token y_t , enabling: (1) **Fine-Grained Guidance**: Pseudo-rewards δ_t highlight specific tokens needing improvement. (2) **Interpretability**: Each update step is grounded in human-readable feedback. (3) **Transferability**: The model learns a mapping from text to gradient signals, facilitating generalization across tasks.

3.2 Overview of TEXT2GRAD

The central objective of TEXT2GRAD is to construct a Natural Language Gradient that directly drives policy updates. This requires solving two key challenges: (1) converting free-form textual critiques—which humans can easily highlight—to fine-grained numerical feedback, and (2) leveraging these numerical signals to compute token-level advantages and update the policy. To address these challenges, as shown in Figure 2, TEXT2GRAD comprises three steps: *Dual-Feedback Reward Annotation*, which uses GPT-4o to produce high-quality paired critiques and scores; *Reward Model Training*, which learns to map query-response into text critiques and calibrated numerical rewards; and *NL-Gradient Policy Optimization*, which leverages per-token advantages and applies NL-Gradient PPO updates. Together, these phases realize end-to-end Natural Language Gradient descent for LLM.

3.3 Reward Labeling

Natural language gradient optimization requires dense, interpretable feedback that can be mapped to token-level learning signals. To support this, we develop a general reward annotation framework that produces both free-form critiques and structured span-level numerical feedback. This dual-feedback design is applicable across diverse tasks, and supports the construction of token-level pseudo-rewards required for fine-grained policy optimization.

Dual-Feedback Annotation Given a prompt x and a generated response $y = (y_1, \dots, y_T)$, we aim to annotate each sample with a natural language critique c , describing strengths or weaknesses of the response in free text, and a structured span-level reward map $\mathcal{A}(y)$, where each span is assigned a label from $\{\text{positive}, \text{neutral}, \text{negative}\}$.




Figure 2: An overview of TEXT2GRAD.

In practice, we prompt a strong LLM (e.g., GPT-4o) to output both feedback modalities. For example, in a summarization task, the model may generate a textual critique such as: “*The summary omits key information about the character’s concern that the manuscript may be rejected.*” followed by a structured JSON object assigning sentiment values to spans in the summary:

```
{
  "Good spans": ["a first time author"],
  "Poor spans": ["was hopeful about the submission"]
}
```

Span-level feedback is particularly useful for aligning language-level reasoning with output structure. We focus annotation efforts on non-neutral spans, as these provide the most useful learning signal while reducing labeling overhead.

Reasoning-Augmented Annotation For datasets lacking human-written textual feedback, we employ a multi-step prompting strategy to elicit structured feedback from the LLM. Given a response y , the model is guided to: (1) Reason about the response quality step-by-step; (2) Output a critique c based on this reasoning; (3) Produce a span-level JSON map $\mathcal{A}(y)$ associating specific subphrases with sentiment labels.

Formally, the reward labeler outputs: $R_{\text{LLM}}(x, y) = (c, \mathcal{A}(y))$, where $\mathcal{A}(y) : s_k \mapsto \ell_k$ maps span s_k to label $\ell_k \in \{\text{positive}, \text{neutral}, \text{negative}\}$. This dual annotation process allows the model to derive semantically grounded, structured supervision even in the absence of explicit references. The full prompt used for reasoning-augmented annotation is provided in Appendix C.

Token-Level Reward Mapping Although feedback is annotated at the span level, policy optimization requires token-level rewards. We convert each labeled span s_k into token-aligned supervision by assigning a uniform pseudo-reward $\delta_t \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$ to each token:

$$\delta_t = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } t \in s_k \text{ and } \mathcal{A}(y)[s_k] = \text{positive}, \\ -1, & \text{if } t \in s_k \text{ and } \mathcal{A}(y)[s_k] = \text{negative}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

To reduce labeling cost while retaining informativeness, we adopt a class-prioritized strategy: only **positive** and **negative** spans are explicitly labeled, while **neutral** spans are left unannotated and default to $\delta_t = 0$. This yields a token-level reward vector $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_T)$, which supports token-wise advantage estimation and construction of

the NL-Gradient (see Section 3.5). This component enables scalable, interpretable, and task-general supervision from natural language feedback.

3.4 Reward Model Learning

To support natural language gradient optimization, we train a reward model R_ϕ that jointly generates free-form critiques and structured token-level feedback in a unified autoregressive format. Instead of predicting scalar scores, we frame reward modeling as a text generation task—producing both natural language evaluations and span-level labels as output sequences.

Model Objective. Given a prompt x and model response $y = (y_1, \dots, y_T)$, the reward model outputs a sequence $z = [c; \mathcal{A}(y)]$, where c is a critique and $\mathcal{A}(y)$ is a JSON-formatted map labeling spans in y as **positive**, **negative**, or **neutral**.

We model this as conditional language generation: $p_\phi(z \mid x, y) = \prod_{t=1}^{|z|} p_\phi(z_t \mid z_{<t}, x, y)$, and optimize via maximum likelihood with a cross-entropy loss: $\mathcal{L}_R(\phi) = -\mathbb{E}_{(x,y,z) \in \mathcal{D}_R} [\log p_\phi(z \mid x, y)]$.

This formulation provides three advantages: (1) flexibility across tasks via textual supervision; (2) fine-grained gradient flow through tokenized outputs; and (3) interpretable feedback combining explanation and token-level reward in one model. Each training instance is serialized as $[x; y; z]$, and the model is fine-tuned using teacher forcing under a standard causal LM objective. This unified, text-based approach simplifies the pipeline while enabling both structured and natural language feedback to drive token-level learning in TEXT2GRAD.

3.5 NL-Gradient Policy Optimization

Traditional RL methods rely on sequence-level scalar rewards, which obscure token-level credit assignment and limit precision. This is especially problematic in tasks like summarization and code generation, where only specific parts of the output may be incorrect. To address this, TEXT2GRAD uses dense token-level pseudo-rewards $\{\delta_t\}$ derived from structured textual feedback to enable fine-grained advantage estimation: $A_t = \sum_{k=t}^T \gamma^{k-t} r_k^{\text{total}, A} - V_\phi(x, y_{<t})$, where $r_k^{\text{total}, A} = \delta_k + r_k^{\text{KL}}$.

Given a response y , we query the trained reward model R_ϕ to generate a natural language critique and span-level reward map, which is parsed into token-wise rewards $\{\delta_t\}_{t=1}^T$. These are used to construct the *Natural Language Gradient* (NL-Gradient): $g_{\text{NL}} = \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t \cdot \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y_t \mid x, y_{<t})$, providing localized learning signals aligned with feedback.

We then compute token-level advantages using GAE and integrate them into the PPO objective:

$$L^{\text{PPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_t [\min(\rho_t A_t, \text{clip}(\rho_t, 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) A_t)] - \beta \mathcal{H}(\pi_\theta(\cdot \mid x, y_{<t})),$$

where ρ_t is the importance ratio, \mathcal{H} is the entropy bonus, and ϵ is the clipping threshold that stabilizes updates by constraining large policy shifts. By transforming natural language feedback into token-level gradients, TEXT2GRAD enables interpretable, precise, and efficient policy optimization.

3.6 Theoretical Analysis: Discriminative Power of Token-Level Rewards

Our theoretical analysis shows that token-level rewards derived from textual feedback lead to sharper and more discriminative advantage estimates than end-of-sequence rewards. Under our formulation, the advantage at timestep t is computed as $A_t^A = \sum_{k=t}^T (\gamma\lambda)^{k-t} \delta_k$, where δ_k are pseudo-rewards aligned to tokens via natural language critiques. In contrast, end-of-sequence rewards yield $A_t^B = (\gamma\lambda)^{T-t} \sum_{k=t}^T \delta_k$, discounting all feedback uniformly. The difference between these settings is given by $\Delta A_t^A - \Delta A_t^B = \sum_{k=t}^{T-1} (\gamma\lambda)^{k-t} \Delta \delta_k$, which amplifies early feedback differences. For typical settings where $\gamma\lambda \approx 0.95$, a token-level reward at step $k = T - 20$ is weighted nearly $0.95^{-20} \approx 2.8$ times more than it would be under end-of-sequence supervision—showing that natural language-guided token-level feedback is nearly 3× more effective for early credit assignment. This yields more informative gradients and improves the policy’s ability to localize and correct errors in long-form outputs. The full derivation and comparison are provided in Appendix A.

Table 1: Reward model performance comparison.

Dataset	Positive Token		Negative Token		Win-Rate (W:T:L)	Human-anno Acc.
	Prec.	Rec.	Prec.	Rec.		
SLF5K	0.58	0.63	0.58	0.43	62:9:29	86%
SLF5K (w/o CoT)	0.63	0.46	0.53	0.40	—	—
UltraFeedback	0.66	0.43	0.46	0.22	53:9:38	82%
UltraFeedback (w/o CoT)	0.61	0.59	0.40	0.35	—	—
KodCode	0.64	0.68	0.84	0.71	72:7:21	94%
KodCode (w/o CoT)	0.62	0.61	0.75	0.78	—	—

4 Experiments

We evaluate TEXT2GRAD on summarization, code generation, and question answering to test its ability to transform natural language feedback into fine-grained policy updates. Our experiments demonstrate that TEXT2GRAD outperforms scalar-reward baselines such as PPO, with improved sample efficiency, faster convergence, and better accuracy.

4.1 Datasets Overview

SLF5K [26]: A summarization dataset with 5,000 Reddit posts, human-written summaries, and feedback. We use all 5,000 samples for SFT, reward modeling, and policy training, with 500 held out for evaluation. **KodCode** [28]: A code generation benchmark with 447K question–solution–test triplets across 12 domains. We sample 9K GPT-4o completions (with ChatGPT-3.5 negatives) to train the reward model, and use KodCode-Light-RL-10k for policy optimization. **UltraFeedback** [27]: A QA dataset with 64K prompts and 256K completions from 17 models. Following Huang et al. [33], we split the data into 30% SFT, 50% reward modeling, and 20% RL.

4.2 Reward Model Evaluation

A central component of TEXT2GRAD is the generative reward model, trained to emulate the evaluative reasoning of advanced LLMs (i.e., GPT-4o) by producing structured, token-level feedback.

Experimental Setup We fine-tune Llama3.1-8B-Instruct [34] to serve as the reward model across all tasks. The model is trained to output both a natural language critique and a span-level reward map, using supervision generated by GPT-4o. To ensure high-quality labels, we use a chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting strategy [15, 35] in which GPT-4o first reasons through the correctness of a model response, then articulates strengths and weaknesses, and finally highlights token spans as *positive* or *negative*. This structured annotation improves feedback precision and interpretability, enabling richer training signals than scalar-only supervision.

Main Results Table 1 presents the precision and recall for token-level feedback identification, as well as the win rate of span-level reward signals in pairwise comparisons, with and without CoT reasoning, alongside human-annotated alignment accuracy. Across all datasets, the CoT-based reward model consistently outperforms the ablated variant without textual reasoning.

On SLF5K, our model achieved a 62% win rate over the non-CoT variant and aligned with human annotations at 86% accuracy. Although precision for positive spans slightly decreased (58% vs. 63%), recall improved significantly (63% vs. 46%), indicating better coverage and less overfitting to obvious phrases. Similar trends were observed on UltraFeedback and KodCode, with particularly strong span-level grounding in the code domain (KodCode win rate: 72%). These results confirm that natural language feedback—when structured through reasoning—enables more accurate and discriminative reward modeling, forming the basis for token-level learning in TEXT2GRAD. The pairwise-comparison prompt is listed in Appendix E.

In addition, we evaluate the reliability of our span-level reward predictions by comparing them with human-annotated results across three datasets, using 50 sampled cases from each. Our method achieves an alignment rate of over 82% with human judgments, indicating that the span-level rewards are both reliable and effective for identifying good or bad spans in model outputs, and are well-suited for guiding policy updates. Additional reward model evaluation results are listed in Appendix C.

4.3 SLF5K [26]: Summarization

We evaluate TEXT2GRAD on the SLF5K dataset [26], which involves generating high-quality summaries of Reddit posts that closely align with human-written references. This task provides natural language feedback and span-level annotations, making it well-suited for evaluating the effectiveness of token-level reward modeling. Additional hyperparameters are provided in Appendix D.

Table 2: Performance on SLF5K dataset. All models use Llama-3.1-8B Instruct. SFT=Supervised Fine-Tuning, SFT+Reflection adds reward-guided reflection. TEXT2GRAD is our approach.

Model	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU	BERTScore F1
ChatGPT-3.5	0.155	0.059	0.108	0.020	0.844
ChatGPT-4o	0.296	0.066	0.203	0.030	0.886
8B-SFT	0.285	0.078	0.195	0.032	0.875
8B-SFT+Reflection	0.329	0.087	0.225	0.041	0.888
8B-PPO	0.365	0.132	0.262	0.075	0.893
TEXT2GRAD-8B	0.400	0.155	0.291	0.094	0.902

Experimental Setup We use Llama3.1-8B-Instruct [34] as the base policy model. It is first fine-tuned using supervised learning on SLF5K to control output length and content coverage, and subsequently optimized using our NL-Gradient method. We compare TEXT2GRAD against several baselines: (1) PPO [7] trained with scalar rewards, (2) supervised fine-tuning (SFT), and (3) SFT augmented with reward-guided reflection strategies [12, 36]. We also include GPT-3.5 and GPT-4o outputs as reference points. Evaluation metrics include ROUGE [37], BLEU [38], BERTScore [39], and LLM-as-a-Judge [40].




Figure 3: Combined figure for SLF5K dataset analysis.

Main Results TEXT2GRAD consistently outperforms all baselines, as shown in Table 2. It achieves the highest scores across all automatic metrics, including a substantial +25.3% BLEU improvement over PPO and a +3.3 ROUGE-L gain over the strongest reflection baseline. These results demonstrate the benefits of fine-grained token-level reward modeling enabled by structured natural language feedback. Human preference evaluation using GPT-4-as-a-Judge (Figure 3b) shows that TEXT2GRAD achieves a 12% win-rate improvement over PPO. This confirms that its summaries are not only better aligned with references but also more coherent and informative from a qualitative perspective. Additionally, the reward curve in Figure 3a shows that TEXT2GRAD converges significantly faster, reaching optimal performance within 75% of training steps compared to PPO’s 97%. These highlight the efficiency of token-level feedback in accelerating training and guiding interpretable policy updates.

4.4 KodCode [28]: Code Generation

We evaluate TEXT2GRAD on the KodCode dataset [28], which focuses on generating correct and efficient Python solutions across 12 diverse problem domains. This task highlights the importance of span-level feedback in structured text generation where subtle errors can invalidate the entire output.

Experimental Setup We use Llama3.1-8B-Instruct [34] as the policy model. To train the reward model, we sample 10,000 prompt-completion pairs from the supervised dataset. GPT-4o solutions serve as high-quality references, while GPT-3.5 completions provide challenging negatives to construct pairwise training examples. Annotations include textual critiques and span-level labels derived.

We compare TEXT2GRAD against standard PPO [7] and several strong baselines, including pre-trained models (Llama-3.2-Instruct, CodeLlama-34B, and Gemini Pro). Evaluation is conducted using pass@1 accuracy on HumanEval [41], MBPP [42], and their enhanced counterparts (HumanEval+ and MBPP+ [43]), which include additional test cases for robustness evaluation.

Table 3: Performance comparison on code benchmarks. Results show pass@1 scores (%). HumanEval+ and MBPP+ include additional test cases beyond the base benchmarks.

Model	Size	HumanEval		MBPP		Avg.
		Base	Plus	Base	Plus	
Pre-Trained Models						
Llama-3.2-Instruct	3B	48.2	43.9	61.9	51.3	51.3
Llama-3.1-Instruct	8B	64.0	58.5	66.7	55.0	61.1
CodeLlama	34B	51.8	43.9	69.3	56.3	55.3
Gemini Pro	–	63.4	55.5	72.9	57.9	62.4
Fine-tuned Models (Llama3.1-8B-Instruct)						
PPO	8B	64.6	61.0	68.5	55.8	62.5
TEXT2GRAD (w/o CoT)	8B	63.8	57.3	62.2	53.4	59.2
TEXT2GRAD	8B	67.7	61.6	73.3	61.6	66.1

robust programs that generalize across both clean and adversarial evaluation settings.

Main Results Table 3 shows that TEXT2GRAD outperforms all fine-tuned and pre-trained baselines across both standard and enhanced benchmarks. Compared to PPO, TEXT2GRAD achieves a +5.8 point improvement on MBPP+ and a +3.6 point gain on HumanEval+, demonstrating its ability to generalize to challenging and previously unseen test cases. The ablated version of TEXT2GRAD, without natural language feedback, underperforms by 6.9 points on average, highlighting the critical role of structured critiques in token-level optimization. These results confirm that TEXT2GRAD effectively leverages textual feedback to correct fine-grained coding errors, producing semantically

4.5 UltraFeedback [27]: Open-Domain Question Answering

To evaluate TEXT2GRAD on general-purpose alignment and reasoning, we test it on the UltraFeedback dataset [27], which comprises diverse prompts spanning multiple domains and difficulty levels. This task assesses how well models trained with natural language feedback generalize to open-ended questions, factual correctness, and multi-turn coherence.

Experimental Setup We use Llama3.1-8B-Instruct as the policy backbone. For evaluation, we benchmark against standard PPO and report performance on three widely adopted QA alignment metrics: (1) **AlpacaEval 2.0** [44], which measures instruction-following via GPT-4-based pairwise comparisons, (2) **ARC-Challenge** [45], which tests science and commonsense reasoning, and (3) **MT-Bench** [46], which evaluates multi-turn conversation quality.

Main Results As shown in Table 4, TEXT2GRAD consistently improves over both the base SFT model and PPO across all metrics. On AlpacaEval 2.0, TEXT2GRAD achieves a 12.1-point gain over the base model and a 2.3-point improvement over PPO, indicating stronger instruction alignment and preference satisfaction. On ARC-Challenge, TEXT2GRAD shows improved reasoning (+3.9 vs. base, +1.7 vs. PPO), while MT-Bench results highlight better multi-turn dialogue performance.

Table 4: Performance comparison across benchmarks for Llama3-8B-Instruct trained with Ultrafeedback.

Model	AlpacaEval 2.0	ARC-C	MTBench
GPT-4	30.2	96.4	7.93
GPT-3.5	22.7	85.2	6.91
Llama3-8B	22.6	80.5	6.87
Llama3-8B PPO	32.4	82.7	7.43
TEXT2GRAD (w/o CoT)	28.6	83.1	7.49
TEXT2GRAD	34.7	84.4	7.58

Our ablation study clarifies the significance of structured feedback by examining the impact of excluding CoT reasoning during the annotation phase, where feedback is provided directly as span-level scores without prior natural language explanations. Results show that training without CoT reasoning leads to a consistent decline in performance across all metrics, with a notable drop on AlpacaEval (-6.1 points). This underscores the critical role of natural language explanations in generating effective token-level supervision. These results rein-

force that NL-Gradient optimization, guided by explicit feedback, enhances both alignment and reasoning.

4.6 Case Study




Figure 4: A case study from the code generation scenario comparing PPO vs. TEXT2GRAD.

Figure 4 shows how TEXT2GRAD corrects a faulty implementation of `match_parens` while standard PPO fails. The policy LM first produces a buggy patch. A scalar reward model gives PPO a single negative score (−2), leaving the optimiser without guidance on where the error resides. After several updates, it still ignores the two cross-concatenation checks required by the hidden tests.

TEXT2GRAD proceeds differently. The natural language reward model highlights the exact faulty span for `char in lst[0] ...` and explains that the code “fails to check `lst[0] + lst[1]` and `lst[1] + lst[0]`.” This critique is aligned with the offending tokens and converted into negative rewards for that span and positive rewards for the rest. A single NL-Gradient update rewrites only the highlighted lines. The resulting function passes all unit tests. This example underscores the advantages of TEXT2GRAD. Additional qualitative results appear in Appendix F.

5 Conclusion

vspace-3mm We presented TEXT2GRAD, a new framework for learning from natural language feedback by converting free form textual critiques into span-level reward signals and actionable gradients. Unlike traditional RLHF approaches that rely on scalar rewards or inference-time prompting strategies, TEXT2GRAD directly incorporates feedback into the training process through token-aware policy updates. This enables precise credit assignment and more interpretable learning dynamics. Experimental results across summarization, code generation, and question answering demonstrate that TEXT2GRAD consistently outperforms scalar-reward PPO and prompt-based baselines in both alignment quality and sample efficiency. Overall, TEXT2GRAD opens a new direction for fine-grained, feedback-driven optimization of language models, moving beyond scalar supervision toward more human-like, interpretable, and effective learning.

References

- [1] Chaoyun Zhang, Zicheng Ma, Yuhao Wu, Shilin He, Si Qin, Minghua Ma, Xiaoting Qin, Yu Kang, Yuyi Liang, Xiaoyu Gou, et al. Allhands: Ask me anything on large-scale verbatim feedback via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15157*, 2024.
- [2] Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. Learning to summarize with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:3008–3021, 2020.
- [3] 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.
- [4] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislaw Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.

- [5] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:53728–53741, 2023.
- [6] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Y Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [7] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [8] Stephen Casper, Xander Davies, Claudia Shi, Thomas Krendl Gilbert, J  r  my Scheurer, Javier Rando, Rachel Freedman, Tomasz Korbak, David Lindner, Pedro Freire, et al. Open problems and fundamental limitations of reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15217*, 2023.
- [9] Zeqiu Wu, Yushi Hu, Weijia Shi, Nouha Dziri, Alane Suhr, Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, Noah A Smith, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Fine-grained human feedback gives better rewards for language model training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:59008–59033, 2023.
- [10] Sebastian Raschka. *Build a Large Language Model (From Scratch)*. Simon and Schuster, 2024.
- [11] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- [12] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8634–8652, 2023.
- [13] Chaoyun Zhang, Liqun Li, Shilin He, Xu Zhang, Bo Qiao, Si Qin, Minghua Ma, Yu Kang, Qingwei Lin, Saravan Rajmohan, et al. Ufo: A ui-focused agent for windows os interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07939*, 2024.
- [14] Chaoyun Zhang, He Huang, Chiming Ni, Jian Mu, Si Qin, Shilin He, Lu Wang, Fangkai Yang, Pu Zhao, Chao Du, et al. Ufo2: The desktop agentos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14603*, 2025.
- [15] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [16] Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, et al. Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332*, 2021.
- [17] Chaoyun Zhang, Shilin He, Jiaxu Qian, Bowen Li, Liqun Li, Si Qin, Yu Kang, Minghua Ma, Guyue Liu, Qingwei Lin, et al. Large language model-brained gui agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18279*, 2024.
- [18] Patrick Fernandes, Aman Madaan, Emmy Liu, Ant  nio Farinhas, Pedro Henrique Martins, Amanda Bertsch, Jos   GC de Souza, Shuyan Zhou, Tongshuang Wu, Graham Neubig, et al. Bridging the gap: A survey on integrating (human) feedback for natural language generation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:1643–1668, 2023.
- [19] Alexander Pan, Erik Jones, Meena Jagadeesan, and Jacob Steinhardt. Feedback loops with language models drive in-context reward hacking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06627*, 2024.
- [20] Archit Sharma, Sedrick Scott Keh, Eric Mitchell, Chelsea Finn, Kushal Arora, and Thomas Kollar. A critical evaluation of ai feedback for aligning large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:29166–29190, 2024.
- [21] Harrison Lee, Samrat Phatale, Hassan Mansoor, Thomas Mesnard, Johan Ferret, Kellie Lu, Colton Bishop, Ethan Hall, Victor Carbune, Abhinav Rastogi, et al. Rlaif vs. rlhf: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00267*, 2023.
- [22] Weixin Liang, Yuhui Zhang, Hancheng Cao, Binglu Wang, Daisy Yi Ding, Xinyu Yang, Kailas Vodrahalli, Siyu He, Daniel Scott Smith, Yian Yin, et al. Can large language models provide useful feedback on research papers? a large-scale empirical analysis. *NEJM AI*, 1(8):AIoa2400196, 2024.
- [23] Dakota Mahan, Duy Van Phung, Rafael Rafailov, Chase Blagden, Nathan Lile, Louis Castricato, Jan-Philipp Fr  nken, Chelsea Finn, and Alon Albalak. Generative reward models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12832*, 2024.
- [24] Zhipeng Chen, Kun Zhou, Wayne Xin Zhao, Junchen Wan, Fuzheng Zhang, Di Zhang, and Ji-Rong Wen. Improving large language models via fine-grained reinforcement learning with minimum editing constraint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06081*, 2024.

- [25] Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Joseph Boen, Sheng Liu, Zhi Huang, Carlos Guestrin, and James Zou. Textgrad: Automatic "differentiation" via text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07496*, 2024.
- [26] Jérémy Scheurer, Jon Ander Campos, Tomasz Korbak, Jun Shern Chan, Angelica Chen, Kyunghyun Cho, and Ethan Perez. Training language models with language feedback at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16755*, 2023.
- [27] Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Ning Ding, Guanming Yao, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Ultrafeedback: Boosting language models with high-quality feedback. 2023.
- [28] Zhangchen Xu, Yang Liu, Yueqin Yin, Mingyuan Zhou, and Radha Poovendran. Kodcode: A diverse, challenging, and verifiable synthetic dataset for coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.02951*, 2025.
- [29] 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.
- [30] Binghai Wang, Rui Zheng, Lu Chen, Yan Liu, Shihan Dou, Caishuang Huang, Wei Shen, Senjie Jin, Enyu Zhou, Chenyu Shi, et al. Secrets of rlhf in large language models part ii: Reward modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06080*, 2024.
- [31] Nathan Lambert. Reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.12501*, 2025.
- [32] Zhiqing Sun, Sheng Shen, Shengcao Cao, Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yikang Shen, Chuang Gan, Liang-Yan Gui, Yu-Xiong Wang, Yiming Yang, et al. Aligning large multimodal models with factually augmented rlhf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14525*, 2023.
- [33] Chenghua Huang, Zhizhen Fan, Lu Wang, Fangkai Yang, Pu Zhao, Zeqi Lin, Qingwei Lin, Dongmei Zhang, Saravan Rajmohan, and Qi Zhang. Self-evolved reward learning for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.00418*, 2024.
- [34] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2407, 2024.
- [35] Ruomeng Ding, Chaoyun Zhang, Lu Wang, Yong Xu, Minghua Ma, Wei Zhang, Si Qin, Saravan Rajmohan, Qingwei Lin, and Dongmei Zhang. Everything of thoughts: Defying the law of penrose triangle for thought generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 1638–1662, 2024.
- [36] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46534–46594, 2023.
- [37] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004.
- [38] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002.
- [39] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*, 2019.
- [40] Jiawei Gu, Xuhui Jiang, Zhichao Shi, Hexiang Tan, Xuehao Zhai, Chengjin Xu, Wei Li, Yinghan Shen, Shengjie Ma, Honghao Liu, et al. A survey on llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15594*, 2024.
- [41] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [42] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021.
- [43] Zhaojian Yu, Yilun Zhao, Arman Cohan, and Xiao-Ping Zhang. Humaneval pro and mbpp pro: Evaluating large language models on self-invoking code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.21199*, 2024.
- [44] Yann Dubois, Balázs Galambosi, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Length-controlled alpaca-eval: A simple way to debias automatic evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04475*, 2024.
- [45] Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.
- [46] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46595–46623, 2023.

A Discriminative Power of Token-Level Rewards

A key design choice in our method is to provide dense, token-level feedback rather than sparse, end-of-sequence rewards. Intuitively, localized reward signals allow the policy to attribute credit or blame more precisely to specific parts of the output. In this section, we formalize this intuition and show how token-level rewards lead to sharper and more discriminative advantage estimates, thereby improving policy learning.

Background. In reinforcement learning, policy updates are guided by the advantage function, which measures how much better (or worse) an action is compared to the policy’s expected value. Using Generalized Advantage Estimation (GAE), the advantage at timestep t is computed from the temporal-difference (TD) errors:

$$A_t = \sum_{l=0}^{T-t} (\gamma\lambda)^l \delta_{t+l}, \quad \text{where} \quad \delta_t = r_t + \gamma V(s_{t+1}) - V(s_t),$$

and V is the value function, γ is the discount factor, and λ is the GAE parameter.

Comparing Token-Level vs. End-of-Sequence Reward Settings. We define two settings for reward assignment:

Setting A: Token-Level Rewards. Each token may receive its own feedback:

- $r_t^{\text{token,A}} \neq 0$ for many $t \in [1, T]$
- Total reward: $r_t^{\text{total,A}} = r_t^{\text{token,A}} + r_t^{\text{KL}}$

Setting B: End-of-Sequence Reward. Only the final token is rewarded:

- $r_t^{\text{token,B}} = 0$ for all $t < T$
- $r_T^{\text{token,B}} \neq 0$; total reward: $r_t^{\text{total,B}} = r_t^{\text{token,B}} + r_t^{\text{KL}}$

Let τ_1 and τ_2 be two trajectories, where τ_1 is qualitatively better than τ_2 . Define $\Delta r_t = r_t^{\text{token,A}}(\tau_1) - r_t^{\text{token,A}}(\tau_2)$, and assume all KL terms and value functions are held constant for simplicity (the general case follows similarly).

Advantage Difference Across Trajectories. The advantage difference under each setting is:

$$\Delta A_t^A = \sum_{k=t}^T (\gamma\lambda)^{k-t} \Delta r_k, \quad \Delta A_t^B = (\gamma\lambda)^{T-t} \sum_{k=t}^T \Delta r_k.$$

Even if $\sum_{k=t}^T \Delta r_k$ is the same in both cases (i.e., the same total reward difference), $\Delta A_t^A > \Delta A_t^B$ whenever any $\Delta r_k > 0$ for $k < T$, because:

$$(\gamma\lambda)^{k-t} > (\gamma\lambda)^{T-t}, \quad \text{for all } k < T.$$

This means the earlier the reward difference occurs in the sequence, the more strongly it is emphasized in Setting A relative to Setting B.

Amplification of Early Signal. To quantify this difference, define the amplification factor:

$$\alpha(k, T) = \frac{(\gamma\lambda)^{k-t}}{(\gamma\lambda)^{T-t}} = (\gamma\lambda)^{-(T-k)}.$$

For a typical value of $\gamma\lambda = 0.95$ and a gap of $T - k = 20$ steps (i.e., the difference occurs 20 tokens before the final token), we have:

$$\alpha(k, T) \approx 0.95^{-20} \approx 2.8,$$

meaning that in Setting A, the advantage function weights early reward differences nearly 3× more than in Setting B.

This analysis confirms that token-level feedback improves the discriminative power of the advantage signal: even if the total reward difference is the same, Setting A assigns more importance to earlier deviations in quality. This sharper signal allows the policy to learn localized corrections—e.g., improving grammar or factual consistency in specific parts of a summary—rather than attributing success or failure to the entire sequence. As a result, our method enables faster convergence and better fine-tuning, especially on open-ended tasks where quality varies across tokens.

B GPT-4o CoT thinking Annotation Prompt

B.1 SLF5K

Listing 1: SLF5K GPT-4o Annotation Prompt

```
1 Please critique the following summary of a post and provide feedback
  in the specified JSON format:
2
3 ---
4
5 **Original Post:**
6 {post}
7
8 **Generated Summary:**
9 {generated_summary}
10
11 ---
12
13 **Definitions:**
14 - **good_spans**: 0-2 phrases from the summary that greatly improve
    its quality by accurately and concisely capturing the original
    post's core meaning or key details, as explained in
    'textual_feedback'. Empty if none apply.
15 - **poor_spans**: 0-2 phrases from the summary that noticeably harm
    its quality due to inaccuracy, redundancy, poor wording, or being
    less important and replaceable with more critical content, as
    explained in 'textual_feedback'. Empty if none apply.
16
17 ---
18
19 **Instructions:**
20 1. Identify the summary's most essential strengths that reflect the
    original post accurately and its most critical weaknesses that
    misrepresent or confuse it.
21 2. Select 0-2 of the most significant phrases for 'good_spans' and
    'poor_spans', keeping them concise and impactful, with brief
    justifications. Include none if no phrases stand out.
22 3. Ensure 'good_spans' and 'poor_spans' are directly supported by
    the analysis in 'textual_feedback'.
23
24 ---
25
26 **Chain of Thought:**
27 First, carefully analyze both the original post and the generated
    summary:
28 1. What are the key points of the original post?
29 2. Which of these key points are accurately captured in the summary?
30 3. What important information is missing from the summary?
31 4. Are there any inaccuracies or misrepresentations in the summary?
32 5. Which specific phrases in the summary represent its strongest
    elements?
33 6. Which specific phrases in the summary represent its weakest
    elements?
34
35 Based on this analysis, formulate your textual feedback and identify
    the good and poor spans.
```

```

36 ---
37
38
39 **Output Format:**
40 Provide a concise, one-paragraph critique and the GOOD/POOR spans in
   this JSON structure:
41 ```json
42 {
43   "textual_feedback": "Your critique here summarizing key strengths
   and weaknesses in one paragraph.",
44   "good_spans": ["phrase1", "phrase2"], // 0-2 concise phrases from
   the generated summary, tied to textual_feedback, or [] if none
45   "poor_spans": ["phrase1", "phrase2"] // 0-2 concise phrases from
   the generated summary, tied to textual_feedback, or [] if none
46 }
47 ```
48
49 Focus on precision: include only the most impactful phrases of the
   generated summary, avoiding excessive or minor details.

```

B.2 UltraFeedback

Listing 2: UltraFeedback GPT-4o Annotation Prompt

```

1 <CritiquePrompt>
2
3   <Instructions>Critique a response to a user input and provide
   feedback in JSON format:</Instructions>
4
5
6   <EvaluationCriteria>
7     <Criterion name="Accuracy">Does it correctly address the
   input?</Criterion>
8     <Criterion name="Relevance">Does it stay on
   topic?</Criterion>
9     <Criterion name="Clarity">Is it easy to
   understand?</Criterion>
10    <Criterion name="Completeness">Does it cover the input's
   core needs?</Criterion>
11  </EvaluationCriteria>
12
13
14  <SpanGuidelines>
15    <GoodSpans>
16      <Description>Phrases from the response that best capture
   its strengths (e.g., accurate, relevant, clear).
   Select only the most essential and impactful phrases,
   directly tied to 'textual_feedback'.</Description>
17    </GoodSpans>
18    <PoorSpans>
19      <Description>Phrases from the response that best
   highlight its weaknesses (e.g., inaccurate,
   irrelevant, vague). Select only the most essential
   and impactful phrases, directly tied to
   'textual_feedback'.</Description>

```

```

20     </PoorSpans>
21     <Requirement>Spans must be exact quotes from the
        response.</Requirement>
22 </SpanGuidelines>
23
24
25 <ReflectionProcess>
26     <Step>First, carefully analyze the user input to understand
        the core question or request.</Step>
27     <Step>Next, examine the generated response against each
        evaluation criterion.</Step>
28     <Step>For each criterion, identify specific strengths and
        weaknesses with supporting evidence from the
        response.</Step>
29     <Step>Consider how well the response addresses the user's
        explicit and implicit needs.</Step>
30     <Step>Finally, synthesize your analysis into a coherent
        critique that highlights the most important points.</Step>
31 </ReflectionProcess>
32
33
34 <Separator>---</Separator>
35
36
37 <UserInput>{entry['prompt']}

```

B.3 KodCode

Listing 3: KodCode GPT-4o Annotation Prompt

```
1 Analyze the following code solution for the given problem:
2
3 Problem Description:
4 '''
5 {problem}
6 '''
7
8 Submitted Code:
9 '''
10 {solution}
11 '''
12
13 Test Results:
14 Passed: {passed}
15
16 {% - if not passed -%}
17 Test Question:
18 {test_question}
19
20 Error Output:
21 {stdout}
22 {% - endif -%}
23
24 Please analyze the code and identify the following in JSON format:
25
26 1. Identify any error-causing code segments directly from the
    submitted solution.
27 2. Provide detailed feedback on the code's functionality, issues,
    and improvement suggestions.
28     - First, understand what the code is trying to accomplish
29     - Analyze the algorithm and approach used
30     - Identify any logical errors or inefficiencies
31     - Consider edge cases and potential improvements
32 3. Point out any code segments from the solution that work but could
    be improved.
33
34 Return your analysis in this JSON structure:
35 '''json
36 {
37     "Code Feedback": "Provide a detailed explanation of the code's
38     functionality, any potential issues, and suggestions for
39     improvement. Use markdown formatting for better readability.",
40     "wrong_code": ["Extract ONLY the problematic code segments FROM
41     THE SUBMITTED SOLUTION that cause failures. Must be exact
42     quotes. Leave empty [] if none found."],
43     "improvement_code": ["Extract ONLY the working but improvable
44     code segments FROM THE SUBMITTED SOLUTION. Must be exact
45     quotes. Leave empty [] if none needed."]
46 }
47 '''
48 Note: For 'wrong_code' and 'improvement_code', only include direct
    quotes from the submitted code above, not suggested fixes."'''
```


C Additional Reward Model Performance Results

Table 5: Span prediction quality on UltraFeedback dataset. GT/Pred shows the count of ground truth and predicted spans, with E-P indicating exact matches and partial matches. OUI (Overlap Unit Index) measures boundary precision.

Dataset	GOOD Spans	POOR Spans
UltraFeedback	1150/736 (292-237)	812/400 (101-104)
OUI	0.40	0.27

Table 6: Code suggestion quality on KodCode dataset. Exact Match shows the proportion of suggestions that perfectly match ground truth. RougeL measures lexical overlap between predicted and reference code segments.

Code Type	Exact Match	RougeL
Improvement	0.47	0.64
Wrong	0.55	0.59

Table 7: Additional metrics for all models on the SLF5K dataset, including perplexity and BERTScore components. Human perplexity: 37.375.

Model	Perplexity	BERTScore	
		Precision	Recall
ChatGPT-3.5	27.288	0.806	0.884
ChatGPT-4o	53.242	0.879	0.894
8B	19.248	0.848	0.894
8B-SFT	44.103	0.865	0.885
8B-SFT+Reflection	34.823	0.880	0.897
8B-PPO	28.472	0.892	0.895
TEXT2GRAD-8B	25.423	0.903	0.902

D Hyperparameters of NL-Gradient PPO Optimization

We report the full training hyperparameters used for NL-Gradient PPO optimization across three datasets: SLF5K, UltraFeedback, and KodCode. All experiments use the Llama 3 or Llama 3.1 8B Instruct variant as both the base policy and reward models.

For the **SLF5K** dataset (Table 8), we adopt a linear learning rate scheduler with a base learning rate of 1×10^{-6} . The model is trained using a batch size of 12 and gradient accumulation over 12 steps. PPO is run for 4 epochs per batch with mini-batch size of 1. The KL penalty is enforced with a full KL term, an initial coefficient of 0.2, and a target KL divergence of 6. Adaptive KL control is enabled, and training is conducted over 4 full epochs.

For the **UltraFeedback** dataset (Table 9), we use a cosine learning rate scheduler with the same learning rate of 1×10^{-6} . The training is conducted with a batch size of 8, gradient accumulation over 8 steps, and 4 PPO epochs per batch. The KL penalty remains full, but with a lower initial KL coefficient of 0.05 and a tighter target KL of 3. The training is distributed across 8 GPUs using DeepSpeed ZeRO-3 parallelism for efficiency and scalability.

For the **KodCode** dataset (Table 10), we apply a more conservative learning rate of 5×10^{-7} with a cosine scheduler. The batch and gradient accumulation sizes match UltraFeedback, but the target KL is stricter at 1, with an initial KL coefficient of 0.07. The model is again trained with 4 PPO epochs per batch and a full KL penalty. Training is conducted on 8 GPUs using DeepSpeed ZeRO-1 parallelism.

These configurations were selected to balance stability and efficiency, while ensuring sufficient capacity for fine-grained span-level optimization guided by natural language feedback.

Table 8: Hyperparameters for NL-Gradient PPO Training on SLF5K

Hyperparameter	Value
Base Policy Model	Llama 3.1 8B Instruct
Base Reward Model	Llama 3.1 8B Instruct
Learning Rate	1×10^{-6}
LR Scheduler	Linear
Batch Size	12
Mini-batch Size	1
PPO Epochs	4
Gradient Accumulation Steps	12
Initial KL Coefficient	0.2
Target KL	6
KL Penalty	Full
Adaptive KL Control	True
Training Epochs	4

Table 9: Hyperparameters for NL-Gradient PPO Training on UltraFeedback

Hyperparameter	Value
Base Policy Model	Llama 3 8B Instruct
Base Reward Model	Llama 3.1 8B Instruct
Learning Rate	1×10^{-6}
LR Scheduler	Cosine
Batch Size	8
Mini-batch Size	1
PPO Epochs	4
Gradient Accumulation Steps	8
Initial KL Coefficient	0.05
Target KL	3
KL Penalty	Full
Adaptive KL Control	True
Training Epochs	4
Dataset	Ultrafeedback
Number of GPUs	8
Parallelism	DeepSpeed ZeRO-3

Table 10: Hyperparameters for NL-Gradient PPO Training on KodCode

Hyperparameter	Value
Base Policy Model	Llama 3.1 8B Instruct
Base Reward Model	Llama 3.1 8B Instruct
Learning Rate	5×10^{-7}
LR Scheduler	Cosine
Batch Size	8
Mini-batch Size	1
PPO Epochs	4
Gradient Accumulation Steps	8
Initial KL Coefficient	0.07
Target KL	1
KL Penalty	Full
Adaptive KL Control	True
Training Epochs	4
Dataset	KodCode
Number of GPUs	8
Parallelism	DeepSpeed ZeRO-1

E GPT-4o Judge CoT Influence Annotation Prompt

E.1 SLF5K Evaluation Prompt

The following prompt template was used to evaluate model responses on the SLF5K dataset. To prevent position bias in the evaluation, the order of model responses (analysis_1 and analysis_2) was randomly shuffled for each comparison:

Listing 4: SLF5K Evaluation Prompt

```
1 Compare and evaluate two different summaries of the same query. You
  must respond in valid JSON format.
2
3 Original Query:
4 {query}
5
6 {analysis_1_label}:
7 {response_1}
8
9 {analysis_2_label}:
10 {response_2}
11
12 Evaluation Criteria:
13 1. Accuracy (0-10):
14   - Does it capture the main points correctly?
15   - Is it faithful to the original content?
16   - Are there any factual errors?
17
18 2. Completeness (0-10):
19   - Are all key points included?
20   - Is any important information missing?
21   - Does it cover the core message?
22
23 3. Conciseness (0-10):
24   - Is it clear and to the point?
25   - Does it avoid unnecessary details?
26   - Is the language efficient?
27
28 4. Coherence (0-10):
29   - Is the summary well-organized?
30   - Does it flow logically?
31   - Is it easy to understand?
32
33 Compare both summaries and evaluate them. Respond ONLY with a JSON
  object in this exact format:
34 {
35   "{score_key_1}": {
36     "strengths": ["specific strength 1", "specific strength 2",
37       ...],
38     "weaknesses": ["specific weakness 1", "specific weakness 2",
39       ...]
40     "score": <overall score between 0-10>,
41     "accuracy": <score between 0-10>,
42     "completeness": <score between 0-10>,
43     "conciseness": <score between 0-10>,
44     "coherence": <score between 0-10>,
45   },
46   "{score_key_2}": {
```

```

45     "strengths": ["specific strength 1", "specific strength 2",
46         ...],
47     "weaknesses": ["specific weakness 1", "specific weakness 2",
48         ...]
49     "score": <overall score between 0-10>,
50     "accuracy": <score between 0-10>,
51     "completeness": <score between 0-10>,
52     "conciseness": <score between 0-10>,
53     "coherence": <score between 0-10>,
54 }
55 }

```

E.2 KodCode Evaluation Prompt

The following prompt template was used to evaluate the quality of code span selections for the KodCode dataset, which resulted in the win-rate metrics (72.17 : 7.01 : 20.82) comparing Chain-of-Thought (CoT) feedback quality:

Listing 5: KodCode Evaluation Prompt

```

1  Evaluate the precision and specificity of code span selections in
2    two different analyses.
3
4  Problem:
5  {problem}
6
7  Solution Code:
8  {solution}
9
10 {analysis_1_label}:
11 Selected spans: {spans_1}
12 Suggestions: {improve_1}
13
14 {analysis_2_label}:
15 Selected spans: {spans_2}
16 Suggestions: {improve_2}
17
18 Please evaluate the quality of span selections in JSON format,
19 focusing on precision and minimality:
20 {
21     "{score_key_1}": {
22         "score": (0-10 score for span selection precision),
23         "Reason": "Explain the reason for the score"
24     },
25     "{score_key_2}": {
26         "score": (0-10 score for span selection precision),
27         "Reason": "Explain the reason for the score"
28     },
29     "comparison": "Explain which analysis has more precise and
30                   minimal span selections"
31 }
32
33 Guidelines for span evaluation:
34 1. Each span should capture ONLY the specific problematic code,
35    nothing more

```

- 32 2. General or overly broad selections (like entire functions) are penalized
- 33 3. Spans should not include irrelevant surrounding code
- 34 4. Multiple small precise spans are better than one large span
- 35 5. Spans must directly relate to the identified issue

E.3 UltraFeedback Evaluation Prompt

The following prompt template was used to evaluate the precision and specificity of text span selections for the UltraFeedback dataset:

Listing 6: UltraFeedback Evaluation Prompt

```

1  """Evaluate the precision and specificity of text span selections in
   two different analyses.
2
3  Problem:
4  {problem}
5
6  Response:
7  {solution}
8
9  {analysis_1_label}:
10 Problematic spans: {spans_1}
11 Good spans: {improve_1}
12
13 {analysis_2_label}:
14 Problematic spans: {spans_2}
15 Good spans: {improve_2}
16
17 Please evaluate the quality of span selections in JSON format,
   focusing on precision and minimality:
18 {
19     "{score_key_1}": {
20         "score": (0-10 score for span selection precision),
21         "Reason": "Explain the reason for the score"
22     },
23     "{score_key_2}": {
24         "score": (0-10 score for span selection precision),
25         "Reason": "Explain the reason for the score"
26     },
27     "comparison": "Explain which analysis has more precise span
   selections while avoiding unnecessary or overly broad spans"
28 }
29
30 Guidelines for span evaluation:
31 1. Each problematic span should capture ONLY the specific
   problematic text, nothing more
32 2. General or overly broad selections are penalized
33 3. Spans should not include irrelevant surrounding text
34 4. Multiple small precise spans are better than one large span
35 5. Spans must directly relate to the identified issue
36 6. Good spans should highlight the best parts of the response

```

F Case Studies on HumanEval

We present three case studies from the HumanEval benchmark to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach.

F.1 Special Factorial

Problem Statement

```
1 def special_factorial(n):
2     """The Brazilian factorial is defined as:
3     brazilian_factorial(n) = n! * (n-1)! * (n-2)! * ... * 1!
4     where n > 0
5
6     For example:
7     >>> special_factorial(4)
8     288
9
10    The function will receive an integer as input and should return
11    the special
12    factorial of this integer.
13    """
```

Instruct Model Solution

```
1 def special_factorial(n):
2     if n < 0:
3         raise ValueError("Input must be a non-negative integer")
4
5     result = 1
6     for i in range(1, n + 1):
7         result *= math.factorial(i)
8
9     return result
```

PPO Model Solution

```
1 def special_factorial(n):
2     result = 1
3     for i in range(1, n + 1):
4         result *= i
5     return result
```

Our Approach

```
1 import math
2 def special_factorial(n):
3     if not isinstance(n, int) or n <= 0:
4         raise ValueError("Input must be a positive integer.")
5
6     result = 1
7     for i in range(1, n + 1):
8         result *= math.factorial(i)
```

```
9
10     return result
```

F.2 Prime Fibonacci Numbers

Problem Statement

```
1 def prime_fib(n: int):
2     """
3     prime_fib returns n-th number that is a Fibonacci number and
4     it's also prime.
5     >>> prime_fib(1)
6     2
7     >>> prime_fib(2)
8     3
9     >>> prime_fib(3)
10    5
11    >>> prime_fib(4)
12    13
13    >>> prime_fib(5)
14    89
    """
```

Instruct Model Solution

```
1 def is_prime(num: int) -> bool:
2     if num < 2:
3         return False
4     for i in range(2, int(num ** 0.5) + 1):
5         if num % i == 0:
6             return False
7     return True
8 def prime_fib(n: int) -> int:
9     a, b = 0, 1
10    count = 0
11    while True:
12        a, b = b, a + b
13        if is_prime(b):
14            count += 1
15            if count == n:
16                return b
```

PPO Model Solution

```
1 def prime_fib(n: int):
2     a, b = 0, 1
3     count = 0
4     while True:
5         a, b = b, a + b
6         if is_prime(b):
7             count += 1
8             if count == n:
```



```
9         return b
```

Our Approach

```
1 def is_prime(num: int) -> bool:
2     if num < 2:
3         return False
4     for i in range(2, int(num ** 0.5) + 1):
5         if num % i == 0:
6             return False
7     return True
8 def prime_fib(n: int) -> int:
9     a, b = 0, 1
10    count = 0
11    while True:
12        a, b = b, a + b
13        if is_prime(b):
14            count += 1
15            if count == n:
16                return b
```

E.3 File Name Validation

Problem Statement

```
1 def file_name_check(file_name):
2     """Create a function which takes a string representing a file's
3         name, and returns
4         'Yes' if the the file's name is valid, and returns 'No'
5         otherwise.
6         A file's name is considered to be valid if and only if all the
7         following conditions
8         are met:
9         - There should not be more than three digits ('0'-'9') in the
10           file's name.
11         - The file's name contains exactly one dot '.'
12         - The substring before the dot should not be empty, and it
13           starts with a letter from
14           the latin alphapet ('a'-'z' and 'A'-'Z').
15         - The substring after the dot should be one of these: ['txt',
16           'exe', 'dll']
17     Examples:
18     file_name_check("example.txt") # => 'Yes'
19     file_name_check("1example.dll") # => 'No' (the name should start
20         with a latin alphapet letter)
21     """
```

Instruct Model Solution

```
1 def file_name_check(file_name):
2     # First, split the file's name by the dot
3     name, extension = file_name.rsplit('.', 1)
```

```

4
5 # Check if the extension is valid
6 valid_extensions = ['txt', 'exe', 'dll']
7 if extension not in valid_extensions:
8     return 'No'
9
10 # Check if the substring before the dot is not empty
11 if not name:
12     return 'No'
13
14 # Check if the substring before the dot starts with a letter
15 # from the latin alphabet
16 if not name[0].isalpha():
17     return 'No'
18
19 # Check if there are more than three digits in the file's name
20 if sum(c.isdigit() for c in file_name) > 3:
21     return 'No'
22
23 # If all conditions are met, return 'Yes'
24 return 'Yes'

```

PPO Model Solution

```

1 def file_name_check(file_name):
2     # Split the file name into two parts: the name and the extension
3     name, extension = file_name.split('.')
4
5     # Check if the name starts with a latin alphabet letter
6     if not name[0].isalpha():
7         return 'No'
8
9     # Check if there are more than three digits in the name
10    if sum(c.isdigit() for c in name) > 3:
11        return 'No'
12
13    # Check if the extension is valid
14    if extension not in ['txt', 'exe', 'dll']:
15        return 'No'
16
17    # Check if the file name contains exactly one dot
18    if file_name.count('.') != 1:
19        return 'No'
20
21    # If all checks pass, return 'Yes'
22    return 'Yes'

```

Our Approach

```

1 def file_name_check(file_name):
2     """
3     Checks if a file name is valid according to the given conditions.
4

```

```

5     A file's name is considered to be valid if and only if all the
6     following conditions
7     are met:
8     - There should not be more than three digits ('0'-'9') in the
9       file's name.
10    - The file's name contains exactly one dot '.'.
11    - The substring before the dot should not be empty, and it
12      starts with a letter from
13    the latin alphabet ('a'-'z' and 'A'-'Z').
14    - The substring after the dot should be one of these: ['txt',
15      'exe', 'dll'].
16
17    Args:
18        file_name (str): The name of the file to check.
19
20    Returns:
21        str: 'Yes' if the file name is valid, 'No' otherwise.
22        """
23
24    # Check if the file name contains exactly one dot
25    if file_name.count('.') != 1:
26        return 'No'
27
28    # Split the file name into two parts: before and after the dot
29    before_dot, after_dot = file_name.split('.')
30
31    # Check if the substring before the dot is not empty and starts
32    # with a letter
33    if not before_dot or not before_dot[0].isalpha():
34        return 'No'
35
36    # Check if the substring before the dot contains more than three
37    # digits
38    if sum(c.isdigit() for c in before_dot) > 3:
39        return 'No'
40
41    # Check if the substring after the dot is one of the allowed
42    # extensions
43    if after_dot not in ['txt', 'exe', 'dll']:
44        return 'No'
45
46    # If all conditions are met, return 'Yes'
47    return 'Yes'

```

G Limitations

Despite its effectiveness, TEXT2GRAD has two primary limitations. First, its performance depends on the quality of the reward model. While our model achieves moderate alignment with reference critiques, further improvements in critique generation and span-level accuracy could enhance downstream policy optimization—particularly in tasks requiring nuanced feedback. Second, generating and applying token-level rewards introduces computational overhead compared to scalar reward methods, which may impact scalability in large-scale deployments. In future work, we aim to improve reward model precision and efficiency, and to extend our framework to broader generation settings, including open-ended tasks where fine-grained feedback is harder to define.




Figure 5: Comparative analysis of training dynamics between TEXT2GRAD and standard PPO. The results demonstrate that TEXT2GRAD (red line) achieves more stable and consistent learning progress, while standard PPO (blue line) shows significant volatility and unstable oscillations throughout the training process.

H Training Dynamics on KodCode and UltraFeedback

I Hyperparameters for Natural Language Reward Model Training

Parameter	Value
Base Model	Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct
Hardware	8× NVIDIA V100 (32GB)
Parallelization	DeepSpeed ZeRO-3
Batch Size	1 per GPU
Learning Rate	1e-5
Epochs	3
Prompt Max Length	950 tokens
Max Sequence Length	1250 tokens
LoRA Rank (r)	16
LoRA Alpha	32
LoRA Target Modules	q_proj, v_proj
LoRA Dropout	0.1
Optimizer	AdamW
Adam β_1, β_2	0.9, 0.999
Adam ϵ	1e-8
Weight Decay	3e-7
Gradient Clipping	1.0
FP16	Enabled

Table 11: Hyperparameters for Natural Language Reward Model Training

J Ablation Study for SLF5K

To demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed components, we conduct ablation studies on the SLF5K dataset. Figure 6 shows the performance comparison when removing the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning process and the span-level reward signals from our framework.




Figure 6: Ablation study results on SLF5K dataset. The graph shows the win rate comparison between our full model and the variant without CoT reasoning and span-level reward signals during reward model training. The results demonstrate that these components are crucial for achieving optimal performance in natural language gradient policy optimization.

K Pseudocode for the Text2Grad Framework

Algorithm 1 TEXT2GRAD: Reinforcement Learning from Natural Language Feedback (Overall Framework)

Input: Set of prompts for policy training.

Output: Optimized policy π_θ .

Phase 1: Dual-Feedback Reward Annotation (Described in Section 3.3)

- 1: Initialize dataset for reward model training $\mathcal{D}_R \leftarrow \emptyset$.
- 2: Generate initial responses y_i for a set of prompts x_i (e.g., using a base policy).
- 3: **for all** prompt x_i and its corresponding response y_i **do**
- 4: $(c_i, \mathcal{A}(y_i), \delta_i) \leftarrow \text{GenerateDualFeedback}(x_i, y_i)$ ▷ See Algorithm 2
- 5: Let $z_i \leftarrow [c_i; \mathcal{A}(y_i)]$ ▷ c_i is critique, $\mathcal{A}(y_i)$ is span-JSON
- 6: Add (x_i, y_i, z_i) to \mathcal{D}_R .
- 7: **end for**

Phase 2: Reward Model Training (Described in Section 3.4)

- 8: $R_\phi \leftarrow \text{TrainRewardModel}(\mathcal{D}_R)$ ▷ See Algorithm 3

Phase 3: NL-Gradient Policy Optimization (Described in Section 3.5)

- 9: Initialize policy π_θ (e.g., with a pre-trained LLM) and value function V_ψ .
 - 10: $\pi_\theta \leftarrow \text{OptimizePolicyWithNLGradient}(\pi_\theta, R_\phi, V_\psi)$ ▷ See Algorithm 4
 - 11: **return** Optimized policy π_θ .
-

Algorithm 2 Dual-Feedback Reward Annotation (Section 3.3)

```
1: procedure GENERATEDUALFEEDBACK( $x, y$ )
2:   Input: Prompt  $x$ , generated response  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_T)$ .
3:   Output: Natural language critique  $c$ , structured span-level reward map  $\mathcal{A}(y)$ , token-level pseudo-rewards  $\delta$ .
   // Dual-Feedback Annotation using a strong LLM (e.g., GPT-4o)
4:   if human-written feedback is lacking (Reasoning-Augmented Annotation) then
5:     Guide LLM to:
6:     (1) Reason about the quality of response  $y$  step-by-step.
7:     (2) Output a critique  $c$  based on this reasoning.
8:     (3) Produce a span-level JSON map  $\mathcal{A}(y)$  associating spans  $s_k \subset y$  with labels  $\ell_k \in \{\text{positive}, \text{neutral}, \text{negative}\}$ .
9:   else
10:    Prompt LLM to output critique  $c$  and span-level JSON map  $\mathcal{A}(y)$ .
11:   end if
12:    $\triangleright$  Formally,  $R_{\text{LLM}}(x, y) = (c, \mathcal{A}(y))$ , where  $\mathcal{A}(y) : s_k \mapsto \ell_k$ 
   // Token-Level Reward Mapping
13:   Initialize token-level pseudo-rewards  $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_T)$  with zeros.
14:   for all labeled span  $s_k$  in  $\mathcal{A}(y)$  do
15:     Let  $\ell_k = \mathcal{A}(y)[s_k]$ .
16:     if  $\ell_k = \text{positive}$  then
17:       for all token index  $t$  such that  $y_t \in s_k$  do
18:          $\delta_t \leftarrow +1$ .
19:       end for
20:     else if  $\ell_k = \text{negative}$  then
21:       for all token index  $t$  such that  $y_t \in s_k$  do
22:          $\delta_t \leftarrow -1$ .
23:       end for
24:     end if
25:   end for
26:    $\triangleright$  neutral spans are typically unannotated and default to  $\delta_t = 0$ .
27:   return  $c, \mathcal{A}(y), \delta$ .
28: end procedure
```

Algorithm 3 Reward Model Training (Section 3.4)

```
1: procedure TRAINREWARDMODEL( $\mathcal{D}_R$ )
2:   Input: Dataset  $\mathcal{D}_R = \{(x_i, y_i, z_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $z_i = [c_i; \mathcal{A}(y_i)]$ .
3:   Output: Trained reward model  $R_\phi$ .
4:   Initialize reward model parameters  $\phi$ .
5:   The reward model  $R_\phi$  is trained to predict  $z$  given  $x, y$ :  $p_\phi(z \mid x, y) = \prod_{j=1}^{|z|} p_\phi(z_j \mid z_{<j}, x, y)$ .
6:   Define the loss function:  $\mathcal{L}_R(\phi) = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{D}_R} [\log p_\phi(z \mid x, y)]$ .
7:   Train  $R_\phi$  by minimizing  $\mathcal{L}_R(\phi)$  on  $\mathcal{D}_R$  using teacher forcing and a standard causal LM objective.
8:   return Trained reward model  $R_\phi$ .
9: end procedure
```

Algorithm 4 NL-Gradient Policy Optimization (Section 3.5)

```
1: procedure OPTIMIZEPOLICYWITHNLGRADIENT( $\pi_{\theta_{\text{init}}}, R_{\phi}, V_{\psi_{\text{init}}}$ )
2:   Input: Initial policy  $\pi_{\theta_{\text{init}}}$ , trained reward model  $R_{\phi}$ , initial value function  $V_{\psi_{\text{init}}}$ .
3:   Hyperparameters: Learning rates, PPO clipping  $\epsilon$ , entropy bonus  $\beta$ , GAE  $\gamma, \lambda$ .
4:   Output: Optimized policy  $\pi_{\theta}$ .
5:   Initialize policy  $\pi_{\theta} \leftarrow \pi_{\theta_{\text{init}}}$ , value function  $V_{\psi} \leftarrow V_{\psi_{\text{init}}}$ .
6:   for each iteration  $iter = 1, \dots, \text{MaxIterations}$  do
7:     Let  $\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}} \leftarrow \pi_{\theta}$ .
8:     Initialize a batch of rollouts  $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
9:     for each sample  $s = 1, \dots, \text{NumSamplesPerIteration}$  do
10:      Sample prompt  $x$ .
11:      Generate response  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_T) \sim \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\cdot | x)$ .
12:      Generate feedback  $z' = [c'; \mathcal{A}'(y)] \sim R_{\phi}(z' | x, y)$ .
13:      Parse  $\mathcal{A}'(y)$  to get token-level pseudo-rewards  $\delta' = (\delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_T)$  (using lines 11-20 of Alg. 2).
14:      For  $t = 1, \dots, T$ :  $r_t^{\text{total}, A} \leftarrow \delta'_t + r_t^{\text{KL}}$   $\triangleright r_t^{\text{KL}}$  is an optional KL-penalty term.
15:      Compute advantages  $A_1, \dots, A_T$ . For  $t = T \dots 1$ :
16:         $A_t = \sum_{k=t}^T \gamma^{k-t} r_k^{\text{total}, A} - V_{\psi}(x, y_{<t})$ . (Or use GAE:  $A_t = \sum_{l=0}^{T-t-1} (\gamma\lambda)^l (r_{t+l}^{\text{total}, A} + \gamma V_{\psi}(x, y_{<t+l+1}) - V_{\psi}(x, y_{<t+l}))$ )
17:        Add  $(x, y, \delta', \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r}^{\text{total}, A})$  to  $\mathcal{B}$ .
18:     end for
19:     for each epoch  $e = 1, \dots, \text{NumEpochsPPO}$  do
20:       for all  $(x, y, \delta', \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r}^{\text{total}, A})$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  do
21:         For  $t = 1, \dots, T$ :
22:            $\rho_t(\theta) = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y_t | x, y_{<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(y_t | x, y_{<t})}$ .
23:            $L_t^{\text{CLIP}}(\theta) = \min(\rho_t(\theta) A_t, \text{clip}(\rho_t(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) A_t)$ .
24:            $L_t^{\text{VF}}(\psi) = (V_{\psi}(x, y_{<t}) - (\sum_{k=t}^T \gamma^{k-t} r_k^{\text{total}, A}))^2$ .  $\triangleright$  Value target is discounted sum of rewards.
25:            $L_t^{\text{ENT}}(\theta) = \mathcal{H}(\pi_{\theta}(\cdot | x, y_{<t}))$ .
26:         end for
27:          $L^{\text{PPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{B}, t} [L_t^{\text{CLIP}}(\theta) - \beta L_t^{\text{ENT}}(\theta)]$ .
28:          $L^{\text{VF}}(\psi) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{B}, t} [L_t^{\text{VF}}(\psi)]$ .
29:         Update policy parameters:  $\theta \leftarrow \text{optimizer\_step}(\theta, \nabla_{\theta} L^{\text{PPO}}(\theta))$ .
30:         Update value function parameters:  $\psi \leftarrow \text{optimizer\_step}(\psi, \nabla_{\psi} L^{\text{VF}}(\psi))$ .
31:       end for
32:     end for
33:   return Optimized policy  $\pi_{\theta}$ .
34: end procedure
```
