
DVAO: Dynamic Variance-adaptive Advantage Optimization for Multi-reward Reinforcement Learning

Guochao Jiang*, Jingyi Song, Guofeng Quan, Chuzhan Hao, Guohua Liu, Yuewei Zhang
Alibaba Cloud Computing
anyue.jgc@alibaba-inc.com

Abstract

Reinforcement Learning has become a standard paradigm for aligning Large Language Models with human intent and task requirements. While Group Relative Policy Optimization offers an efficient, value-model-free alternative to Proximal Policy Optimization, adapting it to real-world multi-reward settings remains challenging. Standard scalarization practices, such as Reward Combination and Advantage Combination, suffer from significant drawbacks: Reward Combination frequently generates advantages with excessively large squared magnitudes that lead to training instability, while Advantage Combination relies on static hyperparameters and ignores cross-objective correlations. To address these limitations, we propose **Dynamic Variance-adaptive Advantage Optimization (DVAO)**, which dynamically adjusts combination weights based on the empirical reward variance of each objective within a rollout group, effectively up-weighting objectives with a stronger learning signal while suppressing noisy ones. We mathematically prove that DVAO maintains bounded advantage magnitudes for stable training and introduces a self-adaptive cross-objective regularization mechanism. Extensive experiments on mathematical reasoning and tool-use benchmarks using Qwen3 and Qwen2.5 models demonstrate that DVAO significantly outperforms baseline methods, achieving a superior multi-objective Pareto frontier and robust training stability.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across a wide range of natural language processing tasks (Plaat et al., 2025), including Qwen3 (Yang et al., 2025), Kimi K2.5 (Team et al., 2026), and DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025). To align these models with human intent and specific task requirements, Reinforcement Learning (RL) has become a standard paradigm (Zhang et al., 2025b; Chu et al., 2025). Recently, Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) (Shao et al., 2024) and its variants (Yu et al., 2025; Zheng et al., 2025; Jiang et al., 2025a) have emerged as highly efficient alternatives to Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017) for LLMs. By eliminating the need for a separate value model and relying instead on relative advantage estimation within a sampled group of rollouts, GRPO significantly reduces memory overhead and simplifies the training pipeline (Liu et al., 2025d).

However, deploying LLMs in real-world scenarios rarely involves optimizing a single, isolated metric. Practical applications dictate multi-objective requirements: a model must not only provide accurate answers but also adhere to length constraints (Sui et al., 2025; Feng et al., 2025a), minimize bug rates in code generation (Tambon et al., 2025; Gao et al., 2025), maintain a low hallucination rate

*Corresponding author.

(Huang et al., 2025; Sahoo et al., 2024), and keep correct tool-calling format in tool-use (Jin et al., 2025; Feng et al., 2025b). Adapting GRPO to this multi-reward setting is non-trivial. The standard practice involves scalarization—either linearly combining the raw rewards (Reward Combination) or independently normalizing the rewards and then combining their respective advantages (Advantage Combination).

Despite their widespread use, both methods suffer from significant theoretical and practical drawbacks. As we demonstrate in this work, the Reward Combination method frequently generates advantages with excessively large squared magnitudes than the Advantage Combination method, which translates to erratic policy gradients and training instability. Conversely, while the Advantage Combination method normalizes these magnitudes, it relies on static hyperparameters and completely isolates the objectives during normalization. This naive decoupling fails to capture the intricate correlations—whether synergistic or antagonistic—between different objectives during a single rollout, often leading to suboptimal trade-offs.

To address these fundamental limitations, we propose **Dynamic Variance-adaptive Advantage Optimization (DVAO)**. DVAO elegantly bridges the gap between stability and objective synergy by dynamically adjusting the combination weights based on the empirical reward variance of each objective within the rollout group. This completely data-driven method up-weights objectives with higher variance—indicating a stronger learning signal—while suppressing noisy, low-variance objectives. Crucially, we mathematically prove that DVAO not only bounds the advantage magnitude for stable training but also introduces a self-adaptive cross-objective regularization mechanism. In DVAO, the gradient contribution of a single objective is modulated by the overall multi-objective performance of that specific rollout, ensuring a holistic optimization trajectory.

In summary, we theoretically expose the fundamental flaws of existing scalarization methods in multi-reward GRPO—namely magnitude explosion and objective isolation—and propose Dynamic Variance-adaptive Advantage Optimization to address these limitations. DVAO is a fully dynamic, hyperparameter-free weighting scheme that we mathematically prove maintains bounded advantage magnitudes while introducing an implicit cross-objective regularization mechanism to promote synergistic learning. Extensive empirical evaluations on mathematical reasoning and tool-use benchmarks demonstrate that DVAO significantly outperforms baseline methods, accelerating convergence and consistently achieving a superior multi-objective Pareto frontier without sacrificing robust training stability.

2 Preliminaries

Recently, GRPO (Shao et al., 2024) and its variants, including Dynamic Sampling Policy Optimization (DAPO) (Yu et al., 2025) and Group Sequence Policy Optimization (GSPO) (Zheng et al., 2025), have become widely used algorithms for policy optimization due to their simplicity and efficiency. Unlike Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017), GRPO gains more flexibility by eliminating the value model and using relative advantage within group.

GRPO initially calculates the relative advantage for a single reward and then performs policy optimization. However, real-world tasks often have multi-objective requirements. In addition to the accuracy of the task itself, there may be other requirements, such as output length (Jiang et al., 2025b; Liu et al., 2025b; Aggarwal and Welleck, 2025), bug rate of generated code (Tambon et al., 2025; Gao, 2025), hallucination rate of output content, and correct function call in tool-use (Li et al., 2025; Xie et al., 2025). To adapt to GRPO, the usual solution is to combine the rewards corresponding to multiple objectives to form a final reward for policy optimization.

Formally, given a dataset \mathcal{D} , x is the query and y is the response. For the policy model π_θ parameterized by θ , the likelihood by the policy model π_θ is given by $\pi_\theta(y|x) = \prod_{t=1}^{|y|} \pi_\theta(y_t|x, y_{<t})$. In a multi-reward setting, there are n reward functions r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n for independent objectives. For a given input-output pair (x_i, y_j) , the corresponding reward is denoted as $r_k^{(i,j)} = r_k(x_i, y_j) \in [0, 1], k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. In the usual practice, the reward r ultimately used for strategy optimization is a convex combination of the various reward component:

$$r_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} = w_1 r_1^{(i,j)} + w_2 r_2^{(i,j)} + \dots + w_n r_n^{(i,j)} = \sum_k w_k r_k^{(i,j)}, \sum_k w_k = 1, w_k \in [0, 1], \quad (1)$$

where w_k is the weight hyperparameter corresponding to r_k .

For GRPO, each input x_i will sample G rollouts y_1, y_2, \dots, y_G to calculate the relative advantage:

$$A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} = \frac{r_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} - \text{mean} \left(\left\{ r_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} \right\}_{j=1}^G \right)}{\text{std} \left(\left\{ r_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} \right\}_{j=1}^G \right)}. \quad (2)$$

The corresponding policy optimization objective for GRPO can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{GRPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim \mathcal{D}, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^G \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | x_i)} \left[\frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \frac{1}{|y_j|} \sum_{t=1}^{|y_j|} \min \left(s_{j,t}(\theta) A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)}, \text{clip}(s_{j,t}(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} \right) \right], \quad (3)$$

where $s_{j,t}(\theta) = \frac{\pi_\theta(y_{j,t} | x_i, y_{j,<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(y_{j,t} | x_i, y_{j,<t})}$ is the importance sampling ratio and ϵ is the clipping range. For clarity, we omit the KL divergence term. The corresponding gradient is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\theta \mathcal{J}_{\text{GRPO}}(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim \mathcal{D}, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^G \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | x_i)} \\ &\frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \frac{1}{|y_j|} \sum_{t=1}^{|y_j|} \min \left(s_{j,t}(\theta) A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)}, \text{clip}(s_{j,t}(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} \right) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y_{j,t} | x_i, y_{j,<t}). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Another common multi-reward policy optimization method focuses on convex combinations of advantages rather than rewards, such as Group reward-Decoupled Normalization Policy Optimization (GDPO) (Liu et al., 2026). Specifically, the independent reward for each objective is calculated as an independent advantage in a manner similar to GRPO, and these advantages are then combined to obtain the advantage used for policy optimization:

$$A_1^{(i,j)} = \frac{r_1^{(i,j)} - \text{mean} \left(\left\{ r_1^{(i,j)} \right\}_{j=1}^G \right)}{\text{std} \left(\left\{ r_1^{(i,j)} \right\}_{j=1}^G \right)}, \dots, A_n^{(i,j)} = \frac{r_n^{(i,j)} - \text{mean} \left(\left\{ r_n^{(i,j)} \right\}_{j=1}^G \right)}{\text{std} \left(\left\{ r_n^{(i,j)} \right\}_{j=1}^G \right)}. \quad (5)$$

Then, these individual advantages are combined using a similar convex combination method to obtain a single advantage result:

$$A^{(i,j)} = w_1 A_1^{(i,j)} + w_2 A_2^{(i,j)} + \dots + w_n A_n^{(i,j)} = \sum_k w_k A_k^{(i,j)}, \sum_k w_k = 1, w_k \in [0, 1], \quad (6)$$

where w_k is the weight hyperparameter corresponding to A_k . Based on $A^{(i,j)}$ and Equation 3, policy optimization is performed to improve the performance of LLM for multiple objectives. GDPO further utilizes batch-wise advantage normalization to maintain training stability.

3 Method

In this section, we will first discuss the shortcomings of the reward combination and advantage combination methods discussed above, and then introduce our proposed DVAO method in detail.

3.1 Reward Combination and Advantage Combination

Having introduced both the reward combination method and the advantage combination method, a natural question arises: **which method produces a more effective gradient signal for policy optimization?** To answer this, we analyze the magnitude of the mean squared advantage, as the policy gradient is directly proportional to the advantage value in Equation 4. Specifically, a larger advantage magnitude leads to a larger policy gradient update, which may cause training instability and hinder convergence in the multi-reward setting. To answer this, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 1. For a fixed query x_i , let $\hat{\rho}_{kl}^i$ denote the sample correlation between A_k and A_l within the group rollout. The reward combination method and the advantage combination method satisfy:

$$\frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(A_{sum}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(A^{(i,j)} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(\sum_k w_k A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 \quad (7)$$

with equality if and only if $\hat{\rho}_{kl} = 1$ for all $k \neq l$.

This result reveals that the reward combination method, despite its simplicity, produces advantages with larger squared magnitude on average, leading to larger policy gradients. Although the advantage combination method achieves better results in the magnitude of the advantage, it fails to explicitly consider the correlation between multiple rewards. It is essentially equivalent to making a convex combination of the RL optimization objective composed of multiple independent rewards. Full proof is in Appendix A.

Formally, based on Equation 4 and Equation 6, without considering clipping range for brevity, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J}_{GRPO}(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim \mathcal{D}, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^G \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot|x_i)} \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \frac{1}{|y_j|} \sum_{t=1}^{|y_j|} s_{j,t}(\theta) A^{(i,j)} \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(y_{j,t}|x_i, y_{j,<t}) \\ &= \sum_k w_k \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J}_{GRPO}(\theta)_k, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{J}_{GRPO}(\theta)_k$ is the gradient of the RL optimization objective corresponding to $A_k^{(i,j)}$. Therefore, from the perspective of RL gradient, the advantage combination method does not explicitly take into account the correlation between multiple rewards. Furthermore, it is difficult to adjust the training intensity of different RL objectives during dynamic training with fixed hyperparameters of convex combination coefficients $\{w_k\}_{k=1}^n$.

3.2 Dynamic Variance-adaptive Advantage Optimization

The above discussion reveals that the reward combination method, despite its simplicity, produces advantages with larger squared magnitude on average, leading to larger policy gradients. While the advantage combination method alleviates this problem by decoupling the normalization of each objective, it still relies on fixed weights and does not explicitly introduce the correlation between multiple rewards, making it difficult to optimize multiple objectives as a whole. This motivates our proposed **Dynamic Variance-adaptive Advantage Optimization**, namely **DVAO**, which further adapts the combination weights according to the reward variance of each objective. At the same time, DVAO has a better advantage magnitude than the reward combination method.

Formally, DVAO replaces the fixed combination weights w_k with dynamic variance-adaptive weights $\tilde{w}_k = \frac{w_k \sigma_k^i}{\sum_l w_l \sigma_l^i}$, which up-weights objectives with higher reward variance and down-weights objectives with lower reward variance in a fully dynamic and data-driven manner, where $\sigma_k^i = \text{std} \left(\left\{ r_k^{(i,j)} \right\}_{j=1}^G \right)$ and $\sigma_{sum}^i = \text{std} \left(\left\{ r_{sum}^{(i,j)} \right\}_{j=1}^G \right)$ are the corresponding group standard deviations. The DVAO advantage is then computed as:

$$A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)} = \sum_k \tilde{w}_k A_k^{(i,j)} = \frac{\sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i A_k^{(i,j)}}{\sum_l w_l \sigma_l^i}. \quad (9)$$

To illustrate the advantage of DVAO over the reward combination method in terms of advantage magnitude, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 2. For a fixed query x_i and rollout group $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^G \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot|x_i)$, the reward combination method produces a pointwise larger advantage magnitude than DVAO:

$$\left| A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)} \right| \leq \left| A_{sum}^{(i,j)} \right|, \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, G\} \quad (10)$$

with equality if and only if $\text{Cov} \left(r_k^{(i,j)}, r_l^{(i,j)} \right) = \sigma_k^i \sigma_l^i$ for all $k \neq l$, i.e., all reward pairs are perfectly positively correlated within the rollout group.

Beyond the pointwise advantage magnitude comparison, we further analyze how DVAO and the advantage combination method differ in their sensitivity to the raw rewards of individual objectives. Full proof is in Appendix B. This analysis provides a deeper understanding of how DVAO explicitly captures cross-objective interactions, a property that the standard advantage combination method fundamentally lacks. Specifically, we examine the partial derivative of the combined advantage with respect to the raw reward $r_k^{(i,j)}$. This derivative measures how the final advantage responds to a perturbation in the k -th objective’s reward, reflecting the degree to which each objective influences the overall gradient signal. We have the following proposition:

Proposition 3. *For a fixed query x_i , and rollout group $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^G \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x_i)$, the sensitivity of the combined advantage with respect to the k -th raw reward $r_k^{(i,j)}$ for the advantage combination method and DVAO are respectively given by:*

$$\frac{\partial A^{(i,j)}}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} = \frac{w_k}{\sigma_k^i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} - \frac{1}{G} \left(A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 \right), \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\partial A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)}}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} = \frac{\tilde{w}_k}{\sigma_k^i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} - \frac{1}{G} A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)} A_k^{(i,j)} \right). \quad (12)$$

While the sensitivity of $A^{(i,j)}$ strictly depends on the isolated advantage of the k -th objective, the sensitivity of $A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)}$ adaptively depends on the cross-term $A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)} A_k^{(i,j)}$, allowing it to aggregate global performance information across all objectives within the rollout group.

This result highlights a fundamental difference in the optimization dynamics. In the advantage combination method, the gradient contribution from the k -th objective is scaled purely by its own isolated performance $\left(A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2$, treating the auxiliary objectives as entirely separate tasks. In contrast, DVAO scales the gradient contribution using the cross-interaction term $A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)} A_k^{(i,j)}$. This mathematical property proves that DVAO dynamically adjusts the learning signal of the k -th objective based on the model’s overall multi-objective performance $A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)}$ on that specific rollout. Consequently, DVAO automatically modulates the reward sensitivity to reinforce the synergistic alignment of multiple objectives, effectively functioning as a cross-objective, variance-aware regularization mechanism. Full proof is in Appendix C.

In summary, our proposed DVAO method addresses the fundamental limitations of both standard reward combination and advantage combination methods in multi-reward GRPO. By dynamically adapting combination weights based on the empirical variance of each reward within a rollout group, DVAO achieves two critical theoretical properties. First, as demonstrated in Proposition 2, DVAO mitigates the training instability inherent in the raw reward combination method by yielding advantages with a strictly bounded magnitude, preventing overly aggressive policy updates. Second, and perhaps more importantly, Proposition 3 proves that DVAO goes beyond the naive decoupling of the advantage combination method. By mathematically linking the gradient sensitivity of a single objective to the overall combined advantage $A_{DVAO}^{(i,j)} A_k^{(i,j)}$, DVAO introduces an implicit cross-objective regularization mechanism. The learning signal for any individual objective is dynamically modulated by the model’s global multi-objective performance on that specific rollout. This context-aware scaling ensures that the policy does not greedily over-optimize a single easy objective at the expense of others, inherently promoting synergistic alignment and a more stable trajectory toward a multi-objective Pareto optimal policy.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Benchmarks. In this work, we focus specifically on mathematical reasoning and tool-use tasks to evaluate our proposed DVAO algorithm. For mathematical reasoning task, we evaluate models on AIME-2024², AIME-2025³, MATH500 (Lightman et al., 2024), OlympiadBench (He et al., 2024),

²https://huggingface.co/datasets/Maxwell-Jia/AIME_2024

³https://huggingface.co/datasets/yentinglin/aime_2025

Table 1: Performance comparison across different methods on AIME-2024, AIME-2025, MATH500, OlympaidBench, and AMC23. **Acc.**: Output Accuracy (%). **Len.**: The Rate (%) of output length not exceeding l . DVAO achieves state-of-the-art performance with both scores in average.

| Method | AIME-2024 | | AIME-2025 | | MATH500 | | Olympaid | | AMC23 | | Average | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Acc. | Len. | Acc. | Len. | Acc. | Len. | Acc. | Len. | Acc. | Len. | Acc. | Len. |
| Qwen3-4B-Base | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Model | 7.92 | 88.12 | 4.79 | 88.54 | 55.05 | 91.42 | 26.98 | 92.02 | 34.18 | 91.94 | 25.78 | 90.41 |
| + GRPO | 17.91 | 62.08 | 10.20 | 68.33 | 78.92 | 93.04 | 42.88 | 82.82 | 49.62 | 82.91 | 39.91 | 77.84 |
| + RC | 14.58 | 92.50 | 9.38 | 95.42 | 78.31 | 98.91 | 41.18 | 97.43 | 51.50 | 97.67 | 38.99 | 96.39 |
| + AC | 16.25 | 91.04 | 9.38 | 95.21 | 77.65 | 98.69 | 41.02 | 98.08 | 49.47 | 98.12 | 38.75 | 96.23 |
| + GDPO | 2.08 | 95.83 | 3.75 | 96.46 | 30.06 | 99.52 | 16.56 | 98.29 | 14.60 | 98.95 | 13.41 | 97.81 |
| + DVAO | 16.87 | 100.0 | 13.54 | 99.79 | 81.36 | 99.94 | 45.63 | 99.96 | 53.53 | 99.85 | 42.19 | 99.91 |
| Qwen3-8B-Base | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Model | 11.87 | 89.79 | 8.96 | 93.33 | 69.20 | 97.44 | 34.95 | 94.66 | 41.56 | 96.16 | 33.31 | 94.28 |
| + GRPO | 29.58 | 40.00 | 24.58 | 52.08 | 87.93 | 89.61 | 55.57 | 70.81 | 65.21 | 64.83 | 52.57 | 63.47 |
| + RC | 21.04 | 97.08 | 16.25 | 99.38 | 84.97 | 99.59 | 49.73 | 98.48 | 59.33 | 99.02 | 46.26 | 98.71 |
| + AC | 20.41 | 97.71 | 15.62 | 98.96 | 84.42 | 99.58 | 48.52 | 98.93 | 58.13 | 99.02 | 45.42 | 98.84 |
| + GDPO | 1.67 | 100.0 | 0.00 | 100.0 | 35.07 | 100.0 | 9.15 | 99.96 | 27.56 | 100.0 | 14.69 | 99.99 |
| + DVAO | 21.87 | 100.0 | 18.33 | 100.0 | 86.10 | 99.99 | 50.62 | 99.76 | 60.54 | 99.85 | 47.49 | 99.92 |

and AMC23⁴. In mathematical reasoning tasks, we focus on two main objectives: accuracy and length constrain. For tool-use task, we follow the setup of ToolRL (Qian et al., 2025) and GDPO, which evaluate models on Berkeley Function Call Leaderboard (BFCL-v4) (Patil et al., 2025), a comprehensive benchmark covering a broad range of challenges, including single-step reasoning, multi-step tool-use, real-time execution, irrelevant tool rejection, simultaneous multi-tool selection, and multi-tool execution. In tool-use task, we focus on two main objectives: tool-use correctness and format compliance.

Baselines and Models. We mainly use GRPO (Shao et al., 2024) as the single-reward r_{acc} baseline for the comparison. Based on GRPO, we implement the Reward Combination (RC) method and Advantage Combination (AC) method for the multi-reward tasks. For comparison, we include the GDPO (Liu et al., 2026) algorithm. We use *Qwen3-4B-Base* and *Qwen3-8B-Base* (Yang et al., 2025) for the mathematical reasoning tasks, and *Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct* and *Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct* (Yang et al., 2024) for the tool-use tasks. For complete implementation details, see Appendix D.

4.2 Main Results

Tables 1 and Table 2 summarize the performance across all methods and model scales. DVAO achieves the highest average accuracy and near-perfect length/format compliance simultaneously across both tasks and model scales, while every baseline method sacrifices one dimension for the other. On math reasoning, RC and AC trade accuracy for length compliance, and GDPO achieves near-perfect length compliance at the cost of the lowest accuracy among all methods. On tool-use, DVAO leads both accuracy and format compliance by a substantial margin. Notably, DVAO remains the only method to achieve the highest score on both dimensions simultaneously at both scales, whereas other methods improve one dimension at the expense of the other—GRPO shows near-zero format compliance on both tool-use models, and AC on 7B actually underperforms the base model in accuracy. Importantly, all methods share the same equal-weight initialization, so the consistent advantage of DVAO stems from its adaptive mechanism rather than superior initial hyperparameter choice, a conclusion reinforced by the Pareto frontier analysis in Section 4.4 where DVAO dominates across the entire weight sweep.

4.3 Training Dynamics

To understand how DVAO shapes the optimization trajectory, we visualize the evolution of accuracy reward, length reward, and response length throughout training on both *Qwen3-4B-Base* and *Qwen3-8B-Base* (Figure 1 and 2). All curves are smoothed with a centered moving average (window = 15).

⁴<https://huggingface.co/datasets/AI-MO/aimo-validation-amc>

Table 2: Performance comparison across different methods on Live, Non-Live, and Multi-Turn in BFCL-v4. **Acc.:** Output Accuracy (%). **Format.:** The Rate (%) of output content conforming to the required format. DVAO achieves state-of-the-art performance with both scores in average.

| Method | Live | | Non-Live | | Multi-Turn | | Average | |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Acc. | Format. | Acc. | Format. | Acc. | Format. | Acc. | Format. |
| Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct | | | | | | | | |
| Model | 59.44 | 11.02 | 47.10 | 4.89 | 1.75 | 1.08 | 36.10 | 5.66 |
| + GRPO | 59.73 | 10.35 | 47.94 | 5.18 | 2.00 | 1.29 | 36.56 | 5.61 |
| + RC | 67.51 | 61.71 | 79.94 | 83.45 | 5.62 | 36.29 | 51.02 | 60.48 |
| + AC | 69.43 | 67.04 | 82.35 | 84.82 | 8.62 | 42.20 | 53.47 | 64.69 |
| + GDPO | 67.73 | 65.08 | 82.08 | 84.53 | 8.38 | 48.04 | 52.73 | 65.88 |
| + DVAO | 72.73 | 77.44 | 84.75 | 95.11 | 12.50 | 57.40 | 56.66 | 76.65 |
| Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct | | | | | | | | |
| Model | 62.92 | 0.0 | 69.56 | 0.0 | 11.00 | 0.0 | 47.83 | 0.00 |
| + GRPO | 68.76 | 0.0 | 81.65 | 0.0 | 6.38 | 0.0 | 52.26 | 0.00 |
| + RC | 75.06 | 87.58 | 85.33 | 96.11 | 14.75 | 45.56 | 58.38 | 76.42 |
| + AC | 63.80 | 67.39 | 56.21 | 85.40 | 12.75 | 51.33 | 44.25 | 68.04 |
| + GDPO | 76.17 | 68.90 | 86.73 | 85.83 | 17.50 | 49.63 | 60.13 | 68.12 |
| + DVAO | 79.68 | 77.93 | 87.06 | 95.11 | 22.25 | 64.58 | 63.00 | 79.21 |




Figure 1: Training dynamics on *Qwen3-4B-Base*. Left: accuracy reward (top=mean, bottom=std). Middle: length reward (top=mean, bottom=std). Right: average response length.

Accuracy reward. Across both model scales, DVAO consistently achieves the highest accuracy reward while suppressing its variance most effectively. All methods start from a similar low baseline and rise steadily throughout training. DVAO’s accuracy reward curve stays above all baselines at every stage, with the margin widening on the larger model. More importantly, the standard deviation of accuracy rewards under DVAO declines more sharply than all baselines. On both 4B and 8B, DVAO’s accuracy standard deviation drops to the lowest final value among all methods, while AC consistently exhibits the highest variance throughout training. This combination of higher mean accuracy and lower variance indicates that adaptive variance normalization yields both stronger task performance and more stable gradients, consistent with Proposition 2 which guarantees that DVAO’s advantage magnitude remains bounded and well-scaled throughout training.

Length reward. DVAO drives the length reward closest to the target value of 1.0 and exhibits the most dramatic variance collapse. On both model scales, DVAO’s length reward rises quickly and stabilizes near the target, while RC fluctuates more noticeably and settles at a visibly lower level. The length reward standard deviation under DVAO shows a far steeper decline than any baseline. For 4B, DVAO’s standard deviation drops to a fraction of the RC and AC final values, which remain clustered together at significantly higher levels. For 8B, the gap is even more pronounced, with DVAO’s standard deviation approaching near-zero while baselines retain substantially more variance. This variance-balancing mechanism prevents either reward channel from dominating the gradient, enabling





Figure 2: Training dynamics on *Qwen3-8B-Base*. Left: accuracy reward (top=mean, bottom=std). Middle: length reward (top=mean, bottom=std). Right: average response length.



(a) Mathematical Reasoning Task (*Qwen3-4B-Base*)

(b) Tool-Use Task (*Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct*)

Figure 3: Pareto frontier of accuracy vs. length/format compliance across methods. DVAO consistently dominates the upper-right region.

more stable convergence to the target length reward. The pronounced std collapse under DVAO directly reflects the cross-objective regularization effect described in Proposition 3, where the adaptive normalization couples the accuracy and length objectives to prevent either from overwhelming the combined advantage signal.

Response length. All methods start from a similar initial response length of around 800 tokens. DVAO drives the fastest and most sustained growth, reaching the highest final length on both model scales. RC achieves comparable final lengths, while AC exhibits the slowest growth. Notably, DVAO’s response length curves on 4B and 8B display more visible oscillation compared to the smoother trajectories of RC and AC, which reflects its more aggressive length reward optimization and explores longer reasoning traces more dynamically. Despite this oscillation, the mean response length still converges to a higher plateau, confirming that DVAO’s bounded advantage signal prevents runaway exploration while still encouraging productive length growth.

4.4 Pareto Frontiers

While Section 4.2 reports the trained single checkpoint per method, optimizing with a single weight w_k only reveals one point on the accuracy–length trade-off curve. To fully characterize how each method balances correctness and conciseness, we sweep the accuracy weight w_1 (with length weight or format weight $w_2 = 1 - w_1$) across a range of values $\{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$ and plot the

resulting Pareto frontier in Figure 3a (*Qwen3-4B-Base*, Mathematical Reasoning Task) and Figure 3b (*Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct*, Tool-Use Task).

DVAO consistently achieves superior trade-offs, dominating the frontier across both tasks by maintaining high auxiliary compliance (length/format) across the entire accuracy range. In contrast, fixed-weight baselines exhibit distinct failure modes: RC saturates quickly, AC suffers from severe instability, and GDPO fluctuates incoherently. This confirms that without adaptive normalization, uncontrolled advantage scaling prevents effective trade-off navigation. Furthermore, DVAO’s dominance is especially pronounced on the complex math task, shifting the entire frontier significantly above baselines. This suggests that dynamic variance-balancing is crucial for multi-step reasoning, as it prevents easier objectives (length) from overwhelming harder learning signals (accuracy) during training.

5 Related Work

Advancements in GRPO and Reasoning Models The shift from PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) to GRPO (Shao et al., 2024) has significantly streamlined the post-training pipeline for Large Language Models by eliminating the need for a heavily parameterized value model. This efficiency has been instrumental in the development of state-of-the-art reasoning models like DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025). Recently, several variants have been proposed to further enhance GRPO’s stability and efficiency. GSPO (Zheng et al., 2025) shifts the importance ratio calculation from the token level to the sequence level to mitigate variance. DAPO (Yu et al., 2025) introduces dynamic sampling and token-level policy gradients to accelerate convergence. To address the issue of length explosion during reasoning, methods like GFPO (Shrivastava et al., 2025) and DLER (Liu et al., 2025a) incorporate length-based heuristics, such as filtering responses by reward-per-token ratios or applying simple truncation penalties. While these extensions improve specific aspects of the GRPO framework, they primarily focus on single-reward maximization or rely on rigid heuristics, which struggle to generalize to complex, multi-dimensional alignment tasks.

Multi-Reward Reinforcement Learning in LLMs Integrating multiple, often conflicting, reward signals is increasingly vital for practical LLM deployments, ranging from balancing diverse human preferences (Lai et al., 2024; Jang et al., 2023) to enforcing length efficiency (Shrivastava et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2025a; Luo et al., 2025) and strict formatting constraints in agentic tool-use (Qian et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2025a). To simultaneously optimize these diverse objectives, standard practices typically rely on Reward Combination (RC) or Advantage Combination (AC). While RC directly scalarizes raw rewards but frequently suffers from magnitude explosion, AC-based methods like GDPO (Liu et al., 2026) independently normalize each reward into an advantage before applying a static convex combination. Although GDPO mitigates extreme gradients, its reliance on fixed hyperparameters completely isolates the objectives during normalization. Our proposed DVAO diverges fundamentally from these approaches: by introducing a dynamic, variance-adaptive weighting scheme, DVAO strictly bounds advantage magnitudes while explicitly modeling cross-objective correlations, enabling a self-adaptive regularization mechanism that seamlessly scales to multiple objectives without manual tuning.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we identify the fundamental theoretical and practical limitations of standard scalarization techniques—namely Reward Combination and Advantage Combination—for multi-reward GRPO. To address the issues of magnitude explosion and objective isolation, we introduce Dynamic Variance-adaptive Advantage Optimization. By dynamically adjusting combination weights based on the empirical variance of each objective within a rollout group, DVAO explicitly up-weights learning signals from high-variance objectives while suppressing low-variance noise. Empirical evaluations across comprehensive mathematical reasoning and tool-use benchmarks confirm that DVAO achieves a superior Pareto optimal policy, seamlessly balancing accuracy with length and format constraints without relying on fixed hyperparameters. Future work will explore scaling the DVAO framework to environments with a larger number of conflicting reward functions and extending the variance-adaptive mechanism to broader alignment paradigms.

References

- Pranjal Aggarwal and Sean Welleck. L1: Controlling how long a reasoning model thinks with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.04697*, 2025.
- Tianzhe Chu, Yuexiang Zhai, Jihan Yang, Shengbang Tong, Saining Xie, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Sergey Levine, and Yi Ma. SFT memorizes, RL generalizes: A comparative study of foundation model post-training. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2025, Vancouver, BC, Canada, July 13-19, 2025*. OpenReview.net, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=dYur3yabMj>.
- Sicheng Feng, Gongfan Fang, Xinyin Ma, and Xinchao Wang. Efficient reasoning models: A survey. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2025, 2025a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=sySqlxj8EB>.
- Wenfeng Feng, Chuzhan Hao, Yuewei Zhang, Guochao Jiang, and Jingyi Song. Airrag: Autonomous strategic planning and reasoning steer retrieval augmented generation. In Christos Christodoulopoulos, Tanmoy Chakraborty, Carolyn Rose, and Violet Peng, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025, Suzhou, China, November 4-9, 2025*, pages 18934–18953. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025b. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.findings-emnlp.1030/>.
- Ruofan Gao. Bugs in ai-generated code - understanding bug patterns and possible fix strategies. In *IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution, ICSME 2025, Auckland, New Zealand, September 7-12, 2025*, pages 881–883. IEEE, 2025. doi: 10.1109/ICSME64153.2025.00098. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSME64153.2025.00098>.
- Ruofan Gao, Amjed Tahir, Peng Liang, Teo Susnjak, and Foutse Khomh. A survey of bugs in ai-generated code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.05239*, 2025.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Shirong Ma, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, Hao Zhang, Hanwei Xu, Honghui Ding, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Jinhao Tu, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaichao You, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingxu Zhou, Meng Li, Miaojuan Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, Tao Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. Deepseek-r1 incentivizes reasoning in llms through reinforcement learning. *Nat.*, 645(8081):633–638, 2025. doi: 10.1038/S41586-025-09422-Z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-09422-z>.

- Chaoqun He, Renjie Luo, Yuzhuo Bai, Shengding Hu, Zhen Leng Thai, Junhao Shen, Jinyi Hu, Xu Han, Yujie Huang, Yuxiang Zhang, Jie Liu, Lei Qi, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Olympiad-bench: A challenging benchmark for promoting AGI with olympiad-level bilingual multimodal scientific problems. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024, pages 3828–3850. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. doi: 10.18653/V1/2024.ACL-LONG.211. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.211>.
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 43(2):42:1–42:55, 2025. doi: 10.1145/3703155. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3703155>.
- Joel Jang, Seungone Kim, Bill Yuchen Lin, Yizhong Wang, Jack Hessel, Luke Zettlemoyer, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Yejin Choi, and Prithviraj Ammanabrolu. Personalized soups: Personalized large language model alignment via post-hoc parameter merging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11564*, 2023.
- Guochao Jiang, Wenfeng Feng, Guofeng Quan, Chuzhan Hao, Yuewei Zhang, Guohua Liu, and Hao Wang. Vcrl: Variance-based curriculum reinforcement learning for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.19803*, 2025a.
- Guochao Jiang, Guofeng Quan, Zepeng Ding, Ziqin Luo, Dixuan Wang, and Zheng Hu. Flashthink: An early exit method for efficient reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13949*, 2025b.
- Bowen Jin, Hansi Zeng, Zhenrui Yue, Jinsung Yoon, Sercan Arik, Dong Wang, Hamed Zamani, and Jiawei Han. Search-rl: Training llms to reason and leverage search engines with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09516*, 2025.
- Yuhang Lai, Siyuan Wang, Shujun Liu, Xuanjing Huang, and Zhongyu Wei. Alarm: Align language models via hierarchical rewards modeling. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting, August 11-16, 2024*, Findings of ACL, pages 7817–7831. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. doi: 10.18653/V1/2024.FINDINGS-ACL.465. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.465>.
- Xuefeng Li, Haoyang Zou, and Pengfei Liu. Torl: Scaling tool-integrated rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23383*, 2025.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=v8L0pN6E0i>.
- Qiqiang Lin, Muning Wen, Qiuying Peng, Guanyu Nie, Junwei Liao, Jun Wang, Xiaoyun Mo, Jiamu Zhou, Cheng Cheng, Yin Zhao, et al. Hammer: Robust function-calling for on-device language models via function masking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04587*, 2024.
- Shih-Yang Liu, Xin Dong, Ximing Lu, Shizhe Diao, Mingjie Liu, Min-Hung Chen, Hongxu Yin, Yu-Chiang Frank Wang, Kwang-Ting Cheng, Yejin Choi, et al. Dler: Doing length penalty right-incentivizing more intelligence per token via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.15110*, 2025a.
- Shih-Yang Liu, Xin Dong, Ximing Lu, Shizhe Diao, Peter Belcak, Mingjie Liu, Min-Hung Chen, Hongxu Yin, Yu-Chiang Frank Wang, Kwang-Ting Cheng, et al. Gdpo: Group reward-decoupled normalization policy optimization for multi-reward rl optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.05242*, 2026.
- Wei Liu, Ruochen Zhou, Yiyun Deng, Yuzhen Huang, Junteng Liu, Yuntian Deng, Yizhe Zhang, and Junxian He. Learn to reason efficiently with adaptive length-based reward shaping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15612*, 2025b.

- Weiwen Liu, Xu Huang, Xingshan Zeng, Xinlong Hao, Shuai Yu, Dexun Li, Shuai Wang, Weinan Gan, Zhengying Liu, Yuanqing Yu, Zezhong Wang, Yuxian Wang, Wu Ning, Yutai Hou, Bin Wang, Chuhan Wu, Xinzhi Wang, Yong Liu, Yasheng Wang, Duyu Tang, Dandan Tu, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Ruiming Tang, Defu Lian, Qun Liu, and Enhong Chen. Toolace: Winning the points of LLM function calling. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net, 2025c. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=8EB8k6DdCU>.
- Zihe Liu, Jiashun Liu, Yancheng He, Weixun Wang, Jiaheng Liu, Ling Pan, Xinyu Hu, Shaopan Xiong, Ju Huang, Jian Hu, et al. Part i: Tricks or traps? a deep dive into rl for llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.08221*, 2025d.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7>.
- Haotian Luo, Li Shen, Haiying He, Yibo Wang, Shiwei Liu, Wei Li, Naiqiang Tan, Xiaochun Cao, and Dacheng Tao. O1-pruner: Length-harmonizing fine-tuning for o1-like reasoning pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12570*, 2025.
- Shishir G. Patil, Huanzhi Mao, Fanjia Yan, Charlie Cheng-Jie Ji, Vishnu Suresh, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. The berkeley function calling leaderboard (BFCL): from tool use to agentic evaluation of large language models. In Aarti Singh, Maryam Fazel, Daniel Hsu, Simon Lacoste-Julien, Felix Berkenkamp, Tegan Maharaj, Kiri Wagstaff, and Jerry Zhu, editors, *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2025, Vancouver, BC, Canada, July 13-19, 2025*, volume 267 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*. PMLR / OpenReview.net, 2025. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v267/patil25a.html>.
- Aske Plaat, Max J. van Duijn, Niki van Stein, Mike Preuss, Peter van der Putten, and Kees Joost Batenburg. Agentic large language models, a survey. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 84, 2025. doi: 10.1613/JAIR.1.18675. URL <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.18675>.
- Cheng Qian, Emre Can Acikgoz, Qi He, Hongru Wang, Xiushi Chen, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, Gokhan Tur, and Heng Ji. Toolrl: Reward is all tool learning needs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.13958*, 2025.
- Pranab Sahoo, Prabhath Meharia, Akash Ghosh, Sriparna Saha, Vinija Jain, and Aman Chadha. A comprehensive survey of hallucination in large language, image, video and audio foundation models. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024, Miami, Florida, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, volume EMNLP 2024 of *Findings of ACL*, pages 11709–11724. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. doi: 10.18653/V1/2024.FINDINGS-EMNLP.685. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.685>.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Yang Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- Guangming Sheng, Chi Zhang, Zilingfeng Ye, Xibin Wu, Wang Zhang, Ru Zhang, Yanghua Peng, Haibin Lin, and Chuan Wu. Hybridflow: A flexible and efficient RLHF framework. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth European Conference on Computer Systems, EuroSys 2025, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 30 March 2025 - 3 April 2025*, pages 1279–1297. ACM, 2025. doi: 10.1145/3689031.3696075. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3689031.3696075>.
- Vaishnavi Shrivastava, Ahmed Awadallah, Vidhisha Balachandran, Shivam Garg, Harkirat Behl, and Dimitris Papailiopoulos. Sample more to think less: Group filtered policy optimization for concise reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.09726*, 2025.
- Yang Sui, Yu-Neng Chuang, Guanchu Wang, Jiamu Zhang, Tianyi Zhang, Jiayi Yuan, Hongyi Liu, Andrew Wen, Shaochen Zhong, Na Zou, Hanjie Chen, and Xia Hu. Stop overthinking: A survey on efficient reasoning for large language models. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2025, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HvoG8SxggZ>.

- Florian Tambon, Arghavan Moradi Dakhel, Amin Nikanjam, Foutse Khomh, Michel C. Desmarais, and Giuliano Antoniol. Bugs in large language models generated code: an empirical study. *Empir. Softw. Eng.*, 30(3):65, 2025. doi: 10.1007/S10664-025-10614-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-025-10614-4>.
- Kimi Team, Tongtong Bai, Yifan Bai, Yiping Bao, SH Cai, Yuan Cao, Y Charles, HS Che, Cheng Chen, Guanduo Chen, et al. Kimi k2. 5: Visual agentic intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.02276*, 2026.
- Tian Xie, Zitian Gao, Qingnan Ren, Haoming Luo, Yuqian Hong, Bryan Dai, Joey Zhou, Kai Qiu, Zhirong Wu, and Chong Luo. Logic-rl: Unleashing llm reasoning with rule-based reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14768*, 2025.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025.
- Qiyang Yu, Zheng Zhang, Ruofei Zhu, Yufeng Yuan, Xiaochen Zuo, Yu Yue, Weinan Dai, Tiantian Fan, Gaohong Liu, Lingjun Liu, et al. Dapo: An open-source llm reinforcement learning system at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.14476*, 2025.
- Jianguo Zhang, Tian Lan, Ming Zhu, Zuxin Liu, Thai Hoang, Shirley Kokane, Weiran Yao, Juntao Tan, Akshara Prabhakar, Haolin Chen, Zhiwei Liu, Yihao Feng, Tulika Manoj Awalgaonkar, Rithesh R. N., Zeyuan Chen, Ran Xu, Juan Carlos Niebles, Shelby Heinecke, Huan Wang, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. xlam: A family of large action models to empower AI agent systems. In Luis Chiruzzo, Alan Ritter, and Lu Wang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL 2025 - Volume 1: Long Papers, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, April 29 - May 4, 2025*, pages 11583–11597. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025a. doi: 10.18653/V1/2025.NAACL-LONG.578. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-long.578>.
- Kaiyan Zhang, Yuxin Zuo, Bingxiang He, Youbang Sun, Runze Liu, Che Jiang, Yuchen Fan, Kai Tian, Guoli Jia, Pengfei Li, et al. A survey of reinforcement learning for large reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.08827*, 2025b.
- Chujie Zheng, Shixuan Liu, Mingze Li, Xiong-Hui Chen, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Kai Dang, Yuqiong Liu, Rui Men, An Yang, et al. Group sequence policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.18071*, 2025.

A Proof of Proposition 1

Proposition 1. For a fixed query x_i , let $\hat{\rho}_{kl}^i$ denote the sample correlation between A_k and A_l within the group rollout. The reward combination method and the advantage combination method satisfy:

$$\frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(A_{sum}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(A^{(i,j)} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(\sum_k w_k A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2$$

with equality if and only if $\hat{\rho}_{kl} = 1$ for all $k \neq l$.

Proof. For a fixed query x_i , since $A_k^{(i,j)}$ is computed by normalizing $r_k^{(i,j)}$ within the rollout group, we have by definition:

$$\frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G A_k^{(i,j)} = 0, \quad \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 = 1.$$

For the reward combination method, similarly by definition of normalization:

$$\frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 = 1.$$

For the advantage combination:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(A^{(i,j)} \right)^2 &= \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(\sum_k w_k A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_k w_k^2 \cdot \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left(A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{k<l} w_k w_l \cdot \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G A_k^{(i,j)} A_l^{(i,j)} \\ &= \sum_k w_k^2 + 2 \sum_{k<l} w_k w_l \hat{\rho}_{kl}^i \\ &= \left(\sum_k w_k \right)^2 - 2 \sum_{k<l} w_k w_l (1 - \hat{\rho}_{kl}^i) \\ &= 1 - 2 \sum_{k<l} w_k w_l (1 - \hat{\rho}_{kl}^i) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

B Proof of Proposition 2

Proposition 2. For a fixed query x_i and rollout group $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^G \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x_i)$, the reward combination method produces a pointwise larger advantage magnitude than DVAO:

$$\left| A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)} \right| \leq \left| A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} \right|, \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, G\}$$

with equality if and only if $\text{Cov} \left(r_k^{(i,j)}, r_l^{(i,j)} \right) = \sigma_k^i \sigma_l^i$ for all $k \neq l$, i.e., all reward pairs are perfectly positively correlated within the rollout group.

Proof. For a fixed query x_i , and rollout group $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^G \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x_i)$, based on the definitions of the reward combination method, we first establish the following key identity:

$$\sigma_{\text{sum}}^i A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} = \sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i A_k^{(i,j)},$$

which follows from:

$$\sigma_{\text{sum}}^i A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} = r_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} - \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j'} r_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j')} = \sum_k w_k \left(r_k^{(i,j)} - \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j'} r_k^{(i,j')} \right) = \sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i A_k^{(i,j)}.$$

We next show that $\sigma_{\text{sum}}^i \leq \sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i$. By expanding the variance of the combined reward:

$$\left(\sigma_{\text{sum}}^i \right)^2 = \text{Var} \left(\sum_k w_k r_k^{(i,j)} \right) = \sum_k w_k^2 \left(\sigma_k^i \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{k<l} w_k w_l \text{Cov} \left(r_k^{(i,j)}, r_l^{(i,j)} \right).$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\text{Cov} \left(r_k^{(i,j)}, r_l^{(i,j)} \right) \leq \sigma_k^i \sigma_l^i$, and therefore:

$$\left(\sigma_{\text{sum}}^i \right)^2 \leq \sum_k w_k^2 \left(\sigma_k^i \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{k<l} w_k w_l \sigma_k^i \sigma_l^i = \left(\sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i \right)^2.$$

Taking the square root on both sides yields $\sigma_{\text{sum}}^i \leq \sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i$. Finally, taking the absolute value of the above identity and dividing both sides by σ_{sum}^i :

$$\left| A_{\text{sum}}^{(i,j)} \right| = \frac{\left| \sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i A_k^{(i,j)} \right|}{\sigma_{\text{sum}}^i} \geq \frac{\left| \sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i A_k^{(i,j)} \right|}{\sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i} = \left| \sum_k \tilde{w}_k A_k^{(i,j)} \right| = \left| A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)} \right|,$$

where the inequality follows from $\sigma_{\text{sum}}^i \leq \sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i$, and the last equality follows from the definition of $A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)}$. \square

C Proof of Proposition 3

Proposition 3. For a fixed query x_i , and rollout group $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^G \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x_i)$, the sensitivity of the combined advantage with respect to the k -th raw reward $r_k^{(i,j)}$ for the advantage combination method and DVAO are respectively given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial A^{(i,j)}}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} &= \frac{w_k}{\sigma_k^i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} - \frac{1}{G} \left(A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 \right), \\ \frac{\partial A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)}}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} &= \frac{\tilde{w}_k}{\sigma_k^i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} - \frac{1}{G} A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)} A_k^{(i,j)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

While the sensitivity of $A^{(i,j)}$ strictly depends on the isolated advantage of the k -th objective, the sensitivity of $A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)}$ adaptively depends on the cross-term $A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)} A_k^{(i,j)}$, allowing it to aggregate global performance information across all objectives within the rollout group.

Proof. For a fixed query x_i , the standard group normalization advantage for the k -th objective is $A_k^{(i,j)} = \frac{r_k^{(i,j)} - \mu_k^i}{\sigma_k^i}$, where $\mu_k^i = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G r_k^{(i,j)}$. Using the standard properties of the sample mean and standard deviation, the partial derivatives are $\frac{\partial \mu_k^i}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} = \frac{1}{G}$ and $\frac{\partial \sigma_k^i}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} = \frac{A_k^{(i,j)}}{G}$. Consequently, the derivative of the individual advantage is:

$$\frac{\partial A_k^{(i,j)}}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} = \frac{1}{\sigma_k^i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} - \frac{1}{G} \left(A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 \right).$$

For the advantage combination method, since $A^{(i,j)} = \sum_l w_l A_l^{(i,j)}$ and the rewards across different objectives are treated independently in their respective normalizations, applying the chain rule directly yields:

$$\frac{\partial A^{(i,j)}}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} = w_k \frac{\partial A_k^{(i,j)}}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} = \frac{w_k}{\sigma_k^i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} - \frac{1}{G} \left(A_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 \right).$$

For DVAO, we can rewrite the advantage as $A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)} = \frac{\sum_l w_l (r_l^{(i,j)} - \mu_l^i)}{S^i}$, where the denominator $S^i = \sum_k w_k \sigma_k^i$. By applying the quotient rule with respect to $r_k^{(i,j)}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)}}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}} &= \frac{w_k \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} \right) S^i - \left[\sum_l w_l (r_l^{(i,j)} - \mu_l^i) \right] w_k \frac{\partial \sigma_k^i}{\partial r_k^{(i,j)}}}{(S^i)^2} \\ &= \frac{w_k \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} \right) S^i - \left(S^i A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)} \right) w_k \frac{A_k^{(i,j)}}{G}}{(S^i)^2} \\ &= \frac{w_k}{S^i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{G} - \frac{1}{G} A_{\text{DVAO}}^{(i,j)} A_k^{(i,j)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the definition $\frac{w_k}{S^i} = \frac{\tilde{w}_k}{\sigma_k^i}$ into the equation completes the proof. \square

D Implementation Details

For training dataset, we use DAPO-MATH-17K⁵ for mathematical reasoning task, which consists of 17k prompts, each paired with an integer as the answer, and the same training dataset from ToolRL, which consists of 2k samples from ToolACE (Liu et al., 2025c), 1k samples from Hammer (Lin et al., 2024), and 1k samples from xLAM (Zhang et al., 2025a), each training instance contains a question and its corresponding ground-truth tool calls. For the reward design, we use the accuracy reward r_{acc} and the length reward r_{length} for mathematical reasoning task, and use the accuracy reward r_{acc} and the format reward r_{format} for tool-use task. Specifically, $r_{\text{length}} \in \{0, 1\}$ checks whether the model’s output remains within the target length l , which is set 4,000 tokens for all remaining experiments, and $r_{\text{format}} \in \{0, 1\}$ checks whether the model’s output satisfies the required structure and contains all necessary fields in the correct order. All rewards are constrained within the range $[0, 1]$ to maintain consistency with the preceding discussion, while the final reward or advantage is computed via a convex combination with coefficients $\{w_k\}_{k=1}^n$ and $\sum_k w_k = 1$. Unless otherwise specified, the coefficients corresponding to all rewards are equal. We implement our proposed DVAO and conduct all experiments based on verl (Sheng et al., 2025) framework. For hyperparameters, we utilize the AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) optimizer with a constant learning rate of 1×10^{-6} . For rollout, the prompt batch size is 128 and we sample $G = 16$ responses for each prompt. For training, we train 500 steps to ensure convergence. The maximum number of tokens for generation is set to 8,192 tokens. We report avg@16 results for mathematical reasoning task. The inference hyperparameters of evaluation are set to temperature 0.6 and top-p 0.95. We conduct all experiments on a server with 8×NVIDIA H20-3e GPUs and an Intel® Xeon® Platinum 8575C CPU.

E Limitations and Future Work

While DVAO effectively addresses the limitations of fixed scalarization in multi-reward GRPO, there are a few boundaries to consider. First, the accuracy of DVAO’s dynamic weighting relies on the empirical variance estimation within a rollout group (G). In our experiments, a standard group size of $G = 16$ provided highly robust signals. However, for extremely large models where hardware memory constraints force very small group sizes (e.g., $G \leq 4$), the intra-group variance estimation might become noisy. Future work could explore incorporating historical momentum or cross-batch moving averages to stabilize variance estimation under extreme memory constraints. Second, our empirical evaluations primarily focus on dual-objective scenarios (e.g., accuracy and length/format). Although our theoretical proofs mathematically hold for an arbitrary number of n rewards, the empirical optimization dynamics in hyper-dimensional reward spaces—such as simultaneously aligning helpfulness, harmlessness, style, length, and tool-use—remain an open question for future exploration. Lastly, because DVAO inherently amplifies learning signals based on variance, its efficacy is tied to the quality of the underlying reward functions. If a poorly designed auxiliary reward exhibits artificially high variance due to noise rather than meaningful learning signals, DVAO may inadvertently up-weight it. Thus, while DVAO eliminates the need for manual weight tuning, it still operates optimally alongside reasonably well-calibrated individual reward definitions.

⁵<https://huggingface.co/datasets/BytedTsinghua-SIA/DAPO-Math-17k>