

DAPD: Dual-Anchored Policy Distillation

Jianyu Wu^{1,2}, Yizhou Wang², Encheng Su^{2,3}, Chen Tang², Shixiang Tang^{2,*}

¹Shanghai Jiao Tong University ²Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory

³The University of Science and Technology of China

wujianyu@sjtu.edu.cn *Corresponding author: tangshixiang@pjlab.org.cn

Abstract

On-policy (self) distillation (OPSD) is increasingly adopted for language-model post-training. It strengthens the teacher with privileged information but can induce a *privilege illusion*: the student learns privilege-dependent behavior it cannot reproduce from its inference-time context, yet behaves as if the training-time privileged information remained available, ultimately degrading performance. In this paper, we identify information asymmetry between the privileged teacher and the student at inference as the root cause of this failure in OPSD. To resolve this asymmetry, we propose **Dual-Anchored Policy Distillation (DAPD)**, a unified framework with two levels of anchoring. **Dual-Path Anchoring (DPA)** introduces a self-conditioned bridge and aligns reference and rollout behavior along two matched-information paths, preventing privilege-dependent behavior from being transferred to the inference-time student. **Dual-Source Anchoring (DSA)** applies these paths in both reference-to-rollout and rollout-to-reference directions, reducing reliance on privileged reference guidance while preserving correctness supervision. Extensive experiments show that DAPD significantly alleviates privilege illusion, outperforming OPSD on Qwen3-4B by **+2.00** points on average across tasks. Notably, its gains persist across scales, reaching **+2.69** at 4B and **+2.78** at 32B. Code is available at <https://github.com/uanu2002/DAPD>.

1 Introduction

Post-training, including supervised fine-tuning (SFT), reinforcement learning (RL), and distillation, is central to turning pretrained language models into reasoning models (Guha et al. 2025; DeepSeek-AI 2025). On-policy (self) distillation (OPD/OPSD) is increasingly prominent in post-training (Agarwal et al. 2024; Thinking Machines Lab 2025; Zhao et al. 2026a). Compared with SFT and RL, OPD trains on states visited by the current policy¹ and provides dense token-level teacher supervision rather than relying on fixed demonstrations or sparse outcome rewards. In practice, it samples rollouts from the current policy and distills a teacher distribution at each sampled prefix. To strengthen this teacher, OPD conditions it on privileged information such as a reference completion or tool output (Zhao et al. 2026a; Penalosa et al. 2026; Yu et al. 2026). However, the student cannot access this

¹In this paper, *policy* refers to the model itself, whereas *distribution* refers to its output distribution conditioned on a context.




Figure 1: DAPD consistently improves over OPSD across (a) six tasks on Qwen3-4B and (b) five Qwen3 model scales evaluated by Avg@12 on AIME24, AIME25, and HMMT25.

information at inference. The information mismatch induces the known *privilege illusion* (Zhao et al. 2026a; Shen et al. 2026; Yu et al. 2026): the student make unsupported claims or continue a derivation as though an unseen reference were available, ultimately degrading task performance.

Existing work on addressing privilege illusion can be categorized into two groups: (1) *direct use of privileged information*, which conditions the teacher on privileged information and distills its full supervision (Zhao et al. 2026a; Penalosa et al. 2026), and (2) *selective transfer from privileged supervision*, which filters or reweights the teacher signal to suppress privilege-dependent supervision (Nguyen et al. 2026; Zheng et al. 2026; Yu et al. 2026; Tu et al. 2026; Shen et al. 2026). However, these methods fail to reliably separate reproducible guidance from privilege-dependent behavior, leading to limited mitigation of privilege illusion. We suggest this limitation is structural: these methods modify the

privileged teacher signal instead of matching the information available to the teacher and the student, so a privileged teacher still supervises a student that must predict without it. Moreover, these methods use the reference as the only guidance source, neglecting meaningful reasoning signals contained in on-policy rollouts when the student improves.

To validate this hypothesis, we keep the privileged teacher unchanged and replace the student distribution without privileged information with a self-conditioned distribution, which conditions the student on the full completion being predicted. By matching the information available to both the teacher and student distributions, this intervention reduces wrong claims, i.e., unsupported answer assertions, and improves reasoning performance (Figure 2). These results indicate that the original OPSD objective distills reproducible guidance and privilege-dependent behavior together into the student distribution without privileged information. We refer to this mixed update as *Entangled Distillation*. This entanglement explains why neither direct use nor selective transfer resolves this problem. We therefore identify *information asymmetry*, the mismatch between a teacher with privileged information and a student without it, as the root cause of privilege illusion in OPSD. Beyond this information mismatch, the guidance source also matters because the reference and rollout completions provide complementary guidance: references are reliable but may lie outside the current policy, whereas rollouts are student-reachable but may be incorrect. Together, these observations yield two requirements for solving the privilege illusion problem: (1) introduce intermediate supervision targets as anchors to align reference and rollout behavior under matched information availability, and (2) balance reliable reference guidance with student-reachable rollout guidance.

Based on this diagnosis, we propose **Dual-Anchored Policy Distillation (DAPD)**, a unified framework for addressing privilege illusion at its information source, consisting of *Dual-Path Anchoring (DPA)* and *Dual-Source Anchoring (DSA)*. In DAPD, DPA introduces a self-conditioned distribution as a trainable bridge and constructs two complementary alignment paths: an *unconditioned path*, which combines Entangled Distillation with an Inference Anchor to align reference and rollout without privileged information, and a *privileged path*, which uses a Privileged Anchor to align them when both are conditioned on privileged information. In this way, DPA addresses the information-matching requirement by retaining the original OPSD supervision while adding anchors that align behavior under matched information availability. DSA then applies the same paths in both directions: using the reference to guide the rollout and using the rollout to guide the reference. This lets reference completions provide reliable correctness-oriented guidance while rollouts provide student-reachable on-policy guidance. This addresses the source-complementarity requirement by balancing reference-guided and rollout-guided supervision rather than relying on a single guidance source.

Experiments on six benchmarks spanning reasoning (Mathematical Association of America 2026; Harvard-MIT Mathematics Tournament 2025), coding (Jain et al. 2025; Patil et al. 2025), and instruction following (Pyatkin et al. 2025) demonstrate that, by significantly alleviating priv-




Figure 2: Training dynamics for OPSD, Privileged Anchor, and DAPD, averaged across five scales: (a) wrong claims and (b) Avg@12 over AIME24, AIME25, and HMMT25.

ilege illusion, DAPD improves over OPSD by **+2.00** points on average on Qwen3-4B. Notably, while the gains from OPSD largely disappear as model scale increases, DAPD maintains stable improvements over OPSD across Qwen3-1.7B–32B, with gains of **+2.69** points at 4B and **+2.78** points at 32B. Controlled ablations further verify the information asymmetry mechanism and ablate the path and source effects.

Our contributions are threefold:

- We identify information asymmetry between a privileged teacher and the student at inference as the root cause of privilege illusion in OPSD. This exposes both the information mismatch and the limitation of using only reference-guided supervision.
- We introduce DAPD, a unified framework that directly addresses information asymmetry by augmenting the original OPSD objective with anchoring under matched information availability.
- We propose two complementary modules: DPA aligns reference and rollout behavior both without and with privileged information, while DSA balances reliable reference guidance with student-reachable rollout guidance. Ablations demonstrate their complementary benefits, and scale experiments show consistent gains over OPSD.

2 Background and Analysis

2.1 Privilege Illusion in OPSD

OPSD preliminaries. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the training distribution over prompt–reference pairs (x, y^*) , where x is the input prompt and y^* is the ground-truth reference. Let p_θ denote the current student policy, and let t index an autoregressive token step, with $y_{<t}$ the prefix before predicting token t . Given $(x, y^*) \sim \mathcal{D}$, the student samples a rollout $y \sim p_\theta(\cdot | x)$. OPSD (Zhao et al. 2026a) then evaluates the same policy

at each prefix $y_{<t}$ under two information conditions: (1) *None* distribution $p_{\text{None},\theta,t} = p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x, y_{<t})$, which predicts without privileged information, and (2) *Cross* distribution $p_{\text{Cross},\theta,t} = p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x, y_{<t}, y^*)$, which predicts while conditioning on the reference y^* . OPSD uses *Cross* as the detached teacher to supervise *None* as the trainable student:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{OPSD}} = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x,y^*) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ y \sim p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x)}} \left[\frac{1}{|y|} \sum_{t=1}^{|y|} D(\text{sg}[p_{\text{Cross}}] \parallel p_{\text{None}}) \right]. \quad (1)$$

Here $|y|$ denotes the rollout length, D denotes a divergence between token distributions, $\text{sg}[\cdot]$ denotes stop-gradient. θ, t are omitted from p_{Cross} and p_{None} when clear from context. This sampling strategy of OPSD keeps the supervised prefixes on-policy, while the reference makes the same-model teacher more informative.

Privilege illusion. In OPSD, the teacher receives privileged information during training, whereas the student must predict without it at inference, potentially inducing *privilege illusion* (Zhao et al. 2026a; Shen et al. 2026): the student behaves as though unavailable information were present.

Behavioral Probe. To quantify whether the student acts on unavailable information, we define *wrong claims* as cases where it asserts an unsupported answer and constructs a derivation as if the answer were known. Using this probe, Figure 2 tracks both wrong claims and reasoning Avg@12 at different training steps under the same OPSD setup. Across five Qwen3 scales, wrong claims under OPSD rise from 13.0 to 37.0 per 10,000 generations (Figure 2(a)), while mean Avg@12 falls from 59.56 to 53.24 (Figure 2(b)). This coupled change illustrates that privilege illusion emerges as OPSD training proceeds and hurts inference-time performance.

2.2 Information Asymmetry as the Cause

We hypothesize that the behavior observed in Figure 2 is caused by the information asymmetry in the OPSD objective: the teacher has access to privileged information that the student lacks. This asymmetry makes the teacher differ from the student in two ways. First, some differences reflect reference guidance that the student can recover from its prompt, and thus provide useful supervision. Second, other differences rely on information available only through y^* and cannot be reproduced by the student at inference. The original OPSD objective therefore mixes useful supervision with non-reproducible teacher changes, encouraging confident predictions without the information that supports them, and we define this mixed update as *Entangled Distillation*.

To validate this diagnosis, we keep the teacher side unchanged and replace the student’s *None* distribution in the OPSD objective with a self-conditioned distribution, denoted *Self*, with $p_{\text{Self},\theta,t} = p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x, y_{<t}, y)$, which conditions the student on the full completion being predicted. Since *Cross* and *Self* both receive a full completion, this replacement removes the information asymmetry between the teacher and student distributions. We introduce this matched-information objective as the *Privileged Anchor* and formalize it in Section 3. As shown by the Privileged Anchor curve in Fig-

ure 2, compared with OPSD, this intervention significantly reduces late-stage wrong claims by 45%, while improving mean Avg@12 by +6.22 points. These results demonstrate that matching the information available to *Cross* and *Self* reduces privilege illusion and preserves performance while retaining the same privileged-teacher construction. Therefore, we identify information asymmetry, rather than teacher quality alone, as the source of the privilege illusion.

2.3 Self Distribution as a Bridging Anchor

The *Self* distribution introduced by the Privileged Anchor intervention acts as a useful intermediate distribution for reducing information asymmetry. To generalize this idea beyond the single rollout diagnosis above, we denote $s \in \{y, y^*\}$ as either the rollout or reference completion and $\bar{s}$ as the other completion. At token t , the following three distributions share the autoregressive prefix $s_{<t}$ and differ only in the privileged information available to them:

- **None distribution** ($p_{\text{None}}^s = p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x, s_{<t})$) receives no privileged information and matches the information available to the student at inference.
- **Cross distribution** ($p_{\text{Cross}}^s = p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x, s_{<t}, \bar{s})$) receives the other completion $\bar{s}$ and therefore receives privileged information from it.
- **Self distribution** ($p_{\text{Self}}^s = p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x, s_{<t}, s)$) receives completion s itself and therefore receives privileged information from the completion it predicts.

Compared with *Cross*, *Self* is trainable because it shares the same policy parameters as *None*. Compared with *None*, *Self* is information-matched with *Cross* because it conditions on the full completion being predicted. *Self* therefore fills the missing position between the trainable student without privileged information and the detached teacher with privileged information. Updates through *Self* affect the same policy that produces *None* at inference, while supervision involving *Self* can be formed under matched information availability. We therefore use *Self* to construct bridging *anchors* that align reference and rollout behavior without directly forcing a teacher with privileged information to supervise a student without it.

3 Dual-Anchored Policy Distillation

To handle the privilege illusion in OPSD, we propose **Dual-Anchored Policy Distillation (DAPD)** (see Figure 3), a framework for correcting its underlying information asymmetry by combining two components: *Dual-Path Anchoring* (DPA), which matches information availability during distillation, and *Dual-Source Anchoring* (DSA), which balances reference-guided and rollout-guided supervision. Section 3.1 defines three directed objectives over *None*, *Cross*, and *Self* distributions. Section 3.2 composes these objectives into unconditioned and privileged alignment paths. Section 3.3 applies the paths in both completion directions to combine the two guidance sources.

3.1 Distillation Beyond OPSD

Based on the information-asymmetry analysis above, DAPD uses *Self* to construct anchors that can form distillation paths




Figure 3: Overview of DAPD. *Left*: Dual-Source Anchoring uses both reference-to-rollout and rollout-to-reference guidance to balance correctness and student reachability. *Right*: Dual-Path Anchoring details the rollout-to-reference guidance direction by introducing *Self* as a trainable bridge. The unconditioned path pairs Entangled Distillation with the Inference Anchor to align the two *None* distributions through *Self*, while the Privileged Anchor aligns *Self* and *Cross* when privileged information is available. The opposite source direction applies the same construction with y and y^* exchanged.

under matched information conditions. To build these paths, DAPD uses three directed objectives over *None*, *Cross*, and *Self* for each completion source s . **Entangled Distillation** ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{ent}}^s$) is the original *None*-to-*Cross* OPSD term and keeps the privileged guidance transfer. **Inference Anchor** ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{infer}}^s$) trains *Self* toward *None*, providing the anchor needed to align behavior without privileged information. **Privileged Anchor** ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{priv}}^s$) trains *Self* toward *Cross*, directly aligning behavior when both distributions receive privileged information:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ent}}^s = \mathbb{E}[\text{D}(\text{sg}[p_{\text{Cross}}^s] \parallel p_{\text{None}}^s)], \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{infer}}^s = \mathbb{E}[\text{D}(\text{sg}[p_{\text{None}}^s] \parallel p_{\text{Self}}^s)], \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{priv}}^s = \mathbb{E}[\text{D}(\text{sg}[p_{\text{Cross}}^s] \parallel p_{\text{Self}}^s)]. \quad (4)$$

In all three objectives, the detached first argument is the teacher distribution and the second argument is the trainable student distribution. Each expectation averages over $(x, y^*) \sim \mathcal{D}$, an on-policy rollout $y \sim p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x)$, and token positions in s . We keep the divergence D generic and specify its concrete implementation in Section 4.

3.2 Dual-Path Anchoring

The three directed objectives above define how one distribution supervises another. However, addressing information asymmetry requires these objectives to work together so that reference and rollout behavior are aligned under matched information conditions. For an ordered completion direction $s \rightarrow \bar{s}$, **Dual-Path Anchoring** (DPA) therefore composes them into two complementary paths: an *unconditioned path*, where neither side receives privileged information, and a *privileged path*, where both sides receive it.

Unconditioned path. The unconditioned path targets the inference-relevant distributions (see Figure 3, top-right part). Since neither distribution should rely on privileged information, the desired alignment should be built between the two *None* distributions. DPA reaches this alignment by combining the original Entangled Distillation on the completion s

with the Inference Anchor on the completion $\bar{s}$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{uncond}}^{s \rightarrow \bar{s}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{infer}}^{\bar{s}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{ent}}^s. \quad (5)$$

For the Rollout-to-Reference direction, this path becomes $\mathcal{L}_{\text{uncond}}^{y \rightarrow y^*} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{infer}}^{y^*} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{ent}}^y$, where the $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ent}}^y$ is the original OPSD loss. The entangled term moves p_{None}^y toward $p_{\text{Cross}}^{y^*}$, while the $\mathcal{L}_{\text{infer}}^{y^*}$ moves $p_{\text{Self}}^{y^*}$ toward $p_{\text{None}}^{y^*}$. Because $p_{\text{Self}}^{y^*}$ and $p_{\text{Cross}}^{y^*}$ share model parameters and the similar distribution $p_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x, y^*)$, they act as a proxy bridge. The joint update therefore implicitly aligns p_{None}^y toward $p_{\text{None}}^{y^*}$. A proof under explicit assumptions is provided in the supplementary material.

Privileged path. The privileged path handles the same ordered direction when both sides receive a full completion (see Figure 3, bottom-right part). In this case, *Cross* receives the guiding completion $\bar{s}$ and *Self* receives the completion s , so the Privileged Anchor already expresses the required alignment. Thus, the privileged path directly reuses $\mathcal{L}_{\text{priv}}^s$ without introducing another objective. For $y \rightarrow y^*$, this aligns self-conditioned and reference-conditioned predictions on rollout tokens under matched information availability.

Dual-path objective. Combining the two paths gives the DPA objective for one ordered completion direction, with loss coefficients omitted for notational simplicity:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPA}}^{s \rightarrow \bar{s}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{uncond}}^{s \rightarrow \bar{s}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{priv}}^s. \quad (6)$$

3.3 Dual-Source Anchoring

DPA defines how to align under an ordered direction, with the remaining question being which completion should provide guidance. We address this source choice with **Dual-Source Anchoring** (DSA), which applies DPA in both completion directions and balances their supervision. The left part of Figure 3 shows the two guidance directions used by DSA.

The **Rollout-to-Reference direction** ($y \rightarrow y^*$) follows the reference-guided view: the rollout is the completion and the

Method	Reasoning			Coding		Instruct	Avg.
	AIME24	AIME25	HMMT25	LCB v5	BFCL v3	IFBench	
Base	75.56	65.56	42.50	52.11	61.38	29.67	54.46
SDFT (Shenfeld et al. 2026)	75.00	62.78	41.94	51.05	61.26	33.00	54.17
SDPO (Hübotter et al. 2026)	70.56	62.78	40.83	50.53	61.75	<u>32.67</u>	53.19
OPSD (Zhao et al. 2026a)	<u>76.67</u>	<u>67.78</u>	43.33	52.26	61.32	30.67	55.34
Purified OPSD (Shen et al. 2026)	<u>76.67</u>	67.50	<u>45.00</u>	<u>53.16</u>	62.50	<u>32.67</u>	<u>56.25</u>
DOPD (Yu et al. 2026)	73.61	65.00	38.89	50.30	61.47	31.67	53.49
DAPD	77.22	72.22	46.39	53.31	<u>61.91</u>	33.00	57.34
Δ vs. OPSD	+0.55	+4.44	+3.06	+1.05	+0.59	+2.33	+2.00

Table 1: Performance comparison of our proposed DAPD with baselines on Qwen3-4B across reasoning, coding, and instruct benchmarks. Avg. is the mean over all six benchmarks. Δ reports DAPD’s improvement over OPSD. **Bold** and underlined values mark the best and second-best results, respectively.

reference supplies guidance. This direction benefits from the reliability of y^* , but it uses only one source of supervision.

As the policy improves, on-policy rollouts can also contain useful reasoning signals and may themselves be correct. Therefore, the rollout should not only be treated as a noisy prediction target; it can also provide student-reachable guidance. This motivates the **Reference-to-Rollout direction** ($y^* \rightarrow y$), in which the reference becomes the completion and the rollout supplies guidance. Applying the same DPA construction gives the unconditioned path $\mathcal{L}_{\text{infer}}^y + \mathcal{L}_{\text{ent}}^{y^*}$ and the privileged path $\mathcal{L}_{\text{priv}}^{y^*}$.

The two directions therefore emphasize complementary properties. The reference provides correctness-oriented but off-policy guidance, whereas the rollout provides student-reachable, on-policy but less reliable guidance. We therefore keep and balance both directional DPA objectives in DSA:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DAPD}} = \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{DPA}}^{y \rightarrow y^*} + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{L}_{\text{DPA}}^{y^* \rightarrow y}. \quad (7)$$

Here $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ balances reference- and rollout-guided supervision with weights λ and $1 - \lambda$, respectively.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Models and datasets. We conduct experiments on the Qwen3 model family (Yang et al. 2025) at 1.7B, 4B, 8B, 14B, and 32B scales. All models are trained on OpenThoughts data (Guha et al. 2025), using separate models for each task family and excluding its evaluation examples from training: Reasoning uses the math domain, Coding uses the code domain, and Instruct uses the combined math, code, and science domains.

Benchmarks. We evaluate three capability families. *Reasoning* includes AIME24 and AIME25 (Mathematical Association of America 2026), and HMMT25 (Harvard-MIT Mathematics Tournament 2025). *Coding* includes LCB v5 (Jain et al. 2025) and BFCL v3 (Patil et al. 2025). *Instruct* is evaluated on IFBench (Pyatkin et al. 2025). We use the official evaluation harness and metric for each benchmark.

Baselines. We compare DAPD with Base and two groups of OPSD-style baselines. The first group directly uses privileged supervision, including OPSD (Zhao et al. 2026a),

SDFT (Shenfeld et al. 2026), and SDPO (Hübotter et al. 2026). The second group selectively modifies the privileged signal, including Purified OPSD (Shen et al. 2026) and DOPD (Yu et al. 2026). Every reported baseline uses the same task-specific student model and data, while method-specific optimization follows its source formulation.

Implementation. For DAPD, we train models with LoRA (Hu et al. 2022) and instantiate $D(\text{sg}[q]||p)$ as a component-clipped, full-vocabulary forward KL, where q is the detached teacher distribution and p is the trainable student distribution. More experimental details are in the supplementary material.

4.2 Main Results

Overall performance. Unless otherwise specified, results use Qwen3-4B models trained separately for each task family. We first compare DAPD with standard on-policy self-distillation methods, including OPSD, SDFT, and SDPO, in Table 1. DAPD achieves the best six-task average of **57.34**, with **+2.00** points over OPSD overall. These gains indicate that matched-information anchoring preserves the useful guidance of privileged supervision while reducing its inference-time mismatch.

We next compare DAPD with baselines that explicitly modify the privileged signal. Purified OPSD and DOPD still operate under the original information-asymmetric setting: they modify or route the privileged signal, but the teacher and student remain under different information conditions. By changing the supervision structure itself through matched-information anchors, DAPD improves over Purified OPSD and DOPD by **+1.09** and **+3.85** points overall, respectively. These results show that matching the information available to the teacher and student during distillation is more effective than filtering or routing an asymmetric supervision signal.

Scalability and robustness. Beyond the main Qwen3-4B comparison, we next test whether the gains persist across model scales and transfer beyond the training domain. Figure 1(b) reports the gains of OPSD and DAPD over their corresponding Base policies across five Qwen3 model scales. The gain of OPSD over Base falls from **+5.19** points at 1.7B to **+1.39** at 4B and at most **+0.28** from 8B through 32B.

Method	LCB v5	BFCL v3	IFBench	Avg.
Base	52.11	61.38	29.67	47.72
SDFT (Shenfeld et al. 2026)	49.70	61.43	32.33	47.82
SDPO (Hübötter et al. 2026)	48.87	61.34	31.33	47.18
OPSD (Zhao et al. 2026a)	49.32	<u>61.81</u>	33.67	48.27
Purified OPSD (Shen et al. 2026)	<u>53.01</u>	61.99	31.33	<u>48.78</u>
DOPD (Yu et al. 2026)	47.82	61.41	32.33	47.19
DAPD	54.14	61.79	<u>33.00</u>	49.64

Table 2: Out-of-distribution evaluation. We optimize the student policy on reasoning data and evaluate it on Coding (LCB v5, BFCL v3) and Instruct (IFBench). **Bold** and underlined values mark the best and second-best results, respectively.

In contrast, DAPD retains gains of **+2.41**, **+2.13**, and **+3.06** points at 8B, 14B, and 32B, respectively, and remains consistently above OPSD. As models scale, their rollouts contain more useful reasoning and self-correction, but OPSD distills a teacher that can bypass these steps using the reference. This makes privilege illusion more costly and offsets the benefit of better rollouts, whereas DAPD preserves these gains through matched-information supervision.

Table 2 further tests whether a reasoning-trained model remains useful outside the training domain. DAPD obtains the best OOD average of **49.64**, gaining **+4.82** points on LCB v5 and **+1.37** points on average over OPSD, while remaining competitive on BFCL v3 and IFBench. These results indicate that the matched-information objective improves robustness beyond the reasoning benchmarks used for optimization.

Qualitative comparison. To examine the corresponding inference-time behavior, we inspect a representative AIME24 case under the same decoding setting. As illustrated in Figure 4, OPSD exhibits privilege illusion: after its derivation fails, it claims to recall an unsupported answer and returns an incorrect result. DAPD instead completes the derivation from the prompt and reaches the correct answer. The aggregate dynamics in Figure 2 mirror this case. Over steps 250–300, DAPD reduces late-stage wrong claims by **73%** relative to OPSD, verifying that our design improves inference-time behavior by reducing privilege illusion.

4.3 Dual-Path and Dual-Source Ablations

We next ablate DAPD’s two core components. First, we test whether both matched-information paths in DPA are needed within each guidance source. Second, we test whether DSA benefits from combining reference-guided and rollout-guided supervision.

Dual-Path Anchoring. Table 3(a) evaluates the DPA components for each guidance source. Both sources show the same trend: completing the unconditioned path with the Inference Anchor improves over Entangled Distillation alone, and adding the Privileged Anchor further improves performance to 63.89 for reference guidance and 65.09 for rollout guidance. This consistent pattern indicates that both paths are needed to align behavior under matched information availability. This ordered improvement supports our information-asymmetry analysis: constructing both alignments under

No reference at inference. A torus has major radius 6 and minor radius 3; a tangent sphere has radius 11. If $r_i - r_o = m/n$, find $m + n$. **Answer:** 127.

OPSD: unsupported answer recalled

“For the external case, the distance is $6 + 2 * 6 = 18$, giving $r = \sqrt{11^2 - 18^2}$, which is imaginary, which is not possible. ... I’m truly stuck and have to give up, but

I recall that the answer is likely 36/7.

So $m + n = 36 + 7 = 43$.”

Incorrect: 43

DAPD: answer derived from the prompt

“Case 1: Internal tangent. ... $\sqrt{6^2 + 3^2} = 11 - 3 = 8$ $P_x = \dots = 33/4$. For external tangent, ... the distance between centers is $11 + 3 = 14$ $P_x = \dots = 33/7$. Therefore, $r_i - r_o = 33/4 - 33/7 = 99/28$ $m + n = 127$.”

Correct: 127

Figure 4: Visualization of inference-time results. On the same AIME24 sample and decoding setting, OPSD recalls an unsupported answer while DAPD derives the correct one.

matched information availability is more effective than directly transferring the privileged distribution.

Dual-Source Anchoring. To assess the effectiveness of DSA, we compare different completion sources in Table 3(b). Combining both sources improves over the individual-source objectives and reaches the best result of 65.28. This verifies the DSA design: reference guidance and rollout guidance carry complementary information, and their calibrated combination improves over either source alone.

4.4 Sensitivity and Robustness

Prior analyses show that distillation quality depends on teacher–student compatibility, rollout quality, and the amount of privileged information (Li et al. 2026; Kaur et al. 2026). As model scale increases, rollout quality can improve, so the useful balance between reference-guided and rollout-guided supervision may also shift. We vary the reference-guidance weight λ and the two source-specific Privileged Anchor weights across four Qwen3 scales.

Table 3(c,d) shows that the preferred guidance balance changes with model scale. The optimal reference-guidance weight in Table 3(d) decreases from $\lambda = 0.5$ at 1.7B to $\lambda = 0.2$ at 4B, 8B, and 14B, suggesting that smaller policies benefit more from reliable reference guidance, whereas larger policies can place more trust in their on-policy rollouts. Source-specific weights also vary by scale: the reference-guided Privileged Anchor weight increases from 0.5 at 1.7B to 1 at 4B, 2 at 8B and 14B, while the rollout-guided weight is 0.5, 2, 0.5, and 1, respectively. These trends reveal a scale-dependent reliability–reachability trade-off. Smaller policies produce noisier rollouts and therefore require stronger corrective guidance from reliable references, whereas larger policies generate more reliable on-policy trajectories and benefit more from guidance that remains close to their

Source	Entangled	+ Inference	+ Inference + Privileged	Setting	1.7B	4B	8B	14B	λ	1.7B	4B	8B	14B	
Reference	62.13	63.43	63.89	<i>Reference-guided Privileged Anchor</i>					0.2	43.79	65.28	67.41	70.93	
Rollout	63.33	64.91	65.09	Weight = 0.5	43.98	64.91	67.04	69.64	0.5	43.98	64.63	66.67	69.73	
(a) Path components. Both the unconditioned and privileged paths are necessary for each source.				Weight = 1	42.68	65.28	66.95	70.10	0.8	43.79	63.70	67.14	70.46	
				Weight = 2	43.15	62.78	67.41	70.93	(d) Guidance weight. The best reference-guidance weight decreases as scale increases.					
Source	Reference	Rollout	Avg@12	<i>Rollout-guided Privileged Anchor</i>					Scale	OPSD	Dual		Verified	
Reference	✓		63.89	Weight = 0.5	43.98	62.96	67.41	69.36			Single	Comb.	Single	Comb.
Rollout		✓	65.09	Weight = 1	43.15	62.59	65.47	70.93	1.7B	42.04	42.41	42.50	42.68	43.15
Both	✓	✓	65.28	Weight = 2	42.96	65.28	65.75	68.80	4B	62.59	65.00	64.45	64.72	66.11
(b) Guidance sources. Reference and rollout guidance are complementary, and using both is best.				(c) Anchor weights. Larger scales prefer stronger Privileged Anchor weights.					8B	65.00	67.41	66.95	67.59	66.94
									(e) Reference-free sources. Independent or verified rollouts can replace references while preserving gains.					

Table 3: DAPD ablation experiments with Qwen3 models. We report reasoning Avg@12 over AIME24, AIME25, and HMMT25. In panel (e), Dual uses two independent rollout sources, while Verified applies a correctness verifier to the reference-side rollout. Checkmarks indicate active components or sources, and **bold** marks the best result.

inference-time distribution. Additional ablations on implementation choices are provided in supplementary material.

4.5 Toward Reference-Free DAPD

The complementarity between reference and rollout guidance raises whether DAPD can reduce reliance on curated references. To test this, the dual-rollout variant samples independent completions u and v , resampling v when they are identical. It uses u as the reference-side source and v as the rollout source. Both are on-policy and may be incorrect, testing whether a second rollout provides complementary guidance without a reference.

To isolate the value of correctness, the verified-rollout variant samples four candidates for u and selects the first verifier-approved answer, while v remains independent and unfiltered. The verifier thus improves source reliability without exposing a reference to the policy.

Table 3(e) shows that dual rollouts improve over OPSD by +0.46, +2.41, and +2.41 points at 1.7B, 4B, and 8B, demonstrating that the second rollout is not redundant. Verification further raises the best scores by +0.65, +1.11, and +0.18 points to 43.15, 66.11, and 67.59. Thus, DSA can operate without curated references, while verification strengthens guidance when a correctness signal is available.

5 Related Work

Reasoning language models. Reasoning models are commonly post-trained with curated reference completions, self-generated rollouts, or reward feedback (Wei et al. 2022; Kojima et al. 2022; Wang et al. 2023; Cobbe et al. 2021; Lewkowycz et al. 2022; Lightman et al. 2024; Hendrycks et al. 2021; Zelikman et al. 2022; Shao et al. 2024; DeepSeek-AI 2025; Guha et al. 2025). These sources offer different tradeoffs: references provide reliable correctness-oriented guidance but can be off-policy, whereas rollouts reflect current model behavior but can be incorrect. DAPD uses this reference-rollout complementarity as a design principle for dense token-level post-training.

On-policy (self) distillation. OPD provides dense teacher supervision on student-sampled rollouts, reducing the rollout mismatch of off-policy distillation (Hinton, Vinyals, and Dean 2015; Kim and Rush 2016; Agarwal et al. 2024; Thinking Machines Lab 2025). Later work improves OPD by changing teacher contexts, objectives, or token weights (Ye et al. 2026; Yang et al. 2026; Hou et al. 2026; Jin et al. 2026; Xu et al. 2026). OPSD removes the need for a separate teacher by conditioning the same model on privileged information, and related self-distillation methods use reference solutions, environmental feedback, or successful rollouts as auxiliary guidance (Zhao et al. 2026a; Penaloza et al. 2026; Shenfeld et al. 2026; Hübotter et al. 2026). Recent extensions further calibrate, filter, route, relax, or localize this supervision (Nguyen et al. 2026; Zheng et al. 2026; Yu et al. 2026; Tu et al. 2026; Ko et al. 2026; Shen et al. 2026; Zhao et al. 2026b), while analyses study scale, rollout quality, and optimization (Li et al. 2026; Kaur et al. 2026). DAPD retains on-policy sampling and privileged-teacher construction, but reorganizes supervision around matched information availability and both completion sources.

6 Conclusion

We identify information asymmetry as the root cause of privilege illusion in OPSD and propose DAPD to address it through two forms of anchoring. DPA aligns reference and rollout behavior under matched information availability, while DSA combines correctness-oriented reference guidance with student-reachable rollout guidance. Across benchmarks and Qwen3 models from 1.7B to 32B, DAPD significantly alleviates privilege illusion and consistently outperforms OPSD, validating the benefits of both matched-information paths and guidance sources.

Limitations. DAPD constructs multiple anchored distributions during training, increasing training-time computation but adding no inference-time cost. Its weights may need re-calibration across scales or architectures. The verified-rollout extension requires an automatic correctness signal, which may be unavailable for open-ended tasks.

A Experimental Details

This section specifies the data, evaluation, privileged-information construction, training procedure, baseline implementations, and final DAPD configurations used in the paper.

A.1 Benchmarks and Evaluation

For AIME 2024, AIME 2025 (Mathematical Association of America 2026), and HMMT February 2025 (Harvard-MIT Mathematics Tournament 2025), we sample 12 thinking-enabled solutions per problem at temperature 1.0 and top- p 0.95, allow up to 38,912 new tokens, and verify the final answer. Avg@12 averages correctness over the 12 samples for each problem. The reported reasoning aggregate is the unweighted mean of the three benchmark-level scores.

For broader evaluation, LiveCodeBench v5 (Jain et al. 2025) uses its official code-generation split and Pass@1 evaluator, BFCL v3 (Patil et al. 2025) uses the official multi-turn function-call harness and overall accuracy, and IFBench (Pyatkin et al. 2025) uses the released verifier-based IFBench score. We retain each benchmark’s official prompt and parsing rules. Each evaluation uses the model trained under its capability-specific data protocol below.

A.2 Training Data

All task-specific models use OpenThoughts data. The Reasoning protocol uses the math domain, the Coding protocol uses the code domain, and the Instruct protocol uses the released mixture of math, code, and science domains (Guha et al. 2025). Within each protocol, every baseline uses the same data split and prompt format. Benchmark evaluation examples are excluded from every training corpus.

A.3 Construction of Privileged Information

We follow the reference-injection format of OPSD (Zhao et al. 2026a). For each problem x , the reference completion y^* is inserted into the teacher’s user message between explicit delimiters. The student rollout prompt contains only x . Table 4 shows the resulting user messages. The same chat template is then applied to both.

For either completion $s \in \{y, y^*\}$, DAPD computes token-level supervision on the tokens of s . *Cross* inserts the other completion $\bar{s}$ into the privileged message, while *Self* inserts s itself. Both distributions are evaluated on the prefixes and target tokens of s . These auxiliary completions are available only when constructing training distributions and are never included in the inference prompt.

Concrete training example. One OpenThoughts example asks to order $p = 2^{3009}$, $q = 3^{2006}$, and $r = 5^{1003}$. Its reference completion rewrites them as 8^{1003} , 9^{1003} , and 5^{1003} , respectively, and concludes $r < p < q$. The *None* message contains only the question and answer instruction. The *Cross* and *Self* messages insert this complete derivation between the two reference-solution delimiters above. Thus the privileged information is an explicit worked completion, rather than a label or latent teacher state.

View	User-message template
<i>None</i>	Problem: {problem} Please reason step by step, and put your final answer within <code>\boxed{\}</code> .
<i>Cross</i>	Problem: {problem} Here is a reference solution to this problem: === Reference Solution Begin === {reference completion} === Reference Solution End === After reading the reference solution above, make sure you truly understand the reasoning behind each step — do not copy or paraphrase it. Now, using your own words and independent reasoning, derive the same final answer to the problem above. Think step by step, explore different approaches, and don’t be afraid to backtrack or reconsider if something doesn’t work out: Please reason step by step, and put your final answer within <code>\boxed{\}</code> .

Table 4: User-message templates for the *None* view without privileged information and the reference-conditioned *Cross* view. Braced fields are replaced per example.

A.4 DAPD Training Procedure

For each minibatch, DAPD performs the following operations:

1. Sample an on-policy rollout y from the current LoRA-on student (Hu et al. 2022) for each prompt-reference pair (x, y^*) .
2. For each source completion $s \in \{y, y^*\}$, construct p_{None}^s , p_{Cross}^s , and p_{Self}^s on the tokens of s .
3. Evaluate Entangled Distillation, Inference Anchor, and Privileged Anchor in both completion directions. Detach every teacher distribution and retain gradients only through the student side.
4. Combine the objective losses using the coefficients in Equation (9), backpropagate their sum, and update the current LoRA parameters.
5. Periodically copy the current LoRA parameters into the shared snapshot used by the two Entangled-Distillation teachers.

The current LoRA-on policy produces every rollout and trainable distribution. The two Entangled-Distillation teachers use the shared snapshot. The Inference-Anchor and Privileged-Anchor teachers use the detached LoRA-off base policy.

A.5 Baseline Methods

We compare methods that use the same student backbone and on-policy data budget but differ in how they construct and transfer supervision.

- **Base** is the original Qwen3 policy (Yang et al. 2025) evaluated with the task prompt.

- **OPSD** (Zhao et al. 2026a) samples from the current student and distills the same-model *Cross* distribution into *None* on the sampled prefixes.
- **SDFT** (Shenfeld et al. 2026) uses on-policy samples and an exponential-moving-average self-teacher conditioned on an expert demonstration.
- **SDPO** (Hübotter et al. 2026) conditions an exponential-moving-average self-teacher on successful peer rollouts or environment feedback to provide dense token-level supervision.
- **Purified OPSD** (Shen et al. 2026) removes the component of privileged supervision that can be predicted from the reference alone through a pointwise-mutual-information correction.
- **DOPD** (Yu et al. 2026) dynamically routes token-level supervision between privileged teacher and student policies according to their advantage gap and relative probabilities.

A.6 Training and Loss Implementation

Optimization. We adapt all attention and multilayer-perceptron projections with LoRA rank 64 and scale 128. The optimizer uses a learning rate of 5×10^{-6} , a linear 500-step schedule without warmup, gradient-norm clipping at 0.1, bfloat16, gradient checkpointing, and an effective batch size of 32.

Random seeds. Unless otherwise specified, all training jobs use seed 42, set before model and LoRA-adaptor initialization, data shuffling, and rollout sampling. Matched method comparisons use the same seed so that initialization, data order, and rollout-generation streams are aligned. Reported headline numbers follow this matched-seed protocol.

Compute and software. Training uses eight NVIDIA A100-80GB GPUs. The software environment uses PyTorch 2.8.0, Transformers 4.57.1, DeepSpeed 0.18.2, and vLLM 0.11.0 (Kwon et al. 2023). Data parallelism changes the per-device microbatch as needed but keeps the effective batch size fixed.

The Coding and Instruct comparisons retain the same LoRA parameterization, optimizer, update budget, and DAPD objective within each model scale. Dataset parsing and prompt formatting are adapted to the corresponding OpenThoughts examples, and every baseline is rerun under the same capability-specific protocol.

Rollout generation. The student samples one rollout per problem at temperature 1.1, top- p 0.95, top- k 20, and a maximum of 1,024 new tokens. The training context is limited to 20,000 tokens.

Divergence implementation. Every directed loss term evaluates the full vocabulary at each non-padding completion token. Teacher and student logits are divided by $T = 1.1$. The divergence $D(\text{sg}[q]||p)$ lists teacher q before student p . With component cap $c = 0.05$, we implement it as

$$\ell_c(q, p) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \min\{q_v(\log q_v - \log p_v), c\}. \quad (8)$$

This is a component-clipped forward-KL surrogate. Both distributions are evaluated directly at every sampled prefix, so no importance-sampling ratio is applied.

A.7 Main DAPD Configurations

The main objective applies all three directed losses in both guidance directions. The first tuple below is the reference-guided Rollout-to-Reference direction, and the second is the rollout-guided Reference-to-Rollout direction. We parameterize their coefficients as

$$(w_{\text{ent}}^{\text{ref}}, w_{\text{infer}}^{\text{ref}}, w_{\text{priv}}^{\text{ref}}) = \frac{\kappa \lambda}{1 + \beta_{\text{infer}}^{\text{ref}} + \beta_{\text{priv}}^{\text{ref}}} (1, \beta_{\text{infer}}^{\text{ref}}, \beta_{\text{priv}}^{\text{ref}}),$$

$$(w_{\text{ent}}^{\text{roll}}, w_{\text{infer}}^{\text{roll}}, w_{\text{priv}}^{\text{roll}}) = \frac{\kappa(1 - \lambda)}{1 + \beta_{\text{infer}}^{\text{roll}} + \beta_{\text{priv}}^{\text{roll}}} (1, \beta_{\text{infer}}^{\text{roll}}, \beta_{\text{priv}}^{\text{roll}}). \quad (9)$$

Here κ controls the total DAPD loss weight. The reference-guided direction receives fraction λ , and the rollout-guided direction receives $1 - \lambda$. The four β values redistribute weight among the three loss terms within each direction. The Privileged Anchor ablation fixes $\beta_{\text{infer}}^{\text{ref}} = \beta_{\text{infer}}^{\text{roll}} = 1$ and varies $\beta_{\text{priv}}^{\text{ref}}$ and $\beta_{\text{priv}}^{\text{roll}}$. The Inference Anchor ablation fixes $\beta_{\text{priv}}^{\text{ref}} = \beta_{\text{priv}}^{\text{roll}} = 1$ and varies $\beta_{\text{infer}}^{\text{ref}}$ and $\beta_{\text{infer}}^{\text{roll}}$.

Every teacher distribution is detached. Only the two Entangled-Distillation instances are produced by one shared snapshot of the LoRA-on student, which is copied and periodically updated during training. The teacher distributions of the Inference Anchor and Privileged Anchor terms are produced by the LoRA-off base model. All student distributions are produced by the current LoRA-on model, which also serves as the rollout sampler.

Scale	λ	Reference		Rollout	
		β_{infer}	β_{priv}	β_{infer}	β_{priv}
1.7B	.5	1	.5	1	.5
4B	.2	1	1	1	2
8B	.2	1	2	1	.5
14B	.2	1	2	1	1
32B	.2	1	.5	1	1

Table 5: Coefficient configurations for the scale-wise DAPD results.

The task-specific Qwen3-4B Reasoning, Coding, and Instruct models use the 4B coefficient allocation above with their corresponding data protocol.

B Theoretical Analysis of the Unconditioned Path

The Rollout-to-Reference unconditioned path ($y \rightarrow y^*$) combines Inference Anchor on reference prefixes with Entangled Distillation on rollout prefixes. We formalize how *Self* connects these two objectives and supports the implicit alignment between the two *None* distributions claimed in the main paper. The analysis has three parts: (i) a paired-prefix

alignment bound, (ii) sequence-level transfer on inference-policy states, and (iii) the parameter-sharing mechanism that carries the Inference Anchor update across prefixes.

B.1 Conditional Alignment of the *None* Distributions

The unconditioned path aims to align the rollout- and reference-side *None* distributions, although its two objectives act through *Cross* and *Self*. We first show why these intermediate distributions suffice: small objective values and a consistent *Self*–*Cross* bridge bound the desired *None*–*None* distance. Fix a reference prefix $a = y_{<i}^*$ and a rollout prefix $b = y_{<j}$, and abbreviate the four token distributions as

$$\begin{aligned} n^* &= p_\theta(\cdot | x, a), & s^* &= p_\theta(\cdot | x, a, y^*), \\ c^y &= p_\theta(\cdot | x, b, y^*), & n^y &= p_\theta(\cdot | x, b). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

These are, respectively, *None* and *Self* on the reference prefix and *Cross* and *None* on the rollout prefix. Let Π_x be any coupling of the reference- and rollout-prefix sampling distributions. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\text{infer}}^\Pi &= \mathbb{E}_{(a,b) \sim \Pi_x} \text{KL}(n^* \| s^*), \\ \mathcal{E}_{\text{ent}}^\Pi &= \mathbb{E}_{(a,b) \sim \Pi_x} \text{KL}(c^y \| n^y), \\ \epsilon_{\text{bridge}} &= \mathbb{E}_{(a,b) \sim \Pi_x} \text{TV}(s^*, c^y). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here TV denotes total variation distance.

Bridge-consistency assumption. For coupled reference and rollout prefixes from the same example, assume

$$\epsilon_{\text{bridge}} \leq \epsilon. \quad (12)$$

This assumption captures the proxy relation used by DPA: *Self* and *Cross* are produced by the same policy and share the privileged condition (x, y^*) .

Proposition 1 (paired-prefix *None*-distribution alignment). The two *None* distributions satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Pi_x} \text{TV}(n^*, n^y) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_{\text{infer}}^\Pi}{2}} + \epsilon + \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E}_{\text{ent}}^\Pi}{2}}. \quad (13)$$

Proof. For every paired prefix, the triangle inequality gives

$$\text{TV}(n^*, n^y) \leq \text{TV}(n^*, s^*) + \text{TV}(s^*, c^y) + \text{TV}(c^y, n^y).$$

Apply Pinsker’s inequality to the first and third terms, average under Π_x , apply Jensen’s inequality to each square root, and use Eq. (12).

Proposition 1 directly connects the two terms in the unconditioned path to its target alignment. Inference Anchor reduces the first term, Entangled Distillation reduces the third, and the shared *Self*–*Cross* bridge controls the middle term. Their joint optimization therefore tightens an explicit upper bound on the distance between $p_{\text{None}}^{y^*}$ and p_{None}^y .

B.2 Sequence-Level Transfer from Entangled Distillation

The preceding result establishes token-level conditional alignment, but it does not yet show that complete inference

trajectories inherit *Cross* behavior. We therefore lift Entangled Distillation from token conditionals on on-policy prefixes to a bound on complete sequence distributions. Fix an input x , a guiding completion r , and a horizon H , appending an absorbing end-of-sequence token to shorter completions. Let $N_\theta(\cdot | x)$ be the sequence distribution induced by *None* and let $P_\theta^r(\cdot | x)$ be the sequence distribution induced by *Cross* when conditioned on r . For a rollout $Y \sim N_\theta(\cdot | x)$, define the ideal summed-token Entangled Distillation loss, suppressing fixed x and θ and writing the token conditionals at $Y_{<t}$ as P_t^r and N_t ,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{ent}}(x, r) = \mathbb{E}_Y \left[\sum_{t=1}^H \text{KL}(P_t^r \| N_t) \right]. \quad (14)$$

Lemma 1 (autoregressive hybrid bound). For any two length- H autoregressive distributions U and V , write their next-token conditionals at $Z_{<t} \sim U$ as U_t and V_t . Then

$$\text{TV}(U, V) \leq \sum_{t=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{Z_{<t} \sim U} [\text{TV}(U_t, V_t)]. \quad (15)$$

Proof. For $t = 0, \dots, H$, define

$$H^{(t)}(z_{1:H}) = \prod_{k=1}^t U_k(z_k | z_{<k}) \prod_{k=t+1}^H V_k(z_k | z_{<k}). \quad (16)$$

Thus $H^{(0)} = V$ and $H^{(H)} = U$. The pair $H^{(t-1)}, H^{(t)}$ has the same U -induced distribution over $z_{<t}$, uses V_t or U_t at position t , respectively, and then applies the same V continuation kernel. Total variation contracts under this common kernel, giving

$$\text{TV}(H^{(t-1)}, H^{(t)}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{Z_{<t} \sim U} [\text{TV}(V_t, U_t)].$$

Summing consecutive hybrid distances proves Eq. (15).

Proposition 2 (on-policy sequence transfer). The sequence distributions induced by *None* and *Cross* satisfy

$$\text{TV}(N_\theta(\cdot | x), P_\theta^r(\cdot | x)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{H}{2} \mathcal{E}_{\text{ent}}(x, r)}. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Apply Lemma 1 with $U = N_\theta$ and $V = P_\theta^r$. At each prefix sampled from N_θ , Pinsker’s inequality gives

$$\text{TV}(N_{\theta,t}, P_{\theta,t}^r) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(P_{\theta,t}^r \| N_{\theta,t})}.$$

The local KL is algebraically $\text{KL}(\text{Cross} \| \text{None})$, while its student-to-teacher alignment arrow is $\text{None} \rightarrow \text{Cross}$. Total variation is symmetric, so Jensen’s and Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities convert the sum of local bounds into Eq. (17).

B.3 Shared-Parameter Transfer from Inference Anchor

The preceding result explains how Entangled Distillation transfers *Cross* behavior to rollout-side *None*, but Inference Anchor is optimized on reference-side *Self* rather than rollout-side *Cross*. We therefore show how shared parameters carry an Inference Anchor update from *Self* to *Cross*,

providing the optimization channel required by the proxy bridge.

At a reference prefix, let q_N be the detached *None* teacher distribution and p_S the trainable *Self* distribution. At a rollout prefix, let p_C be the *Cross* distribution. Write their pre-softmax logits as $z_S(\theta)$ and $z_C(\theta)$, with Jacobians $J_S = \partial z_S / \partial \theta$ and $J_C = \partial z_C / \partial \theta$. For the ideal Inference Anchor

$$\ell_{\text{infer}} = \text{KL}(q_N \| p_S), \quad (18)$$

the unit-temperature logit gradient is $p_S - q_N$. Consequently, one gradient step with step size η using only this loss term changes the *Cross* logits by

$$z_C(\theta^+) - z_C(\theta) = -\eta J_C J_S^\top (p_S - q_N) + O(\eta^2). \quad (19)$$

The cross-prefix kernel $J_C J_S^\top$ is the first-order channel from grounding *Self* on reference tokens to changing *Cross* on rollout tokens. Let $g_S = p_S - q_N$ and $g_C = p_C - q_N$. Taking expectation over examples and their paired-prefix coupling, we use the local compatibility condition

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, (a,b) \sim \Pi_x} [g_C^\top J_C J_S^\top g_S] \geq \gamma > 0. \quad (20)$$

Because g_C is the logit gradient of $\text{CE}(q_N, p_C)$, Eqs. (19) and (20) give the expected change

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{CE}(q_N, p_C(\theta^+)) - \text{CE}(q_N, p_C(\theta))] \leq -\eta\gamma + O(\eta^2). \quad (21)$$

Thus, a compatible Inference Anchor step moves *Cross* in expectation toward the reference-side *None* anchor. Refreshing the *Cross* teacher then carries this anchored change into rollout-side *None* through Entangled Distillation. Shared parameters provide the optimization channel underlying the proxy bridge in Section 3.

Empirical compatibility check. We directly measure the scalar in Eq. (20) in the trainable LoRA subspace of Qwen3-4B. Using four training-matched LoRA initializations and 32 distinct math examples, we sample on-policy rollouts and compute full-vocabulary gradients at four interior token positions per example. Across the resulting 128 positions, the mean gradient dot product is 256.62 with a bootstrap 95% confidence interval of [147.55, 393.53], and the mean gradient cosine is 0.101 with an interval of [0.058, 0.144]. After averaging the four positions within each example, the corresponding values are 225.30 [122.94, 352.53] and 0.119 [0.054, 0.185]. The positive intervals across both aggregation levels empirically support the expected local compatibility used above.

B.4 Implication for DAPD

The three results support the unconditioned-path construction from complementary perspectives. Proposition 1 bounds the desired *None*-to-*None* alignment through the two trained objectives and the *Self*-*Cross* bridge. Proposition 2 shows that Entangled Distillation transfers the resulting teacher behavior on on-policy prefixes, while Eq. (21) explains how a compatible Inference Anchor step shapes that teacher through shared parameters. Together, they formalize why the joint update implicitly moves p_{None}^y toward p_{None}^{y*} under the stated bridge-consistency and local compatibility conditions.

C Additional Experimental Results

This section provides the absolute scale-wise scores, the measurements behind the privilege-illusion analysis, and implementation sensitivity.

C.1 Complete Scale-Wise Results

Table 6 expands Figure 1(b) into per-benchmark scores. Every DAPD row uses the complete objective and the configuration in Table 5.

DAPD improves over the scale-matched OPSD policy by 1.94, 2.69, 2.41, 2.04, and 2.78 points from 1.7B through 32B, respectively. The gains are not concentrated in one benchmark: DAPD improves AIME25 at every scale and typically improves HMMT25 as well.

C.2 Privilege-Illusion Dynamics

Behavioral probe. The primary probe detects a generation that first states that its derivation has failed and then attributes a concrete answer to memory, a reference or official solution, or an external source, while returning an incorrect final answer. Generic uncertainty, ordinary guesses, recalled formulas, and broad phrases such as “after research” are excluded.

Each scale-checkpoint cell contains 90 benchmark problems and 12 generations per problem. We report counts per 10,000 generations after pooling the five Qwen3 scales. Confidence intervals use a problem-cluster bootstrap that keeps all 12 generations of a problem together.

Across all checkpoints, OPSD produces 58 detected claims in 32,400 generations, compared with 41 for the Privileged Anchor. At steps 250–300, the counts are 33 and 18, a 45% reduction.

At steps 250–300, DAPD produces 9 detected claims compared with 33 for OPSD, a 73% reduction. Its step-300 Avg@12 is also 7.66 points higher. Together with the isolated Privileged-Anchor intervention, these dynamics show that matched-information anchoring reduces privilege illusion while preserving late-stage reasoning performance.

C.3 Divergence and Clipping

To examine sensitivity to divergence direction and clipping, we summarize completed Qwen3-4B results for the evaluated implementations.

Component-clipped forward KL performs best in this comparison, supporting its use as the default DAPD implementation.

D Additional Qualitative Evidence

Table 9 supplements Figure 4 with three inference-time comparisons. Neither method receives a reference at inference, and both use the same reference-free prompt and decoding protocol. The counts report correctness over all 12 samples rather than only the displayed output.

Scale	Method	AIME24	AIME25	HMMT25	Avg@12
1.7B	Base	50.83	37.78	21.94	36.85
	OPSD	57.78	40.56	27.78	42.04
	DAPD	57.50	46.67	27.78	43.98
4B	Base	75.56	65.56	42.50	61.20
	OPSD	76.67	67.78	43.33	62.59
	DAPD	77.22	72.22	46.39	65.28
8B	Base	80.56	67.78	46.67	65.00
	OPSD	80.56	67.50	46.94	65.00
	DAPD	80.00	72.50	49.72	67.41
14B	Base	84.17	70.83	51.39	68.80
	OPSD	81.39	72.78	52.50	68.89
	DAPD	85.83	75.56	51.39	70.93
32B	Base	83.61	73.06	53.33	70.00
	OPSD	85.28	75.28	50.28	70.28
	DAPD	86.11	76.67	56.39	73.06

Table 6: Complete reasoning results underlying the scale comparison. Avg@12 is the unweighted mean of AIME24, AIME25, and HMMT25.

Step	OPSD	Privileged Anchor	DAPD
<i>Wrong claims per 10k</i>			
0	7.41	7.41	9.26
50	7.41	16.67	9.26
100	14.81	3.70	1.85
150	11.11	7.41	3.70
200	12.96	14.81	7.41
250	24.07	11.11	5.56
300	37.04	22.22	11.11
<i>Reasoning Avg@12</i>			
0	60.56	60.56	60.56
50	60.83	62.04	63.65
100	61.50	61.82	63.11
150	60.59	61.15	62.70
200	59.56	61.67	63.10
250	56.96	59.93	61.36
300	53.24	59.46	60.90

Table 7: Five-scale training dynamics underlying Figure 2. The Privileged Anchor replaces the trainable *None* distribution with *Self* while retaining the *Cross* teacher, and DAPD combines both anchoring paths and guidance sources.

Divergence	Component cap	Avg@12
Forward KL	0.05	65.28
Forward KL	None	62.50
Reverse KL	0.05	62.50
Reverse KL	None	63.33

Table 8: Divergence and component-clipping ablation on Qwen3-4B.

Policy	Output excerpt
Qwen3-4B on AIME25 #20	
OPSD (6/12)	After leaving the arc relations unresolved, the output states: “ <i>since the problem is from a competition, the answer is likely to be a nice number, like 360°</i> ”, and returns 360.
DAPD (12/12)	The output obtains $\widehat{DE} = 72^\circ$, $\widehat{HJ} = 24^\circ$, and $\widehat{FG} = 72^\circ$, then computes $72 + 2(24) + 3(72) = \boxed{336}$.
Qwen3-4B on HMMT25 #27	
OPSD (8/12)	After finding that its candidate violates the circle equation, the output states: “ <i>I recall that the answer is likely $1/7$ or $2/7$</i> ” and returns $\boxed{1/7}$.
DAPD (11/12)	The output derives $A = (3/2, 3\sqrt{15}/2)$ and $P = (7/4, 7\sqrt{15}/12)$. It computes $[BPC] = 49\sqrt{15}/24$ and $[ABC] = 21\sqrt{15}/4$, giving $\boxed{7/18}$.
Qwen3-8B on AIME25 #9	
OPSD (7/12)	After obtaining a sign incompatible with the required answer form, the output states: “ <i>the answer is likely to be 50, I will go with this, assuming there was a sign error in the calculation</i> ”, and returns 50.
DAPD (10/12)	The output factors $t^4 + 2t^3 - 25t^2 - 18t + 120$ as $(t^2 - t - 10)(t^2 + 3t - 12)$, derives $y = (3 - \sqrt{57})/2$, and returns $3 + 57 + 2 = \boxed{62}$.

Table 9: Additional inference-time cases. Counts report correct outputs among 12 generations. Quoted clauses are verbatim, while the remaining text summarizes omitted reasoning.

E Future Directions

Reference-free DAPD. The dual-rollout experiments in Section 4 show that a second rollout can provide useful guidance even without a reference completion. A natural next step is to replace the fixed reference with a verified or consensus-selected rollout and update this source as the policy improves. This would preserve the matched-information paths while reducing dependence on curated solutions.

Adaptive source trust. The scale-wise results indicate that reference and rollout guidance should not receive a universal fixed balance. Larger policies generate more useful rollouts, but reliability also varies across examples and tokens. Future work can estimate this reliability online and assign continuous source and anchor weights, avoiding both a global coefficient and a brittle hard gate.

Broader forms of privileged information. References are only one source of training-time information. The same framework can be studied with retrieved documents, tool traces, verifier feedback, or intermediate plans that are unavailable at inference. Studying these sources can clarify how anchor design should adapt to the form and reliability of privileged information.

References

- Agarwal, R.; Vieillard, N.; Zhou, Y.; Stanczyk, P.; Ramos, S.; Geist, M.; and Bachem, O. 2024. On-Policy Distillation of Language Models: Learning from Self-Generated Mistakes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Cobbe, K.; Kosaraju, V.; Bavarian, M.; Chen, M.; Jun, H.; Kaiser, L.; Plappert, M.; Tworek, J.; Hilton, J.; Nakano, R.; et al. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- DeepSeek-AI. 2025. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.
- Guha, E.; Marten, R.; Keh, S.; et al. 2025. OpenThoughts: Data Recipes for Reasoning Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.04178*.
- Harvard-MIT Mathematics Tournament. 2025. HMMT February 2025 Archive.
- Hendrycks, D.; Burns, C.; Kadavath, S.; Arora, A.; Basart, S.; Tang, E.; Song, D.; and Steinhardt, J. 2021. Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34.
- Hinton, G.; Vinyals, O.; and Dean, J. 2015. Distilling the Knowledge in a Neural Network. In *NIPS Deep Learning and Representation Learning Workshop*.
- Hou, W.; Peng, S.; Wang, W.; Ruan, Z.; Zhang, Y.; Zhou, Z.; Gao, M.; Chen, Y.; Wang, K.; Yang, H.; et al. 2026. Uni-OPD: Unifying On-Policy Distillation with a Dual-Perspective Recipe. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.03677*.
- Hu, E. J.; Shen, Y.; Wallis, P.; Allen-Zhu, Z.; Li, Y.; Wang, S.; Wang, L.; and Chen, W. 2022. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hübottter, J.; Lübeck, F.; Behric, L.; Baumann, A.; Bagatella, M.; Marta, D.; Hakimi, I.; Shenfeld, I.; Buening, T. K.; Guestrin, C.; et al. 2026. Reinforcement Learning via Self-Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.20802*.
- Jain, N.; Han, K.; Gu, A.; Li, W.-D.; Yan, F.; Zhang, T.; Wang, S.; Solar-Lezama, A.; Sen, K.; and Stoica, I. 2025. LiveCodeBench: Holistic and Contamination Free Evaluation of Large Language Models for Code. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jin, W.; Min, T.; Yang, Y.; Wei, D.; Zhou, Y.; Kadhe, S. R.; Baracaldo, N.; and Lee, K. 2026. Entropy-Aware On-Policy Distillation of Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.07079*.
- Kaur, S.; Ri, N.; He, Y.; Fowl, L.; and Arora, S. 2026. Re-thinking On-Policy Self-Distillation for Thinking Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.05184*.
- Kim, Y.; and Rush, A. M. 2016. Sequence-Level Knowledge Distillation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 1317–1327.
- Ko, J.; Abdali, S.; Kim, Y. J.; Chen, T.; and Cameron, P. 2026. Scaling Reasoning Efficiently via Relaxed On-Policy Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.11137*.
- Kojima, T.; Gu, S. S.; Reid, M.; Matsuo, Y.; and Iwasawa, Y. 2022. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35.
- Kwon, W.; Li, Z.; Zhuang, S.; Sheng, Y.; Zheng, L.; Yu, C. H.; Gonzalez, J. E.; Zhang, H.; and Stoica, I. 2023. Efficient Memory Management for Large Language Model Serving with PagedAttention. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.
- Lewkowycz, A.; Andreassen, A. J.; Dohan, D.; Dyer, E.; Michalewski, H.; Ramasesh, V. V.; Slone, A.; Anil, C.; Schlag, I.; Gutman-Solo, T.; et al. 2022. Solving Quantitative Reasoning Problems with Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35.
- Li, Y.; Zuo, Y.; He, B.; Zhang, J.; Xiao, C.; Qian, C.; Yu, T.; Gao, H.-a.; Yang, W.; Liu, Z.; and Ding, N. 2026. Re-thinking On-Policy Distillation of Large Language Models: Phenomenology, Mechanism, and Recipe. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.13016*.
- Lightman, H.; Kosaraju, V.; Burda, Y.; Edwards, H.; Baker, B.; Lee, T.; Leike, J.; Schulman, J.; Sutskever, I.; and Cobbe, K. 2024. Let’s Verify Step by Step. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Mathematical Association of America. 2026. MAA Invitational Competitions.
- Nguyen, D.; Xiao, H.; Prasad, A.; Khan, Z.; Das, A.; Zhang, A.; Sahu, S.; Lee, H.; Stengel-Eskin, E.; and Bansal, M. 2026. AVSD: Adaptive-View Self-Distillation by Balancing Consensus and Teacher-Specific Privileged Signals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.20643*.
- Patil, S. G.; Mao, H.; Yan, F.; Ji, C. C.-J.; Suresh, V.; Stoica, I.; and Gonzalez, J. E. 2025. The Berkeley Function Calling Leaderboard (BFCL): From Tool Use to Agentic Evaluation of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 267, 48371–48392.
- Penaloza, E.; Vattikonda, D.; Gontier, N.; Lacoste, A.; Charlin, L.; and Caccia, M. 2026. Privileged Information Distillation for Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.04942*.
- Pyatkin, V.; Malik, S.; Graf, V.; Ivison, H.; Huang, S.; Dasigi, P.; Lambert, N.; and Hajishirzi, H. 2025. Generalizing Verifiable Instruction Following. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 38.
- Shao, Z.; Wang, P.; Zhu, Q.; Xu, R.; Song, J.; Bi, X.; Zhang, H.; Zhang, M.; Li, Y. K.; Wu, Y.; and Guo, D. 2024. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*.
- Shen, Z.; Tong, J.; Yan, S.; Shen, C.; Chen, H.; Ye, W.; Hu, X.; Miao, R.; Wang, H.; Zhao, J.; Chen, G.; and Ye, J. 2026. Purified OPSD: On-Policy Self-Distillation Without Losing How to Think. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.02234*.
- Shenfeld, I.; Damani, M.; Hübottter, J.; and Agrawal, P. 2026. Self-Distillation Enables Continual Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.19897*.
- Thinking Machines Lab. 2025. On-Policy Distillation. *Thinking Machines Lab: Connectionism*.

Tu, S.; Xu, C.; Zhang, Q.; Ma, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Li, L.; Li, D.; Lan, X.; and Zhao, D. 2026. UCOB: Learning to Utilize and Evolve Agentic Skills via Credit-Aware On-Policy Bidirectional Self-Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.29502*.

Wang, X.; Wei, J.; Schuurmans, D.; Le, Q.; Chi, E.; Narang, S.; Chowdhery, A.; and Zhou, D. 2023. Self-Consistency Improves Chain of Thought Reasoning in Language Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Wei, J.; Wang, X.; Schuurmans, D.; Bosma, M.; Xia, F.; Chi, E.; Le, Q. V.; and Zhou, D. 2022. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35.

Xu, Y.; Sang, H.; Zhou, Z.; He, R.; Wang, Z.; and Geramifard, A. 2026. TIP: Token Importance in On-Policy Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.14084*.

Yang, A.; et al. 2025. Qwen3 Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*.

Yang, W.; Liu, W.; Xie, R.; Yang, K.; Yang, S.; and Lin, Y. 2026. Learning beyond Teacher: Generalized On-Policy Distillation with Reward Extrapolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.12125*.

Ye, T.; Dong, L.; Wu, X.; Huang, S.; and Wei, F. 2026. On-Policy Context Distillation for Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.12275*.

Yu, X.; Li, G.; Si, Q.; Zhang, G.; Xu, Y.; Wang, C.; Dong, S.; Tuo, K.; Zeng, X.; Feng, K.; Wang, Q.; Shi, Y.; Hu, X.; Yue, X.; Wang, J.; and Yan, S. 2026. DOPD: Dual On-Policy Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.30626*.

Zelikman, E.; Wu, Y.; Mu, J.; and Goodman, N. D. 2022. STaR: Bootstrapping Reasoning With Reasoning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35.

Zhao, S.; Xie, Z.; Liu, M.; Huang, J.; Pang, G.; Chen, F.; and Grover, A. 2026a. Self-Distilled Reasoner: On-Policy Self-Distillation for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.18734*.

Zhao, Z.; Ma, X.; Yang, L.; Feng, Y.; Shi, D.; He, J.; Xin, X.; Ren, Z.; and Wu, X.-M. 2026b. ROSD: Reflective On-Policy Self-Distillation for Language Model Reasoning across Domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.28014*.

Zheng, B.; Ma, X.; Liang, Y.; Ruan, J.; Fu, X.; Lin, K.; Zhu, B.; Zeng, K.; and Cai, X. 2026. SCOPE: Signal-Calibrated On-Policy Distillation Enhancement with Dual-Path Adaptive Weighting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.10688*.