

Diagnosing Training Inference Mismatch in LLM Reinforcement Learning

Tianle Zhong^{1,2,*} Neiwen Ling^{1,*} Yifan Pi¹ Zijun Wei¹
 Tianshu Yu¹ Geoffrey Fox² Peng Wu^{1,†} Xiao Yu^{1,†}
¹ByteDance ²The University of Virginia
 *Equal contribution †Corresponding authors

Abstract

Modern LLM RL systems separate rollout generation from policy optimization. These two stages are expected to produce token probabilities that match exactly. However, implementation differences can make them assign different values to the same sequence under the same model weights, inducing Training–Inference Mismatch (TIM). TIM is difficult to inspect because it is entangled with off-policy drift and common stabilization mechanisms. In this work, we isolate TIM in a zero-mismatch diagnostic setting (*VeXact*), and show that small token-level numerical disagreements can independently cause training collapse. We further show that TIM changes the effective optimization problem, and identify a set of remedies that could mitigate TIM. Our results suggest that TIM is not benign numerical noise, but a systems-level perturbation that should be treated as a first-order factor in analyzing LLM RL stability.

1 Introduction

Large language model (LLM) reinforcement learning (RL) has become a central paradigm for post-training foundation models and a key driver of recent advances in complex reasoning capabilities [Schulman et al., 2017, Ouyang et al., 2022, Ziegler et al., 2019, Shao et al., 2024, Stiennon et al., 2020, Liu et al., 2025b]. However, RL training remains difficult to stabilize in practice: policies may rapidly degrade, causing reward signals to drop over short training windows.

Understanding what causes these collapses is therefore essential for building reliable LLM RL training systems [Sheng et al., 2025b, Hu et al., 2024, Fu et al., 2025b, Team, 2025, Cao et al., 2025, Sheng et al., 2025a, MiniMax et al., 2025]. However, diagnosing the root cause is difficult because many failure modes are deeply entangled and arise at different levels of the training stack. A collapse may be caused by many factors, such as poorly tuned hyperparameters, reward misspecification, and reward hacking [Fu et al., 2025a, Pan et al., 2024]. Among these factors, Training-Inference Mismatch (TIM) is a infrastructure-level confounder: implementation differences between training and inference engines can cause divergent token probabilities even for the same input and model weights.

In response to these stability challenges, the community has developed a range of training-level stabilization techniques, including importance sampling, rejection sampling, and other forms of conservative policy updates [Schulman et al., 2017, Yao et al., 2025, Li et al., 2026, Team et al., 2025, Ring AI Team, 2025, Zheng et al., 2025a, Liu et al., 2025a]. Although effective in some settings, their connection to specific failure mechanisms remains unclear: the same technique may correct PPO mini-step off-policy drift, suppress TIM-induced numerical outliers, or introduce additional optimization bias. Without a TIM-free diagnostic baseline to isolate these effects, practitioners must tune interventions and filtering thresholds by trial and error rather than by causal diagnosis.

In this paper, we aim to systematically understand the impact of TIM on LLM RL stability. Specifically, we aim to answer two key questions: First, does TIM contribute to RL training instability,

and if so, to what extent? Second, how do common stabilization techniques interact with TIM, what aspects of the mismatch do they mitigate, and what optimization side effects do they introduce?

To answer these questions, we develop *VeXact*¹, a lightweight rollout engine that achieves zero-mismatch with FSDP [Zhao et al., 2023, Rajbhandari et al., 2020] engine on top of VeRL [Sheng et al., 2025b]. *VeXact* eliminates TIM by unifying kernel and model implementations with the FSDP training engine, and by employing batch-invariant kernels [He, 2025] (§ 3.1). Using *VeXact*, we conduct fine-grained diagnostic studies of LLM RL stability. Concretely, our contributions are:

Isolating TIM impact for LLM RL: Using our TIM-free baseline, we identify TIM alone as a significant factor in triggering RL training collapse (§ 3.2).

Analyzing failure modes of TIM-induced RL training collapse. We then conduct ablation studies on TIM’s role in RL training collapse under general setups. Specifically, we analyze why RL training collapse in both trainer-side log-probabilities recomputation and rollout-side log-probabilities bypass. We find that TIM fundamentally changes the optimization objective, thereby inducing distinct failure (§ 4.1).

Ablating effectiveness of algorithmic TIM compensation. Furthermore, we evaluate whether common stabilization techniques can effectively mitigate TIM, including truncated importance sampling (TIS) [Yao et al., 2025], and rejection sampling (RS) [Li et al., 2026](§ 4.2). Based on our ablation study, we identify an effective combination of existing algorithmic TIM compensations that can closely track our TIM-free baseline.

2 Training-Inference Mismatch in LLM RL

Due to the implementation differences between the training engines (FSDP [Zhao et al., 2023, Rajbhandari et al., 2020], Megatron [Shoeybi et al., 2020], etc) and the inference engines (vLLM [Kwon et al., 2023], SGLang [Zheng et al., 2024], etc), including divergent model/kernel implementations, the probability distribution on the vocabulary for the next token can be different even with the exact same model checkpoint and inputs. This introduces an unintended off-policy bias between the sampling and model update. Different from the off-policy bias introduced by PPO mini-steps [Schulman et al., 2017], TIM off-policy bias is an infrastructure-level noise, which cannot be addressed by naive PPO clipping methods (discussed in §4).

We formulate this issue in RL objectives as follows: Given a context x and a sampled response $y = (a_1, \dots, a_T)$, let $s_t = (x, y_{<t})$. We distinguish three token-level distributions: $\pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$ denotes the current policy being optimized; $\pi_{old}^{rollout}(a_t|s_t)$ denotes the behavioral distribution realized by the rollout engine when the token is sampled; and $\pi_{old}^{train}(a_t|s_t)$ denotes the trainer-side reference distribution used when an algorithm requires an old-policy probability.

In an exact on-policy implementation, the probability assigned to each sampled token should be consistent between rollout and training. TIM occurs when the rollout execution path and the trainer execution path assign different probabilities to the same token under the same model weights and sampled sequence. At the token level, this discrepancy can be written as

$$\delta_t = \log \pi_{old}^{train}(a_t|s_t) - \log \pi_{old}^{rollout}(a_t|s_t). \quad (1)$$

This definition is objective-agnostic: the mismatch exists before choosing whether the update is implemented with REINFORCE [Williams, 1992, Hu et al., 2025], PPO [Schulman et al., 2017], or GRPO [Shao et al., 2024, Yu et al., 2025].

Table 1 illustrates an example of several sampled tokens from the same context and model checkpoint. For each token, we compare the log-probability produced by the rollout with that re-evaluated by the training engine. Ideally, these two values should be identical for an on-policy update. However, we can observe clear discrepancies in token log-probabilities between the two sides, including cases where the top-1 token choice at a given position is flipped. As Figure 1 shows, although the average difference in token-level probabilities is small per training batch, the maximum difference can even reach 1.0 for some extreme tokens, which is generally observable when TIM exists.

¹The source code of *VeXact* is openly available at <https://github.com/verl-project/vexact>.

	The	problem	states	that [†]	there	exist	real	numbers
$\log \pi_{\text{rollout}}$	-0.279	-0.063	-0.314	-0.694	-0.000	-0.030	-0.000	-0.000
$\log \pi_{\text{train}}$	-0.278	-0.063	-0.314	-0.827	-0.000	-0.038	-0.000	-0.000
δ_t	0.001	0.000	0.000	-0.133	0.000	-0.008	0.000	0.000

Table 1: Token-level kernel-numerical drift between the rollout and training stacks on the same Qwen3-8B (bf16) weights, traced along one sentence from a greedy sampled response on an AIME-2024 problem. $\delta_t = \log \pi_{\text{train}} - \log \pi_{\text{rollout}}$. Most positions are bit-close, but [†] marks an argmax flip: at that, π_{train} ’s top 1 token is actually the punctuation + newline string " : \n\n" (log prob -0.577), so the training side would have ended the clause as “*The problem states: \n\n*”.




Figure 1: Statistical $|\delta_t|$ max and mean for every training batch in the Qwen3-1.7B GRPO experiment (detailed configuration in Appendix A.1). While the mean of $|\delta_t|$ is small, we can observe some extreme tokens with its $|\delta_t|$ near 1.0.

3 Isolating TIM with *VeXact*

In this section, we isolate the impact of TIM on RL training stability. This requires two key ingredients: (1) First, we introduce a TIM-free rollout implementation, *VeXact*, as a diagnostic baseline that removes infrastructure-induced mismatch from the RL loop. (2) Second, we evaluate this baseline under REINFORCE, which avoids PPO ratio clipping that may mask or distort TIM-induced changes in the loss and gradient signals.

3.1 *VeXact*: A Zero-mismatch Rollout Engine

For the TIM-free baseline, we introduce *VeXact*, a lightweight rollout engine whose rollout token log-probabilities can achieve bit-wise alignment with the FSDP engine.

TIM comes from two sources: (1) The model and kernel implementation differences between the inference and training engines. Although semantically and mathematically the same, they often make different decisions regarding implementation details. For example, inference engines prefer inference-optimized kernel libraries like FlashInfer, which is not applicable in training engines. (2) Variations in kernel reduction order and tiling. Even when the same kernel implementation is used, performance-oriented optimizations such as atomic additions can introduce non-determinism, causing the kernel to produce different outputs for identical inputs. Moreover, even a *deterministic* kernel may exhibit batch-dependent numerical behavior: changes in batch size can trigger different launch-grid configurations through auto-tuning, thereby altering GPU tiling strategies and reduction orders. Since floating-point accumulation is non-associative under finite precision, these changes in execution order can ultimately lead to numerically different results.

Hence, *VeXact* addresses these two sources of mismatch by (1) using the same HuggingFace-based model implementation and register *VeXact* kernel implementation in the FSDP engine initialization and (2) employing deterministic and batch-invariant kernels, which fix the tiling and reduction order in the GPU kernel implementation. Following the original batch invariant kernel implementation [He, 2025], *VeXact* additionally implements RMSNorm [Zhang and Sennrich, 2019], batched matrix multiplication, and batch invariant Fused MoE kernels for efficient MoE training/inference. For attention implementation [Dao et al., 2022] specifically, we disable KV splitting [Dao et al., 2023] to ensure determinism as well.

Meanwhile, since fixed tiling in batch-invariant kernels trades performance for numerical stability, *VeXact* retains reasonable throughput for practical RL training by integrating chunked pre-




Figure 2: REINFORCE experiments comparing vLLM non-exact rollout with *VeXact*. Top row: Qwen3-30B-A3B MoE. Bottom row: Qwen3-1.7B dense. Each row reports training reward, AIME 2024 validation reward, δ_t (mean), and log-scale gradient norm. More experimental results in Appendix A.2.

fill [Agrawal et al., 2023], CUDAGraph [NVIDIA Corporation, 2025], pipeline parallelism [Huang et al., 2019], and optimistic KV allocation with preemption fallback. *VeXact* maintains hackable and very lightweight and its LOC is similar to nano-vLLM [GeeekExplorer, 2025].

3.2 Exposing the Impact of TIM

To isolate how TIM impacts RL training stability from low-level numerical disagreement, we first study REINFORCE Williams [1992] on-policy updates. Unlike PPO-style objectives, REINFORCE consumes each rollout batch in a single policy-gradient update. This makes it a cleaner diagnostic objective for attributing changes in loss, gradient, and reward to rollout-training probability disagreement.

We conduct REINFORCE experiments (with batch-whitened advantages) for both dense (Qwen3-1.7B) and MoE (Qwen3-30B-A3B) models [Yang et al., 2025]. Both settings compare a standard non-exact rollout engine (vLLM) against *VeXact*. The dense run is trained on Sanity-Test-R1D-1.5B [Qi et al., 2025] and evaluated on AIME 2024 [Mathematical Association of America, 2024] every 50 global steps. The MoE run is trained on DAPO [Yu et al., 2025] dataset and evaluated on AIME 2024 every 20 global steps. The full experimental configuration is summarized in Appendix Table 2.

Figure 2 shows that the non-exact rollout run exhibits instability jointly in reward and gradient signals, while *VeXact* is significantly more stable. For example, in the MoE setting of Figure 2, the vLLM run initially improves but starts to degrade after step 280, with training and validation rewards decreasing from 0.574 and 0.293 to 0.255 and 0.067, respectively. By contrast, the *VeXact* reference remains stable and continues to improve, reaching 0.753 training reward and 0.534 validation reward. Since TIM is the only difference between *VeXact* and vLLM baseline, *these experiments confirm that TIM is itself a critical destabilizing factor, not merely a secondary artifact compounded with other training effects.*

4 Ablating TIM Mitigations under the *VeXact* Baseline

§ 3 shows that TIM alone can destabilize RL training with the REINFORCE setup. However, algorithms like PPO and GRPO have more complicated setups with PPO mini-steps. Different from fully on-policy algorithms like REINFORCE, algorithms like PPO and GRPO fix a snapshot of the policy (θ_{old}) to collect a batch of samples and perform multiple gradient steps on this batch. To optimize the current policy θ against the data sampled from a different distribution θ_{old} , they apply *importance sampling*, introducing the probability ratio π_θ/π_{old} into the objective.




Figure 3: Qwen3-1.7B GRPO experiments with *VeXact* and vLLM recomputation and bypass, where only *VeXact* can maintain the training stability. More experimental results on the DAPO dataset in Appendix A.3.

Under such setups, TIM is intertwined with stabilization techniques for them like PPO clipping. We now turn to the second research question: when practitioners apply common stabilization techniques, among which some are designed for general PPO training stability and some are TIM-aware, what do these mechanisms actually fix, and what optimization side effects do they introduce?

Experiment setup. We study this question in a practical GRPO training setting. Unless otherwise stated, the experiments in this section use Qwen3-1.7B with FSDP on mathematical reasoning workloads. The model is trained on Sanity-Test-R1D-1.5B and evaluated on AIME 2024 every 50 global steps. We compare *VeXact* with vLLM non-exact rollout implementations using recomputation, bypass, rollout correction, and rejection sampling variants.

4.1 The Failure Modes of Recomputation and Bypass

There are two implementations for acquiring π_{old} : recomputation (where the trainer re-evaluates the sampled tokens) and bypass (where the rollout engine directly transmits its log-probabilities). Both strategies use the same clipped PPO/GRPO surrogate, but differ in how the denominator of the policy ratio is obtained. For a sampled token a_t under state s_t with advantage A_t , the token-level clipped surrogate is

$$\mathcal{L}_{ppo}(r_{ppo}, A) = -\min(r_{ppo}A, \text{clip}(r_{ppo}, 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)A). \quad (2)$$

Under recomputation and bypass, the PPO ratios are respectively defined as

$$r_{ppo}^{\text{train}} = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_t | s_t)}{\pi_{old}^{\text{train}}(a_t | s_t)}, \quad r_{ppo}^{\text{rollout}} = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_t | s_t)}{\pi_{old}^{\text{rollout}}(a_t | s_t)}. \quad (3)$$

Thus, recomputation and bypass instantiate the same clipped surrogate with different denominators:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{recomp}} = \mathcal{L}_{ppo}(r_{ppo}^{\text{train}}, A), \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{bypass}} = \mathcal{L}_{ppo}(r_{ppo}^{\text{rollout}}, A). \quad (4)$$

The sequence-level training loss is obtained by summing these token-level terms over the response and averaging over the sampled batch.

Figure 3 shows the main phenomenon: while *VeXact* keeps the training reward around 0.93, vLLM recomputation first degrades from about 0.87 to roughly 0.40 during the first 650 steps, partially recovers afterward, and then drops rapidly again after about step 1610 before collapsing to near-zero reward after about step 1665. vLLM bypass shows a single-stage degradation, with training reward dropping to roughly 0.4 but not collapsing to zero, and this degradation is not accompanied by comparably large loss spikes. Unlike the REINFORCE setting in § 3.2, where reward collapse is accompanied by clear loss and gradient-norm anomalies, the GRPO runs in Figure 3 show less synchronized behavior across these signals: bypass exhibits reward degradation without a comparably synchronized loss anomaly, while recomputation enters an early reward-degradation phase before the later gradient-norm spike becomes visible. This motivates a finer-grained analysis.

KL estimators are not sufficient indicators. Since TIM directly perturbs the effective distance between the updated policy π_{θ} and the old policy π_{old} , we first inspect KL estimators computed on the PPO ratio [Schulman, 2020], such as $K_1(r_{ppo}) = -\log r_{ppo}$ and $K_3(r_{ppo}) = (r_{ppo} - 1) - \log r_{ppo}$, where r_{ppo} can be instantiated as either r_{ppo}^{train} or r_{ppo}^{rollout} as defined in Eq. 3. In bypass mode, where the rollout and trainer probabilities become visibly inconsistent, these aggregate KL probes increase noticeably in both K_1 and K_3 . However, under recomputation mode, even over the first 700 training steps in which the run already exhibits the onset of failure, the KL estimators




Figure 4: KL estimators under recomputation and bypass. In recomputation mode, both K_1 and K_3 remain nearly flat during the first 700 steps, even though the reward is already entering the degradation phase. In bypass mode, both K_1 and K_3 increase noticeably. Under $VeXact$, $\pi_{old}^{train} = \pi_{old}^{rollout}$, so the two corresponding estimators coincide. With recomputation, $K_1(\pi_{\theta}, \pi_{old}^{train})$ is lower than $VeXact$ because K_1 estimator is signed and each token’s K_1 can cancel out when accumulating at the batch level.

remain close to the $VeXact$ baseline and fail to expose the emerging instability. This indicates that aggregate probability-space divergence is not sufficient to characterize the earliest stage of TIM-induced training failure.

Zero-centered loss contribution. We therefore shift the analysis from probability space to objective space. The optimizer does not directly consume probability discrepancies; it consumes advantage-weighted surrogate-loss contributions. We isolate this effect with the zero-centered loss contribution

$$C(r_{ppo}) = -(r_{ppo} - 1)A_t, \quad r_{ppo} \in \{r_{ppo}^{train}, r_{ppo}^{rollout}\}, \quad (5)$$

which has the same gradient as the standard $-r_{ppo}A_t$ objective but is zero when $r_{ppo} = 1$. Here r_{ppo}^{train} measures the ratio between the current model distribution and the trainer-side reference π_{train} , while $r_{ppo}^{rollout}$ measures the ratio between the current model distribution and the rollout-side behavioral distribution $\pi_{rollout}$. Under recomputation, $C(r_{ppo}^{train})$ is the contribution that actually drives the trainer update, because the optimizer uses the trainer-reconstructed denominator. By contrast, $C(r_{ppo}^{rollout})$ is the rollout-equivalent contribution of the same sampled token: it evaluates the update pressure relative to the behavioral distribution that generated the token. Under $VeXact$, the two references are numerically aligned, so $r_{ppo}^{train} = r_{ppo}^{rollout}$ and therefore $C(r_{ppo}^{train}) = C(r_{ppo}^{rollout})$. Figure 5 shows that recomputation does not merely add uniform noise to this contribution. The distortion is uneven across positive and negative-advantage samples: some harmful contributions are amplified, while offsetting contributions are not amplified symmetrically. This sign-imbalanced contribution distribution changes the effective optimization pressure before the mismatch becomes large enough to appear as a KL estimator spike. We hypothesize that the heavy-tailed numerical errors introduced by TIM interact asymmetrically with PPO’s clipping bounds. Because the surrogate objective reacts differently depending on the sign of A_t , symmetric numerical noise in δ_t is transformed into a skewed, non-zero-mean distortion of the gradient updates. This contribution-level distortion explains why the early degradation phase can remain nearly invisible to KL estimators. At this stage, the dominant failure mode is not a large global distributional shift, but a *skew in the advantage-weighted loss contributions* seen by the optimizer.

Why bypass also fails. In bypass mode, the PPO ratio correctly uses the behavior distribution in the denominator ($r_{ppo}^{rollout} = \pi_{\theta}^{train}/\pi_{old}^{rollout}$). However, the numerator π_{θ}^{train} is evaluated using the trainer’s numerical execution path. During the backward pass, the optimizer computes the score function gradient based on $\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{train}$. Because TIM creates a misaligned probability landscape between the trainer and the rollout engine, the optimizer exploits numerical artifacts in the trainer’s




Figure 5: Sign-imbalanced ratio contributions under recomputation. We plot the zero-centered ratio contribution $C(r) = -(r - 1)A$, which isolates the ratio-dependent component of the surrogate objective. This shows that recomputation induces a sign-dependent skew in the advantage-weighted update signal, rather than merely adding uniform noise.

forward pass. These weight updates fail to translate into actual behavioral improvements when θ is deployed back to the rollout engine, leading to silent policy degradation.

Takeaway. (1) In recomputation mode, the sampling log-probabilities used in loss computation are not from the actual samplers (rollout), resulting in a skew in the advantage-weighted loss contributions seen by the optimizer. (2) Even with bypass mode, the actual optimization target still exists in a different sampling space from the rollout, making policy update ineffective.

4.2 Ablating Algorithmic TIM Compensation

§ 4.1 shows that recomputation and bypass instantiate different ways of accounting for the old-policy probability, but neither removes TIM at the source. This motivates a natural question: can post-hoc algorithmic compensation recover the behavior of zero-mismatch rollout, or does it only suppress some observable symptoms? We answer this question using *VeXact* as a TIM-free reference. Our goal is to diagnose what existing TIM-aware correction scaffolds can approximate, which design choices matter, and where their limits remain.

Existing algorithmic corrections. Existing rollout-correction methods commonly suppress unreliable samples through token-level truncation or sequence-level rejection. Let $r_{\text{corr}} = \frac{\pi_{\text{old}}^{\text{train}}}{\pi_{\text{old}}^{\text{rollout}}}$ denote the correction ratio. They typically act either at the token level through truncated importance sampling,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{TIS}} = \sum_{t=1}^T \min(r_{\text{corr},t}, \tau_{\text{tok}}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}(r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{train}}, A_t), \quad (6)$$

or at the sequence level through rejection sampling,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{RS}} = \mathbf{1}[S_{\text{seq}}(q_{1:T}) \leq \tau_{\text{seq}}] \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}(r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{rollout}}, A_t). \quad (7)$$

Here, τ_{tok} is a token-level truncation threshold that limits large correction weights, and τ_{seq} is the sequence-level rejection threshold. $q_{1:T}$ denotes the sequence of token-level diagnostic signals used for rejection, $S_{\text{seq}}(\cdot)$ maps these signals to a scalar trajectory-level trust-region score.

Our diagnostic instantiation. We therefore use these post-hoc corrections as diagnostic probes rather than as new algorithmic proposals. § 4.1 shows that TIM can enter PPO/GRPO both through trainer–rollout old-policy displacement and through skewed token-level loss contributions. These observations motivate a controlled diagnostic ablation along two axes: the ratio used to drive sequence-level rejection, and the effect of adding token-level truncation before sequence-level rejection.

For the masking signal, we compare $q_t \in \{r_{\text{corr},t}, r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{rollout}}\}$. Here, $r_{\text{corr},t}$ measures system-induced mismatch between $\pi_{\text{old}}^{\text{train}}$ and $\pi_{\text{old}}^{\text{rollout}}$, whereas $r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{rollout}}$ measures policy movement from the rollout behavior policy to the current policy. For both choices, q_t is used only as the masking signal, rather than necessarily as the PPO ratio inside the surrogate objective. At the granularity level, we apply sequence-level rejection to both signals by aggregating token-wise mismatch into $S_{\text{seq}}(q_{1:T}) = \sum_{t=1}^T K(q_t)$, with $K(\cdot)$ instantiated as K_1 or K_3 , and rejecting trajectories whose accumulated




Figure 6: Algorithmic-patch comparison. We evaluate four correction baselines: `srs-k3-corr-ratio` and `srs-k3-ppo-ratio` apply sequence-level rejection using r_{corr} and r_{ppo} , respectively, while `tis-srs-k1-corr-ratio` and `tis-srs-k3-corr-ratio` combine truncated importance sampling with r_{corr} -based sequence rejection instantiated with K1 and K3, respectively. We provide the expanded objectives in Appendix A.4. For sequence rejection, r_{corr} is more effective than r_{ppo} . Additionally with TIS, r_{corr} -based sequence rejection can track *VeXact* closely. For better visual clarity, curves are smoothed by center mean with window size of 25.

mismatch exceeds a threshold. We evaluate a joint token- and sequence-level variant, which first filters localized token-level outliers and then applies the sequence-level rejection criterion.

Together, these choices yield three diagnostic configurations: sequence-level rejection based on either r_{corr} or $r_{\text{ppo}}^{\text{rollout}}$, and joint token-level clipping plus sequence-level rejection based on r_{corr} , with the sequence-level score instantiated by either K1 or K3. We provide the expanded objectives in Appendix A.4.

Experiment results. As Figure 6 shows, comparing the sequence-level variants, using r_t^{corr} as the filtering signal yields higher reward than using $r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{rollout}}$. We attribute this difference to the distinct semantics of the two ratios: The correction ratio clipping guarantees that the *base distribution* ($\pi_{\text{old}}^{\text{train}}$) to update is not too far from the sampling space. In contrast, the rollout ratio overlaps with PPO’s policy-ratio mechanism, whose purpose is to control the update magnitude of how far the current policy moves away from the behavior policy, but not the starting distribution location.

The same ablation also shows that the configuration *combining token-level filtering with sequence-level rejection* most closely tracks the *VeXact* reference, indicating that TIM manifests at multiple granularities. Localized token-level mismatch outliers can distort individual PPO contributions even when the aggregate sequence-level score remains moderate, while some trajectories exhibit large accumulated mismatch and should be rejected at the sequence level. The choice between K1 and K3 for the sequence rejection has a comparatively minor effect in our experiments.

These results suggest that algorithmic correction can closely approach the zero-mismatch reference in the evaluated setting. However, these forms of algorithmic TIM compensation remains post-hoc: unlike *VeXact*, it can only suppress already-generated samples and may also discard useful learning signals. More importantly, without *VeXact* as a ground-truth reference, patch configuration (e.g., τ_{seq} , τ_{tok}) remains largely ad hoc. *VeXact* therefore complements algorithmic patches by enabling their principled calibration.

Takeaway. (1) r_{corr} -based sequence-level rejection sampling is more effective than r_{ppo} -based. The threshold metric choice of K1 or K3 does not affect much. (2) TIS is effective as it fixes the PPO ratio used in loss function from $r_{\text{ppo}}^{\text{train}}$ to $r_{\text{ppo}}^{\text{rollout}}$ by multiplying $r_{\text{ppo}}^{\text{train}}$ with r_{corr} , consistent with

our conclusion from § 4.1. (3) Combining (1) and (2), we find that carefully designed algorithmic configurations can closely track our zero-mismatch reference *VeXact*.

5 Related Works

RL stabilization techniques. Existing stabilization techniques for PPO/GRPO-style training fall into three categories. *Fine-grained clipping regions* such as DAPO [Yu et al., 2025] apply a non-symmetric clipping region for tokens with positive and negative advantages. GSPO [Zheng et al., 2025b] moves to sequence-level importance ratios to reduce variance accumulation over long responses; *TIM-aware corrections* explicitly target the training–inference numerical mismatch: Truncated IS (TIS) [Yao et al., 2025] truncates extreme token-level IS weights, and Masked IS [Zheng et al., 2025a, Li et al., 2026] zeros out gradients for the most divergent tokens from token and sequence-level. Additionally, [Qi et al., 2025] and [Dirhoussi et al., 2026] find that using FP16 instead of BF16 is helpful in RL training stability. *MoE-specific corrections* address the additional instability from dynamic expert routing. For example, R3 [Ma et al., 2025] directly replays inference-time routing decisions during training mini-steps to eliminate divergent expert selections.

Efficient batch-invariant kernels. To address the performance penalty of fixing tiling and reduction order in batch invariant kernels, DeepSeek-V4 [DeepSeek-AI, 2026] introduces dual-kernel strategies for the attention kernel and a set of optimizations for GEMM kernels. Tree-based invariant kernels (TBIK) [Zhang et al., 2025] resolve the accumulation order mismatch across tensor-parallel orders by using a tree-based reduction order, enabling zero mismatch rollout under TP inference. They prove that batch-invariant kernels can be highly performant and scalable for large-scale RL. Our work focuses more on the analysis of TIM’s role in RL training collapse with *VeXact* baseline.

6 Discussion and Limitations

Implications for asynchronous LLM RL. Large-scale asynchronous LLM RL like agentic tasks are off-policy by design to speed up the training. However, we believe addressing TIM is still necessary for them since TIM fundamentally creates different probability landscapes for optimization and sampling spaces as we discussed. DeepSeek-V4 also reports that the use of batch-invariant kernels ensures the exact behavior of log-probabilities across training, inference, and async RL pipelines. In addition, unlike algorithmic corrections that mask or discard high-mismatch tokens or sequences, zero-mismatch RL preserves the full learning signal. This suggests that eliminating TIM at the system level may enable more robust and sample-efficient learning across both synchronous and asynchronous RL settings.

***VeXact* as a system-algorithm calibration tool.** In real-world developments, *VeXact* can act as a useful calibration tool, which allows researchers to scientifically benchmark algorithmic patches and accurately tune sensitive filtering thresholds in a noise-free environment before deploying algorithmic mitigations to large-scale RL pipelines.

Limitations. Our experiments show that several algorithmic corrections can reduce the impact of TIM and, in some settings, closely track the zero-mismatch baseline. However, our evaluation is limited in scale and coverage: we study a representative set of stabilization and correction techniques under a finite set of models, tasks, and system configurations. It remains unclear whether these mitigations generalize across broader RL settings, or whether they introduce additional optimization side effects that are not visible in our current experiments. This limitation reaffirms a joint systems-and-algorithms perspective on RL stability.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we investigate Training-Inference Mismatch (TIM) as a systems-level confounder in LLM RL stability. With our zero-mismatch diagnostic baseline *VeXact*, we demonstrate that TIM alone can destabilize RL training under a wide range of setups. We further analyze how TIM alters the effective optimization problem, explaining why common implementation choices such as trainer-side recomputation and rollout-side bypass fail to fully eliminate its impact. Finally, we find that existing algorithmic corrections can closely approach the zero-mismatch reference, but require careful design and calibration. Overall, our findings call for a joint system-algorithm perspective on RL stability and highlight the need for zero-mismatch RL execution.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Haolin Liu (University of Virginia), Yuxuan Tong, Xibin Wu and Xia Xiao for their valuable suggestions and insightful discussions.

References

- Amey Agrawal, Ashish Panwar, Jayashree Mohan, Nipun Kwatra, Bhargav S. Gulavani, and Ramachandran Ramjee. Sarathi: Efficient llm inference by piggybacking decodes with chunked prefills, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.16369>.
- Shiyi Cao, Sumanth Hegde, Dacheng Li, Tyler Griggs, Shu Liu, Eric Tang, Jiayi Pan, Xingyao Wang, Akshay Malik, Graham Neubig, Kourosh Hakhmaneshi, Richard Liaw, Philipp Moritz, Matei Zaharia, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Skyrl-v0: Train real-world long-horizon agents via reinforcement learning, 2025.
- Tri Dao, Daniel Y. Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. Flashattention: fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '22*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2022. Curran Associates Inc. ISBN 9781713871088.
- Tri Dao, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, and Grigory Sizov. Flash-decoding for long-context inference, 2023. URL <https://crfm.stanford.edu/2023/10/12/flashdecoding.html>. Blog post.
- DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek-v4: Towards highly efficient million-token context intelligence, 2026.
- Amine Dirhoussi, Quentin Gallouédec, Edward Beeching, Lewis Tunstall, Kashif Rasul, and Leandro von Werra. Defeating the trainer-generator precision mismatch in trl, 2026.
- Jiayi Fu, Xuandong Zhao, Chengyuan Yao, Heng Wang, Qi Han, and Yanghua Xiao. Reward shaping to mitigate reward hacking in rlhf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18770*, 2025a.
- Wei Fu, Jiaxuan Gao, Xujie Shen, Chen Zhu, Zhiyu Mei, Chuyi He, Shusheng Xu, Guo Wei, Jun Mei, Jiashu Wang, et al. Areal: A large-scale asynchronous reinforcement learning system for language reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24298*, 2025b.
- GeeekExplorer. nano-vllm: Nano vllm. <https://github.com/GeeekExplorer/nano-vllm>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-09.
- Horace He. Defeating nondeterminism in llm inference. *Thinking Machines Lab: Connectionism*, 2025. doi: 10.64434/tml.20250910. <https://thinkingmachines.ai/blog/defeating-nondeterminism-in-llm-inference/>.
- Jian Hu, Xibin Wu, Zilin Zhu, Weixun Wang, Dehao Zhang, Yu Cao, et al. Openrlhf: An easy-to-use, scalable and high-performance rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11143*, 6, 2024.
- Jian Hu, Jason Klein Liu, Haotian Xu, and Wei Shen. Reinforce++: Stabilizing critic-free policy optimization with global advantage normalization, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.03262>.
- Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Mia Xu Chen, Dehao Chen, HyounJoong Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V. Le, Yonghui Wu, and Zhifeng Chen. Gpipe: Efficient training of giant neural networks using pipeline parallelism, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.06965>.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.06180>.
- Yingru Li, Jiakai Liu, Jiawei Xu, Yuxuan Tong, Ziniu Li, Qian Liu, and Baoxiang Wang. Trust region masking for long-horizon llm reinforcement learning, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.23075>.

- Jiacai Liu, Yingru Li, Yuqian Fu, Jiawei Wang, Qian Liu, and Yu Shen. When speed kills stability: Demystifying RL collapse from the training-inference mismatch, sep 2025a. URL <https://richardli.xyz/rl-collapse>.
- Zichen Liu, Changyu Chen, Wenjun Li, Penghui Qi, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Wee Sun Lee, and Min Lin. Understanding rl-zero-like training: A critical perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20783*, 2025b.
- Wenxuan Ma, Hangyu Zhang, Lei Zhao, Yuhao Song, Yue Wang, Zhifeng Sui, and Fuwen Luo. Stabilizing MoE reinforcement learning by aligning training and inference routers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.11370*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.11370>.
- Mathematical Association of America. AIME 2024: American Invitational Mathematics Examination, 2024. URL https://artofproblemsolving.com/wiki/index.php/2024_AIME_I.
- MiniMax, :, Aili Chen, Aonian Li, Bangwei Gong, Binyang Jiang, Bo Fei, Bo Yang, Boji Shan, Changqing Yu, Chao Wang, Cheng Zhu, Chengjun Xiao, Chengyu Du, Chi Zhang, Chu Qiao, Chunhao Zhang, Chunhui Du, Congchao Guo, Da Chen, Deming Ding, Dianjun Sun, Dong Li, Enwei Jiao, Haigang Zhou, Haimo Zhang, Han Ding, Haohai Sun, Haoyu Feng, Huaiguang Cai, Haichao Zhu, Jian Sun, Jiaqi Zhuang, Jiaren Cai, Jiayuan Song, Jin Zhu, Jingyang Li, Jinhao Tian, Jinli Liu, Junhao Xu, Junjie Yan, Junteng Liu, Junxian He, Kaiyi Feng, Ke Yang, Kecheng Xiao, Le Han, Leyang Wang, Lianfei Yu, Liheng Feng, Lin Li, Lin Zheng, Linge Du, Lingyu Yang, Lunbin Zeng, Minghui Yu, Mingliang Tao, Mingyuan Chi, Mozhi Zhang, Mujie Lin, Nan Hu, Nongyu Di, Peng Gao, Pengfei Li, Pengyu Zhao, Qibing Ren, Qidi Xu, Qile Li, Qin Wang, Rong Tian, Ruitao Leng, Shaoxiang Chen, Shaoyu Chen, Shengmin Shi, Shitong Weng, Shuchang Guan, Shuqi Yu, Sichen Li, Songquan Zhu, Tengfei Li, Tianchi Cai, Tianrun Liang, Weiyu Cheng, Weize Kong, Wenkai Li, Xiancai Chen, Xiangjun Song, Xiao Luo, Xiao Su, Xiaobo Li, Xiaodong Han, Xinzhu Hou, Xuan Lu, Xun Zou, Xuyang Shen, Yan Gong, Yan Ma, Yang Wang, Yiqi Shi, Yiran Zhong, Yonghong Duan, Yongxiang Fu, Yongyi Hu, Yu Gao, Yuanxiang Fan, Yufeng Yang, Yuhao Li, Yulin Hu, Yunan Huang, Yunji Li, Yunzhi Xu, Yuxin Mao, Yuxuan Shi, Yuze Wenren, Zehan Li, Zelin Li, Zhanxu Tian, Zhengmao Zhu, Zhenhua Fan, Zhenzhen Wu, Zhichao Xu, Zhihang Yu, Zhiheng Lyu, Zhuo Jiang, Zibo Gao, Zijia Wu, Zijian Song, and Zijun Sun. Minimax-ml: Scaling test-time compute efficiently with lightning attention, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.13585>.
- NVIDIA Corporation. *CUDA Programming Guide: CUDA Graphs*, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-09.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, 2022.
- Alexander Pan, Erik Jones, Meena Jagadeesan, and Jacob Steinhardt. Feedback loops with language models drive in-context reward hacking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06627*, 2024.
- Penghui Qi, Zichen Liu, Xinyu Zhou, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Wee Sun Lee, and Min Lin. Defeating the training-inference mismatch via FP16. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26788*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.26788>.
- Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.02054>.
- Ring AI Team. Learning for trillion-scale thinking model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18855*, 2025.
- John Schulman. Approximating kl divergence. <http://joschu.net/blog/kl-approx.html>, 2020.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347>.

- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y.K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03300>.
- Guangming Sheng, Yuxuan Tong, Borui Wan, Wang Zhang, Chaobo Jia, Xibin Wu, Yuqi Wu, Xiang Li, Chi Zhang, Yanghua Peng, et al. Laminar: A scalable asynchronous rl post-training framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.12633*, 2025a.
- 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 '25*, page 1279–1297. ACM, March 2025b. doi: 10.1145/3689031.3696075. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3689031.3696075>.
- Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.08053>.
- Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. Learning to summarize with human feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, 2020.
- Ling Team, Anqi Shen, Baihui Li, Bin Hu, Bin Jing, Cai Chen, Chao Huang, Chao Zhang, Chaokun Yang, Cheng Lin, Chengyao Wen, Congqi Li, Deng Zhao, Dingbo Yuan, Donghai You, Fagui Mao, Fanzhuang Meng, Feng Xu, Guojie Li, Guowei Wang, Hao Dai, Haonan Zheng, Hong Liu, Jia Guo, Jiaming Liu, Jian Liu, Jianhao Fu, Jiannan Shi, Jianwen Wang, Jianxin Lai, Jin Yang, Jun Mei, Jun Zhou, Junbo Zhao, Junping Zhao, Kuan Xu, Le Su, Lei Chen, Li Tang, Liang Jiang, Liangcheng Fu, Lianhao Xu, Linfeng Shi, Lisha Liao, Longfei Zheng, Meng Li, Mingchun Chen, Qi Zuo, Qiang Cheng, Qianggang Cao, Qitao Shi, Quanrui Guo, Senlin Zhu, Shaofei Wang, Shaomian Zheng, Shuaicheng Li, Shuwei Gu, Siba Chen, Tao Wu, Tao Zhang, Tianyu Zhang, Tianyu Zhou, Tiwei Bie, Tongkai Yang, Wang Hong, Wang Ren, Weihua Chen, Wenbo Yu, Wengang Zheng, Xiangchun Wang, Xiaodong Yan, Xiaopei Wan, Xin Zhao, Xinyu Kong, Xinyu Tang, Xudong Han, Xudong Wang, Xuemin Yang, Xueyu Hu, Yalin Zhang, Yan Sun, Yicheng Shan, Yilong Wang, Yingying Xu, Yongkang Liu, Yongzhen Guo, Yuanyuan Wang, Yuchen Yan, Yuefan Wang, Yuhong Guo, Zehuan Li, Zhankai Xu, Zhe Li, Zhenduo Zhang, Zhengke Gui, Zhenxuan Pan, Zhenyu Huang, Zhenzhong Lan, Zhiqiang Ding, Zhiqiang Zhang, Zhixun Li, Zhizhen Liu, Zihao Wang, and Zujie Wen. Every step evolves: Scaling reinforcement learning for trillion-scale thinking model, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.18855>.
- RadixArk Team. Introducing miles: RL framework to fire up large-scale moe training. <https://lmsys.org/blog/2025-11-19-miles/>, 2025.
- Ronald J. Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning*, 8:229–256, 1992. doi: 10.1007/BF00992696.
- An Yang et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388>.
- Feng Yao, Liyuan Liu, Dinghuai Zhang, Chengyu Dong, Jingbo Shang, and Jianfeng Gao. On the rollout-training mismatch in modern RL systems. In *NeurIPS 2025 Workshop on Efficient Reasoning*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=8MHqvb41K9>.
- 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. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.14476>.
- Biao Zhang and Rico Sennrich. Root mean square layer normalization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 12360–12371, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07467>.

- Ziyang Zhang, Xinheng Ding, Jiayi Yuan, Rixin Liu, Huizi Mao, Jiarong Xing, and Zirui Liu. Deterministic inference across tensor parallel sizes that eliminates training-inference mismatch, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.17826>.
- Yanli Zhao, Andrew Gu, Rohan Varma, Liang Luo, Chien-Chin Huang, Min Xu, Less Wright, Hamid Shojanazeri, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, Alban Desmaison, Can Balioglu, Pritam Damania, Bernard Nguyen, Geeta Chauhan, Yuchen Hao, Ajit Mathews, and Shen Li. Pytorch fsdp: Experiences on scaling fully sharded data parallel, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.11277>.
- Chujie Zheng, Kai Dang, Bowen Yu, Mingze Li, Huiqiang Jiang, Junrong Lin, Yuqiong Liu, An Yang, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. Stabilizing reinforcement learning with llms: Formulation and practices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.01374*, 2025a.
- Chujie Zheng, Shixuan Liu, Mingze Li, Xiong-Hui Chen, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Kai Dang, Yuqiong Liu, Rui Men, An Yang, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. Group sequence policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.18071*, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.18071>.
- Lianmin Zheng, Liangsheng Yin, Zhiqiang Xie, Chuyue Sun, Jeff Huang, Cody Hao Yu, Shiyi Cao, Christos Kozyrakis, Ion Stoica, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Clark Barrett, and Ying Sheng. Sglang: Efficient execution of structured language model programs, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.07104>.
- Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*, 2019.

A Additional Details

A.1 Experimental Settings

Setting	Dense GRPO	Dense REINFORCE	MoE REINFORCE
Model	Qwen3-1.7B	Qwen3-1.7B	Qwen3-30B-A3B
RL algorithm	GRPO	REINFORCE	REINFORCE
Training data	Sanity-Test-R1D-1.5B	Sanity-Test-R1D-1.5B	DAPO-Math-17k
Evaluation	AIME 2024 every 50 steps	AIME 2024 every 50 steps	AIME 2024 every 20 steps
Batching	Global batch 64, mini-batch 16, rollout group 8	Global batch 64	Global batch 512
Sequence length	Prompt 1024, response 8192	Prompt 1024, response 8192	Prompt 2048, response 20480
Hardware	1 node, 8 GPUs (H100)	2 nodes, 16 GPUs (H100)	8 nodes, 64 GPUs (H100)
Engine	FSDP2 + vLLM/VeXact	FSDP2 + vLLM/VeXact	FSDP2 + vLLM/VeXact

Table 2: Experimental settings corresponding to the dense GRPO, dense REINFORCE, and MoE REINFORCE recipes.

A.2 Additional REINFORCE Results




Figure 7: Additional metrics of REINFORCE experiments comparing vLLM non-exact rollout with VeXact. Each row reports δ_t (max), and sequence loss. Top row: Qwen3-30B-A3B MoE. Bottom row: Qwen3-1.7B dense.

A.3 Additional DAPO Results




Figure 8: Qwen3-1.7B GRPO experiments on the DAPO dataset, with *VeXact* and vLLM recomputation and bypass, where *VeXact* can maintain the training stability better.

A.4 Expanded Objectives for Post-hoc Patch Variants in Section 4.2

Let $r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{rollout}}$ be the rollout-side PPO ratio defined in Eq. 3, and let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}$ denote the token-level clipped surrogate.

srs-k3-corr-ratio. Sequence-level rejection using the correction ratio r_{corr} as the filtering signal:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{srs-k3-corr}} = 1 \left[\sum_{t=1}^T K3(r_{\text{corr},1:T}) \leq \tau_{\text{seq}} \right] \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}(r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{rollout}}, A_t). \quad (8)$$

srs-k3-ppo-ratio. Sequence-level rejection using the rollout-side PPO ratio $r_{\text{ppo}}^{\text{rollout}}$ as the filtering signal:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{srs-k3-ppo}} = 1 \left[\sum_{t=1}^T K3(r_{\text{ppo},1:T}^{\text{rollout}}) \leq \tau_{\text{seq}} \right] \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}(r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{rollout}}, A_t). \quad (9)$$

tis-srs-k3-corr-ratio. Token-level truncation followed by sequence-level rejection, using the correction ratio r_{corr} as the filtering signal:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{tis-srs-k3-corr}} = 1 \left[\sum_{t=1}^T K3(r_{\text{corr},1:T}) \leq \tau_{\text{seq}} \right] \sum_{t=1}^T \min(r_{\text{corr},t}, \tau_{\text{tok}}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}(r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{train}}, A_t). \quad (10)$$

tis-srs-k1-corr-ratio. Token-level truncation followed by sequence-level rejection, using the correction ratio r_{corr} as the filtering signal:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{tis-srs-k1-corr}} = 1 \left[\sum_{t=1}^T K1(r_{\text{corr},1:T}) \leq \tau_{\text{seq}} \right] \sum_{t=1}^T \min(r_{\text{corr},t}, \tau_{\text{tok}}) \mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}(r_{\text{ppo},t}^{\text{train}}, A_t). \quad (11)$$

In our implementation, we set $\tau_{\text{tok}} = 2$ and $\tau_{\text{seq}} = 0.001$.