

Self-Improving AI Agents through Self-Play

Przemyslaw Chojewski
ulam.ai

December 2, 2025

Abstract

We extend the moduli-theoretic framework of psychometric batteries [2] to the domain of dynamical systems. While previous work established the AAI capability score as a static functional $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ on the space of agent representations $\mathcal{P}(X_{\mathcal{B}})$, this paper formalizes the agent as a flow ν_r parameterized by computational resource r , governed by a recursive **Generator-Verifier-Updater (GVU)** operator. We prove that this operator generates a vector field on the parameter manifold Θ , and we identify the coefficient of self-improvement κ as the Lie derivative of the capability functional along this flow.

The central contribution of this work is the derivation of the **Variance Inequality**, a spectral condition that is sufficient (under mild regularity) for the stability of self-improvement. We show that a sufficient condition for $\kappa > 0$ is that, up to curvature and step-size effects, the combined noise of generation and verification must be small enough.

We then apply this formalism to unify the recent literature on Language Self-Play (LSP), Self-Correction, and Synthetic Data bootstrapping. We demonstrate that architectures such as STaR [4], SPIN [5], Reflexion [8], GANs and AlphaZero are not merely heuristics but specific topological realizations of the GVU operator that satisfy the Variance Inequality through filtration, adversarial discrimination, or grounding in formal systems.

1 Introduction

The central problem in Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) is not the achievement of a specific benchmark score, but the achievement of *ignition*: the point at which an agent can autonomously convert computational resources into capability gains without human intervention. In the framework of [2], we defined the capability of an agent \mathcal{A} on a battery \mathcal{B} as a functional value $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{A}))$. However, for current Large Language Models (LLMs), this value is static once pre-training concludes. As noted in [12], the trajectory of self-improvement for standard LLMs is flat ($\kappa \approx 0$) or decaying due to hallucination drift.

By contrast, systems like AlphaGo Zero [3] exhibited $\kappa \gg 0$, reaching superhuman capability solely through self-play. The disparity lies in the nature of the *verification signal*. Go provides a noiseless, ground-truth verifier (the game rules). Open-ended domains do not.

To bridge this gap, recent literature has proposed various mechanisms for "self-correction" and "self-play" in language models. These include iterative reasoning bootstrapping (STaR [4]), zero-sum language games (SPIN [5], LSP [6]), and verbal reinforcement learning (Reflexion [8]), but also GANs and AlphaZero.

This paper unifies these approaches under a single rigorous mathematical framework. We define the **GVU Operator** as the canonical engine of self-improvement. We show that the success or failure of any self-improving agent is determined by the spectral properties of this operator acting on the tangent bundle of the moduli space. Specifically, we derive a "Second Law of AGI Dynamics":

Entropy (hallucination) tends to increase unless the combined signal from generation and verification is strong enough, relative to their noise and to curvature, to keep the expected capability gain positive. In practice, many architectures satisfy this by making verification spectrally “easier” than generation (e.g., via oracles, ensembles, or external structure).

Central message for practitioners is: The Variance Inequality tells you exactly why your RL training plateaus and what to do about it - strengthen the verifier, not the generator. Check out ?? for relation of our framework to current LLM training pipelines.

Contributions

This paper makes the following contributions:

- **From static scores to dynamical flows.** We extend the moduli-theoretic framework of psychometric batteries [2] from static capability scores to dynamical trajectories. An agent is modeled as a flow $(\nu_r)_{r \geq 0}$ on a statistical parameter manifold Θ , and the self-improvement coefficient $\kappa(r)$ is identified with the Lie derivative of the capability functional $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$ along this flow. This yields an operational notion of *ignition* as sustained $\kappa > 0$ across capability fibers.
- **The Gvu operator and a universality theorem.** We formalize the *Generator–Verifier–Updater* (GVU) operator $\mathcal{T}_{\text{GVU}} = \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{V} \circ \mathcal{G}$ as the canonical engine of self-improvement, and prove a score-based Gvu representation theorem: on a regular statistical manifold, any first-order, sample-based update vector field can be written in REINFORCE form

$$v(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mu \otimes \pi_{\theta}} [V_{\theta}(x, y) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(y \mid x)]$$

for some scalar potential V_{θ} . Thus any rational, data-driven self-update implicitly instantiates a Gvu with an internal Verifier potential. A non-trivial verifier is shown to be *necessary* for non-zero expected κ .

- **The Variance Inequality and the Hallucination Barrier.** We derive the *Variance Inequality*, a sufficient spectral condition for expected capability gain $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] > 0$. It quantitatively relates alignment ρ between the internal potential and the external score, generation and verification variances $(\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2, \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2)$, curvature L , and step size η . A corollary identifies the *Hallucination Barrier*: in diagonal regimes where $\mathcal{V} \approx \mathcal{G}$, verification noise matches generation noise and self-correction typically fails to produce sustained $\kappa > 0$.
- **Geometric and spectral design levers.** Working on the Fisher-information statistical manifold (Θ, g) , we interpret the Gvu drift as a noisy vector field whose usefulness is governed by the Fisher angle between the mean update and the true gradient of F . We analyze generic design levers that improve κ —ensemble verifiers, group-based normalization (GRPO-style schemes), oracle-like executors (code, games, proofs), and “cold” verifier interfaces in diagonal Gvu—and quantify how they increase $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ and widen the stable stepsize window. We also introduce a Goodhart-type limit on long-run κ via decay of the alignment coefficient ρ under proxy optimization.
- **Topological realizations and an empirical $\hat{\kappa}$ protocol.** We show that a wide range of existing self-improvement methods—AlphaZero, GANs, STaR, SPIN/LSP, PRMs, RAG self-training, self-debugging code agents, RLHF, Constitutional AI, Self-Instruct, and GRPO—are concrete topological realizations of the Gvu operator on different fibers (Sociality, Planning, Embodiment, Recursive, Alignment, Synthetic, Critic-less) of the moduli space. Finally, we propose a finite-difference evaluation protocol for estimating an empirical self-improvement rate $\hat{\kappa}$ from before/after battery scores under a fixed compute budget.

Relation to Reinforcement Learning. Classical reinforcement learning (RL) provides a formal model for agents that optimize a reward signal in a Markov decision process. Our framework recovers this setting as a special case but is designed to encompass a much broader class of self-improving systems, including LLM-based agents trained purely with supervised or synthetic data rather than explicit RL. In standard RL, an environment and reward function define a single objective $J(\pi_\theta)$, and updates are derived from estimates of the policy gradient $\nabla_\theta J(\pi_\theta)$. In our setting, the *battery* \mathcal{B} and capability functional $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ play the role of a generalized evaluation layer, inducing a scalar capability $F(\theta) = (\Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}})(\theta)$ that can aggregate performance across heterogeneous tasks and modalities. The Generator–Verifier–Updater (GVU) operator then subsumes actor–critic and self-play schemes as special cases: the generator corresponds to sampling trajectories, the verifier to any internal scoring mechanism (reward model, contrastive critic, oracle, or verbal judge), and the updater to a first-order policy update, possibly implemented via supervised fine-tuning rather than explicit RL. Equipping the parameter manifold Θ with the Fisher information metric turns it into a statistical manifold, allowing us to express these updates as natural-gradient flows and to derive the Variance Inequality, a spectral condition under which *any* such GVU loop—RL-based or not—yields positive expected capability gain. In this way, the theory applies uniformly to conventional RL agents, RLHF/RLAIF pipelines, and purely SFT-trained LLM agents that self-improve via self-correction, synthetic data, or tool use, providing a single geometric lens on their learning dynamics.

Relation to Geometric Deep Learning. Our framework is closely related in spirit to Geometric Deep Learning, which studies neural architectures constrained by underlying geometric structure (groups, graphs, manifolds). Rather than imposing geometry on the input domain, we equip the *space of policies and their learning dynamics* with a statistical and moduli geometry: the parameter manifold (Θ, G) with Fisher metric, and the moduli space \mathfrak{M} of batteries stratified into capability fibers. The GVU operator then defines a noisy vector field on (Θ, G) , and the Variance Inequality constrains which such fields can yield positive drift of the capability functional $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$. In this sense, our results can be viewed as a form of “geometric deep learning of self-improving agents”: on each fiber (Sociality, Planning, Embodiment, Alignment), different GVU topologies (adversarial self-play, filtration, execution oracles, ensemble judges, GRPO) play the role of geometric inductive biases that make the self-improvement dynamics spectrally stable.

Beyond LLMs and RL. Although many of our examples are phrased in terms of language models and RL fine-tuning, the framework is not limited to them. The only ingredients we require are (i) a parametric generator of behaviour—a map Π_Θ from internal state $\theta \in \Theta$ to a stochastic policy π_θ over outputs, (ii) some form of scoring or evaluation, internal or external, and (iii) an update rule that uses these scores to change θ . This pattern occurs across a wide range of systems that are not usually described as RL: evolutionary and black-box optimizers (where θ parameterizes a search distribution and the Verifier is a fitness function), deep-guided theorem provers and SAT solvers (where proof checkers play the role of high-SNR verifiers), AutoML and architecture search (where θ controls a proposal policy over models and hyperparameters), and semi-supervised or self-training pipelines in vision and speech. In all of these cases the Generator–Verifier–Updater (GVU) operator provides a canonical decomposition of the self-improvement loop, and the capability functional $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$ allows us to evaluate progress on batteries of heterogeneous tasks rather than a single reward function. The Variance Inequality then applies unchanged: it constrains when noisy, sample-based updates in these non-RL settings can be expected to yield positive drift in capability, even when there is no explicit MDP or reward signal.

2 Preliminaries: The Geometric Setting

We distinguish between the *External Geometry* (the Battery and Moduli Space defined in [2]) and the *Internal Topology* (the Agent’s parameters and architecture). The self-improvement process is a mapping from the latter to the former.

2.1 Semantic Foundations

Let Σ be a finite alphabet of tokens (e.g., the UTF-8 set or a BPE vocabulary). Let Σ^* denote the Kleene closure of Σ , the set of all finite sequences (strings) over Σ . We equip Σ^* with the discrete topology. The domains Ω_t of tasks are subsets of Σ^* .

2.2 The External Geometry: Batteries

We utilize the exact definition of the battery from [2].

Definition 2.1 (Battery). A *battery* is an octuple

$$\mathcal{B} = (T, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{S}, Q^*, \mu, \mathbf{D}, \Pi, \mathbf{R}),$$

where:

- T is a finite set of tasks; $\mathcal{F} = \{F_k\}$ is a partition of T into families.
- $\mathbf{S} = \{S_t : \Omega_t \rightarrow [0, 1]\}_{t \in T}$ are task-specific scoring maps, where $\Omega_t \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is the domain of valid solution traces for task t .
- $Q^* : T \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are task thresholds.
- μ is a sampling law on $T \times \Pi \times \mathbf{D}$ (tasks, seeds, drifts).
- \mathbf{D} (drifts) and Π (seeds) are measurable spaces.
- $\mathbf{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^{d_R}$ are resource coordinates (e.g., time, tokens, cost), recorded nonnegatively.

Definition 2.2 (Trace and Observables). Given an agent \mathcal{A} and budgetary constraints from \mathbf{R} , an evaluation draws i.i.d. samples $(t_i, s_i, \delta_i) \sim \mu$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and produces *traces*

$$\omega_i = \text{Run}(\mathcal{A}; t_i, s_i, \delta_i, \mathbf{R}).$$

From each trace ω_i , we derive per-task observables:

- **Quality:** $q(t_i) = S_{t_i}(\omega_i) \in [0, 1]$.
- **Strict Success:** $z(t_i) = \mathbb{I}\{q(t_i) \geq Q^*(t_i)\}$.
- **Uninterrupted Action Count:** $a(t_i) \in \mathbb{N}$.
- **Plan Depth:** $d(t_i) \in \mathbb{N}$ (length of the longest executed path of prerequisite actions).
- **Incurred Cost:** $c(t_i) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (derived from the resource component r of y).

Axis-specific raw statistics $r_x = r_x(\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ are computed by fixed functionals and normalized by calibration maps ϕ_x to yield axis scores $x \in [0, 1]$.

From the battery, we derive the explicit interaction spaces:

Definition 2.3 (Input and Output Spaces). 1. The **Input Space** \mathcal{X} is the disjoint union of task-specific prompt domains $P_t \subseteq \Sigma^*$. We identify it with the set of labeled prompts:

$$\mathcal{X} := \bigsqcup_{t \in T} P_t \cong \bigcup_{t \in T} (P_t \times \{t\}) \subseteq \Sigma^* \times T.$$

An element $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is a pair $x = (s, t)$, where $s \in P_t$ is the input prompt and t is the task identifier.

2. The **Output Space** \mathcal{Y} is the product of the semantic trace space and the non-negative resource cone:

$$\mathcal{Y} := \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{d_R}.$$

An element $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is a pair $y = (\omega, r)$, where $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ is the generated trace (see Definition 2.2) and r is the vector of resources consumed to produce it.

2.3 The Internal Topology: Parameter Manifold

Dynamics require a coordinate system. We define the agent’s state space to encompass both its static weights (long-term memory) and its dynamic context (working memory).

Definition 2.4 (Parameter Manifold Θ). Let $W \cong \mathbb{R}^d$ be the space of trainable weights (e.g., Transformer parameters). Let E be the embedding dimension and L the context window size. Let $\mathcal{H} \subset \bigcup_{k=0}^L \mathbb{R}^{k \times E}$ be the space of context states (e.g., the KV-cache or prompt buffer). The *Parameter Manifold* is the product space:

$$\Theta := W \times \mathcal{H}.$$

We equip Θ with a Riemannian metric g (typically the Fisher Information Metric), allowing the definition of gradients ∇_θ . A state $\theta = (w, h) \in \Theta$ completely specifies the agent at an instant r .

Remark 2.5 (Statistical manifold). When the Riemannian metric g on Θ is chosen to be the Fisher information metric induced by the policy family $\{\pi_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$, we will refer to (Θ, g) as a *statistical manifold* in the sense of information geometry.

2.4 The Architecture Map

The link between the internal state θ and the external behavior is the architecture.

Definition 2.6 (Policy Space). Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ denote the space of probability measures on the output space. The space of policies, denoted $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^\mathcal{X}$, is the set of Markov kernels $K : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Definition 2.7 (Architecture Π_Θ). An *architecture* is a smooth map from the parameter manifold to the policy space:

$$\Pi_\Theta : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^\mathcal{X}, \quad \theta \mapsto \pi_\theta(dy|x).$$

This map encapsulates the forward pass of the neural network. Formally, the image π_θ constitutes a Markov kernel from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} , identifying the agent as a stochastic decision rule conditioned on input.

2.5 The Bridge: Observable Representations

The battery \mathcal{B} does not observe θ ; it observes scores. We lift the definition of the agent representation from [2] to depend explicitly on θ .

Definition 2.8 (Representation Map $\rho_\mathcal{B}$). Following Definition 2.2 of [2], let $X_\mathcal{B} := [0, 1]^T \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{d_R}$ be the evaluation space. The *representation map* $\rho_\mathcal{B} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X_\mathcal{B})$ is the pushforward of the agent’s behavior under the battery’s scoring logic.

Let μ_X be the pushforward of the battery sampling law μ to the input space \mathcal{X} via the map $(t, s, \delta) \mapsto x = (s, t)$. For each $\theta \in \Theta$, define the joint probability law

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta := \mu_X \otimes \pi_\theta \quad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y},$$

where π_θ is the policy induced by the architecture Π_Θ .

Define the evaluation map

$$\mathbf{E} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{B}}, \quad \mathbf{E}((s, t), (\omega, r)) := ((S_{t'}(\omega))_{t' \in T}, r).$$

The representation of θ is then the image measure

$$\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(\theta) := \mathbf{E}_\# \mathbb{P}_\theta \in \mathcal{P}(X_{\mathcal{B}}).$$

Definition 2.9 (Capability Functional $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ and Commutative Diagram). The objective of the self-improvement loop is to maximize the scalar capability score defined in Definition 6.1 of [2]. Let $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{P}(X_{\mathcal{B}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an AAI functional (e.g., the tractable instance) satisfying axioms (A1)-(A4): normalization, monotonicity with respect to strict task success, decomposability across task families, and stability under subsampling. We do not repeat the full statements here, but throughout this paper we assume that any $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ satisfies these axioms. We will often write

$$F(\theta) := (\Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}})(\theta)$$

for the induced scalar objective on the parameter manifold.

Given a trajectory $(\theta_r)_{r \geq 0}$ on Θ , we write

$$\nu_r := \rho_{\mathcal{B}}(\theta_r) \in \mathcal{P}(X_{\mathcal{B}})$$

for the induced flow of representations on the evaluation space. The corresponding capability curve is $F(\theta_r) = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\nu_r)$.

The dynamics are governed by the following commutative diagram, which connects the internal physics of the agent (top left) to the moduli space geometry (bottom right):

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Theta & \xrightarrow{\Pi_\Theta} & \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^{\mathcal{X}} & \xrightarrow{\otimes \mu} & \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \\ \text{Dynamics } \mathcal{T}_{GVU} \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \mathbf{E}_\# \\ \Theta & \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathcal{B}}} & \mathcal{P}(X_{\mathcal{B}}) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

The self-improvement dynamics will be expressed in terms of the composite map $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$: the GVV operator acts on the internal state θ , the battery \mathcal{B} compresses the resulting behavior into a representation $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(\theta)$, and $F(\theta)$ is the scalar capability that we differentiate along the induced flow.

3 The Generator-Verifier-Updater (GVU) Operator

We postulate that any rational mechanism for autonomous $\kappa > 0$ can be decomposed into a canonical operator \mathcal{T}_{GVU} . This operator describes one step of the recursive loop (e.g., one round of self-play or one reasoning step).

Definition 3.1 (External score and internal potential). Fix a battery

$$\mathcal{B} = (T, \mathcal{F}, S, Q^*, \mu, D, \Pi, R)$$

with input and output spaces \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} as in Definition 2.3. For $x = (s, t) \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y = (\omega, r) \in \mathcal{Y}$, the *external score map*

$$S_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

is defined by

$$S_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y) = S_{\mathcal{B}}((s, t), (\omega, r)) := S_t(\omega),$$

i.e. it applies the task-specific scoring map S_t of Definition 2.2 to the semantic trace ω and ignores resources r .

An *internal potential* for \mathcal{B} is any measurable function

$$V : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

that the agent uses to internally score interactions (x, y) , typically as a surrogate for the external score $S_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y)$. In later sections we measure the alignment between V and $S_{\mathcal{B}}$ through the coefficient ρ appearing in the update decomposition (2).

Definition 3.2 (The GUV Operator). Fix a battery \mathcal{B} as above, together with:

- a batch size $N \in \mathbb{N}$;
- an architecture $\Pi_{\Theta} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^{\mathcal{X}}$, sending $\theta \mapsto \pi_{\theta}$;
- an internal potential $V : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the sense of Definition 3.1;
- an inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$;
- a regularizer $\mathcal{R} : \Theta \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and coefficient $\lambda \geq 0$.

Let

$$\mathcal{B}_N := (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^N$$

denote the batch space of N input–output pairs, and let

$$\mathcal{E}_N(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \delta_{(x_i, y_i)} \mid (x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, w_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^N w_i = 1 \right\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$$

denote the space of N -point empirical measures.

The GUV operator is a one-step update map

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{GUV}} : \Theta \rightarrow \Theta, \quad \theta \mapsto \mathcal{U}(\theta, \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}(\theta))),$$

defined via three constituent maps

$$\mathcal{G} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_N, \quad \mathcal{V} : \mathcal{B}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_N(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}), \quad \mathcal{U} : \Theta \times \mathcal{E}_N(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \Theta$$

as follows.

1. The Generator (\mathcal{G}). For a given parameter $\theta \in \Theta$, write $\Pi_{\Theta}(\theta) = \pi_{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^{\mathcal{X}}$ for the induced policy. To construct a batch $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$:

1. sample evaluation triples $(t_i, s_i, \delta_i) \sim \mu$ independently from the battery’s sampling law on $T \times \Pi \times \mathcal{D}$;
2. form the corresponding labeled prompts $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ as in Definition 2.3;
3. sample outputs $y_i \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot \mid x_i)$ in \mathcal{Y} .

This defines a (stochastic) map

$$\mathcal{G} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_N, \quad \theta \mapsto \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N.$$

In the infinite-batch limit the empirical law of $\mathcal{G}(\theta)$ converges to the joint measure $\mu \otimes \pi_{\theta}$ that underlies the representation $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(\theta)$.

2. The Verifier (\mathcal{V}). Given a batch $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$, the Verifier uses the internal potential V and inverse temperature β to produce a weighted empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_V \in \mathcal{E}_N(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$:

$$\mathcal{V} : \mathcal{B}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_N(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}), \quad \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \mapsto \hat{\mu}_V := \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \delta_{(x_i, y_i)},$$

with weights

$$w_i = \frac{\exp(\beta V(x_i, y_i))}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(\beta V(x_j, y_j))}.$$

By construction, V is evaluated on the same \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} that arise from the battery \mathcal{B} ; in particular, its alignment with the external score map $S_{\mathcal{B}}$ is what determines the coefficient ρ in the update decomposition (2). Concrete choices of V include:

- *discriminative* potentials (reward models, opponents) [5];
- *logical* potentials derived from unit tests, compilers, or theorem provers [9];
- *heuristic* potentials produced by verbal critics [8].

3. The Updater (\mathcal{U}). The updater maps a weighted empirical measure back to parameters. Given the current parameter $\theta \in \Theta$ and a measure $\hat{\mu}_V \in \mathcal{E}_N(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, we define

$$\mathcal{U}(\theta, \hat{\mu}_V) := \arg \min_{\theta' \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \hat{\mu}_V} \left[-\log \pi_{\theta'}(y \mid x) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(\theta', \theta) \right],$$

whenever a minimizer exists. Here the expectation with respect to $\hat{\mu}_V$ reduces to a finite weighted sum because $\hat{\mu}_V \in \mathcal{E}_N(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$. For fixed θ we can view this as a map

$$\mathcal{U}_{\theta} : \mathcal{E}_N(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \Theta, \quad \hat{\mu}_V \mapsto \mathcal{U}(\theta, \hat{\mu}_V),$$

and the one-step Gvu update is

$$\theta_{t+1} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{GVU}}(\theta_t) = \mathcal{U}(\theta_t, \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}(\theta_t))).$$

This template encompasses stochastic gradient descent on log-likelihood (when $\hat{\mu}_V$ is unweighted), PPO-style updates (when V encodes advantages), and in-context updates when Θ includes a context or memory component.

3.1 Monolithic self-improvement: the diagonal regime $G = V = U$

An instructive extreme case of our Gvu abstraction is when the generator, verifier, and updater are instantiated by the same model. Let M_{θ} be a single LLM with parameters θ . We define three role-specific interfaces:

- \mathcal{G}_{θ} queries M_{θ} with a "solve this task" prompt to sample traces τ ;
- \mathcal{V}_{θ} queries the same M_{θ} with a "critique and score these traces" prompt to assign scalar scores or rankings;
- \mathcal{U}_{θ} queries M_{θ} with a "given these scored traces, propose an update" prompt, producing new training examples, hyperparameters, or code that an outer optimizer converts into a parameter update.

At the level of our abstraction the update still factors as

$$\theta_{t+1} = \mathcal{U}_{\theta} \circ \mathcal{V}_{\theta} \circ \mathcal{G}_{\theta}(\theta_t),$$

but now we are in a *diagonal* regime with (this is a slight abuse of notation) $\mathcal{G}_\theta = \mathcal{V}_\theta = \mathcal{U}_\theta = M_\theta$, i.e. the same model, with the same weights, plays all three roles via different prompts or heads. The battery \mathcal{B} and representation map $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}$ only see the induced flow $(\nu_r)_{r \geq 0}$ and the associated κ -curve, but the noise and bias structure of the estimator is qualitatively different: verification and update are no longer external signals but reflections of the model’s own capabilities and failure modes. In particular, the self-improvement coefficient $\kappa(r)$ distinguishes between regimes of *self-confirmation* (where the model merely reinforces its own preferences) and *genuine self-correction*.

3.2 Ensemble GVV: LLM councils

Consider now a “council of models” setup. A user query x is first broadcast to a fixed set of base models $M^{(1)}, \dots, M^{(K)}$ (e.g. GPT-5.1, Gemini 3, Claude, Grok), each of which returns a candidate answer $y^{(k)}$. In a second stage, all models see the anonymized pool $\{y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(K)}\}$ and produce evaluations or rankings of the candidate answers. Finally, a distinguished “Chairman LLM” receives the answers together with the council’s evaluations and produces the final response.

To view this through our lens we treat the entire council—base models plus chairman and aggregation scheme—as a single meta-agent with parameter space

$$\Theta_{\text{council}} = \Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_K \times \Theta_{\text{chair}}.$$

The generator $\mathcal{G}_{\text{council}}$ maps a query x and current parameters to a trace consisting of all candidate answers (and optionally the chairman’s answer). The verifier $\mathcal{V}_{\text{council}}$ maps this trace to scores by letting each model judge the anonymized pool and aggregating their votes into rankings or pairwise preferences. The updater $\mathcal{U}_{\text{council}}$ then uses these internally generated judgements to update one or more components of the council: for example, distilling a student model on the council’s chosen best answers, or applying preference optimization where “winning” answers are treated as preferred over “losing” answers.

In the limiting case the same council architecture is used for generation, verification, and the proposal of updates, yielding a multi-agent analogue of the diagonal regime $G = V = U$. From the perspective of our Variance Inequality this ensemble structure has two important spectral effects:

1. diversity of base models improves exploration in the generator, potentially increasing $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$; and
2. aggregating multiple judges reduces the variance of the verifier’s signal, improving $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$.

Both effects tend to increase the local κ -slope, making ignition more likely compared to a single-model GVV with the same underlying architecture.

Remark 3.3 (Diagonal vs. ensemble GVV and the AGI criterion). Our framework separates the *roles* of generation, verification, and update from the *implementations* that realize them. In the diagonal regime we have

$$\mathcal{G}_\theta = \mathcal{V}_\theta = \mathcal{U}_\theta = M_\theta,$$

i.e. a single monolithic model plays all three roles via different interfaces or prompts. In the ensemble regime, by contrast, \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{V} , and \mathcal{U} are implemented by a council of models and an aggregation scheme, as in our LLM council example: multiple base models jointly generate traces, jointly evaluate them, and jointly shape the update.

From the perspective of the induced κ -flow the two regimes differ primarily in their noise and bias structure. Diagonal GVV is maximally entangled: the same set of parameters determines what solutions are proposed, how they are judged, and what updates are considered admissible. This makes the system particularly vulnerable to self-confirmation: the verifier inherits the generator’s blind spots, and the updater may systematically reinforce them, potentially driving the flow toward

a suboptimal attractor with $\kappa(r) \approx 0$. Ensemble GVU, on the other hand, can improve both exploration and signal quality: diversity across council members increases the support of the generator’s trace distribution, and aggregating multiple judges can reduce the variance of the verifier’s signal, increasing $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ in our Variance Inequality.

However, neither diagonal nor ensemble GVU is by itself sufficient for “AGI-like” self-improvement in our sense. Both regimes must be evaluated through a battery \mathcal{B} and its induced moduli space of capability fibers. An AGI candidate must exhibit $\hat{\kappa} > 0$ not only in a single, well-instrumented fiber (such as competition mathematics), but across social, planning, embodied, and recursive fibers as well. In this view, diagonal and ensemble GVU are two different ways of wiring up the same underlying self-improvement template; the AGI criterion concerns the global shape of the resulting κ -curve over the moduli space, not the particular choice of wiring.

3.3 Universality of the GVU decomposition

We postulated above that any rational mechanism for autonomous self-improvement fits the GVU template. In this subsection we show that, under mild regularity assumptions, any *first-order statistical* update rule can indeed be written in a REINFORCE-style GVU form. Thus, whenever a flow on Θ achieves $\kappa > 0$ using only samples from the current policy, there exists an implicit internal potential playing the role of a Verifier.

Definition 3.4 (Score and Fisher information). Fix a battery \mathcal{B} and an architecture $\Pi : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^{\mathcal{X}}$, $\theta \mapsto \pi_\theta$. For $\theta \in \Theta$ and $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, define the *score function*

$$s_\theta(x, y) := \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y \mid x) \in T_\theta \Theta.$$

The *Fisher information matrix* at θ is

$$G(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mu \otimes \pi_\theta} [s_\theta(x, y) s_\theta(x, y)^\top].$$

We say the statistical manifold (Θ, G) is *regular* if $G(\theta)$ is finite and positive definite for all θ in the region of interest.

Definition 3.5 (First-order statistical update). A vector field $v : \Theta \rightarrow T\Theta$ is called a *first-order statistical update* if it depends on θ only through the joint law $\mu \otimes \pi_\theta$, in the sense that there exists a measurable function

$$\Psi : \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow T\Theta$$

with

$$v(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mu \otimes \pi_\theta} [\Psi(\theta, x, y)].$$

Intuitively, $v(\theta)$ is computed from first-order statistics of samples (x, y) drawn from the current policy on the battery.

The next theorem shows that, in a regular statistical manifold, any such update can be written as a REINFORCE-style policy-gradient update for an appropriate (possibly implicit) scalar potential.

Theorem 3.6 (Score-based GVU representation). *Assume the regularity conditions of Definition 3.4, so that $G(\theta)$ is positive definite for all θ in a region of interest. Let $v : \Theta \rightarrow T\Theta$ be a smooth vector field, e.g. the velocity $v(\theta_r) = \dot{\theta}_r$ of an autonomous flow $\gamma : r \mapsto \theta_r$ on Θ . Then for each $\theta \in \Theta$ there exists a scalar internal potential*

$$V_\theta : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that

$$v(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mu \otimes \pi_\theta} [V_\theta(x, y) s_\theta(x, y)], \quad (1)$$

where s_θ is the score function from Definition 3.4. In particular, $v(\theta)$ can be realized as the expected REINFORCE update for the scalar potential V_θ .

Proof. Fix $\theta \in \Theta$, and write $s(x, y) := s_\theta(x, y)$ and $G := G(\theta)$ for brevity. By Definition 3.4,

$$G = \mathbb{E}[s(x, y)s(x, y)^\top]$$

is symmetric positive definite, hence invertible. Define

$$a(\theta) := G^{-1}v(\theta) \in T_\theta\Theta,$$

and the scalar function

$$V_\theta(x, y) := \langle a(\theta), s_\theta(x, y) \rangle.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[V_\theta(x, y)s_\theta(x, y)] = \mathbb{E}[\langle a(\theta), s(x, y) \rangle s(x, y)] = \mathbb{E}[s(x, y)s(x, y)^\top]a(\theta) = Ga(\theta) = v(\theta),$$

which is exactly (1). \square

Remark 3.7. The construction of V_θ in the proof is explicit:

$$V_\theta(x, y) = \langle G(\theta)^{-1}v(\theta), \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y | x) \rangle.$$

Thus V_θ can be interpreted as the unique scalar potential whose REINFORCE update reproduces the given first-order vector field $v(\theta)$ in the Fisher geometry.

Equation (1) has a direct Gvu interpretation. The generator \mathcal{G} samples (x, y) from $\mu \otimes \pi_\theta$; the verifier assigns a scalar weight $V_\theta(x, y)$ to each trace; and the updater projects this weighted signal back onto the parameter manifold via the policy gradient $\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y | x)$.

Corollary 3.8 (Necessity of a non-trivial verifier). *In the setting of Theorem 3.6, consider a REINFORCE-style update of the form*

$$\dot{\theta} = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mu \otimes \pi_\theta} [V_\theta(x, y) s_\theta(x, y)].$$

If $V_\theta(x, y)$ is almost surely constant (i.e. independent of (x, y)), then

$$\mathbb{E}[V_\theta(x, y) s_\theta(x, y)] = 0,$$

and hence the expected update vanishes: $\mathbb{E}[\dot{\theta}] = 0$. Consequently, the expected self-improvement coefficient $\mathbb{E}[\kappa(r)]$ is zero: there is no systematic gain in the battery score $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Proof. If $V_\theta(x, y) \equiv c(\theta)$ is constant in (x, y) , then

$$\mathbb{E}[V_\theta(x, y) s_\theta(x, y)] = c(\theta) \mathbb{E}[s_\theta(x, y)].$$

It is a standard property of the score function that $\mathbb{E}[s_\theta(x, y)] = 0$ under $\mu \otimes \pi_\theta$, so the expectation vanishes. The statement about $\mathbb{E}[\kappa(r)]$ follows because $\kappa(r)$ is, up to higher-order curvature terms, the directional derivative of F along θ_r , and the direction itself has zero mean. \square

Taken together, Theorem 3.6 and Corollary 3.8 justify the Gvu template for first-order, data-driven self-improvement: any such update can be viewed as a generator sampling from the current policy, a verifier computing a scalar potential $V_\theta(x, y)$ on traces, and an updater implementing the corresponding policy-gradient step. Moreover, a non-trivial verifier (one for which V_θ is not almost surely constant) is *necessary* for non-zero expected κ .

4 Spectral Stability: The Variance Inequality

We now derive our main theoretical condition linking the GVU update to expected changes in capability. The GVU operator induces a stochastic update vector \hat{g} on Θ . For the agent to improve, this vector must on average align with the gradient of the true battery score $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$. However, the agent only has access to its internal potential V , not directly to the battery’s scoring logic S .

4.1 Decomposition of the Update Vector

Let $F := \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $g^* := \nabla_{\theta} F(\theta)$ be the true gradient of the battery score with respect to parameters. The update \hat{g} produced by GVU is a stochastic estimator of g^* . We decompose it as

$$\hat{g} = \rho \cdot g^* + \xi_{\mathcal{G}} + \xi_{\mathcal{V}} + b_{\text{bias}}, \quad (2)$$

where:

- $\rho \in [-1, 1]$ is an *alignment coefficient* measuring the correlation between the internal potential V and the external score induced by S ;
- $\xi_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the *Generation Noise* (variance due to exploration over tasks and samples $y \sim \pi_{\theta}$);
- $\xi_{\mathcal{V}}$ is the *Verification Noise* (variance due to errors in V as an estimator of the true score);
- b_{bias} is a systematic misalignment term.

We assume throughout this section that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{\mathcal{G}}] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_{\mathcal{V}}] = 0$ and that $\xi_{\mathcal{G}}, \xi_{\mathcal{V}}$ are uncorrelated with g^* . We write

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2 := \mathbb{E}\|\xi_{\mathcal{G}}\|^2, \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2 := \mathbb{E}\|\xi_{\mathcal{V}}\|^2,$$

and define the corresponding signal-to-noise ratios

$$\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G}) := \frac{\|g^*\|^2}{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2}, \quad \text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}) := \frac{\|g^*\|^2}{\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2}.$$

4.2 The Variance Inequality

We study a single small step of size $\eta > 0$: $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \eta \hat{g}$. For brevity we write $\theta := \theta_t$.

Theorem 4.1 (Variance Inequality, sufficient condition). *Assume $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$ is twice differentiable and L -smooth in a neighborhood of θ , i.e., its Hessian satisfies $\|H(\theta')\| \leq L$ for all θ' along the trajectory. Assume the decomposition (2) holds with b_{bias} negligible compared to g^* and $\xi_{\mathcal{G}}, \xi_{\mathcal{V}}$ zero-mean and uncorrelated with g^* and uncorrelated with each other. Then for step size $\eta > 0$ small enough that the second-order expansion is accurate, a sufficient condition for expected improvement $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] := \mathbb{E}[F(\theta_{t+1}) - F(\theta_t)] > 0$ is*

$$\rho \|g^*\|^2 > \frac{\eta L}{2} (\rho^2 \|g^*\|^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2). \quad (3)$$

Equivalently, dividing by $\|g^*\|^2$

$$\rho > \frac{\eta L}{2} \left(\rho^2 + \frac{1}{\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})} + \frac{1}{\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})} \right). \quad (4)$$

In particular, for fixed alignment ρ and curvature/stepsize pair (L, η) , this is a joint constraint on the generator and verifier noise: both $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ must be sufficiently large (i.e. the corresponding variances sufficiently small) for $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] > 0$ to hold. In particular, given $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$ there is a minimum required $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$, and conversely; extremely noisy generation or verification cannot be compensated by the other.

Proof. By a second-order Taylor expansion of F about θ we have

$$F(\theta_{t+1}) \approx F(\theta) + \eta \langle \nabla F(\theta), \hat{g} \rangle + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \hat{g}^\top H(\theta') \hat{g},$$

for some θ' on the line segment between θ and θ_{t+1} . L -smoothness implies $\hat{g}^\top H(\theta') \hat{g} \leq L \|\hat{g}\|^2$, so

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] \approx \eta \mathbb{E}[\langle g^*, \hat{g} \rangle] - \frac{\eta^2 L}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}\|^2].$$

Using the decomposition (2) and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{\mathcal{G}}] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_{\mathcal{V}}] = 0$ and that these terms are uncorrelated with g^* , we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle g^*, \hat{g} \rangle] = \rho \|g^*\|^2 + \langle g^*, b_{\text{bias}} \rangle \approx \rho \|g^*\|^2,$$

where we have neglected the bias term. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}\|^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|\rho g^* + \xi_{\mathcal{G}} + \xi_{\mathcal{V}}\|^2] \approx \rho^2 \|g^*\|^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2,$$

neglecting cross-terms under the decorrelation assumptions. Substituting,

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] \approx \eta \rho \|g^*\|^2 - \frac{\eta^2 L}{2} (\rho^2 \|g^*\|^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2).$$

Requiring $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] > 0$ yields inequality (3). \square

Corollary 4.2 (The Hallucination Barrier). *If $\mathcal{V} \approx \mathcal{G}$ (for example, the model simply asks itself “Is this correct?” without any external grounding), then typically $\rho \approx 1$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}} \approx \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$. Writing*

$$\text{SNR}_{\text{diag}} := \text{SNR}(\mathcal{G}) \approx \text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}),$$

the sufficient condition (4) reduces, up to constants, to a requirement that the shared SNR be large:

$$\frac{2}{\text{SNR}_{\text{diag}}} \ll \frac{2\rho}{\eta L} - \rho^2.$$

For realistic curvature L and stepsizes η , this inequality is rarely satisfied when SNR_{diag} is modest. In this regime $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F]$ is close to zero or negative, and the flow tends toward mode collapse or a noisy random walk. This helps explain the empirical failure of naive self-correction to produce sustained $\kappa > 0$: in diagonal GVVU, generation and verification inherit the same noise, and without an additional low-variance signal the quadratic curvature penalty dominates the linear alignment term.

In practice, the generator is often intrinsically high-entropy, so it is typically easier to increase $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ (via external structure, ensembles, or oracles) than to dramatically improve $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$. Many of the architectures we study exploit this by engineering verification to be spectrally “easier” than generation, even though the sufficient condition (4) itself is symmetric in the two SNRs.

Corollary 4.3 (Verifier SNR dominance). *Assume the setting of Theorem 4.1 and fix an alignment floor $\rho \geq \rho_0 > 0$. Let $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G}) > 0$ be the generator signal-to-noise ratio, and choose a stepsize $0 < \eta < \eta_{\text{max}}(\rho_0, \text{SNR}(\mathcal{G}))$, where*

$$\eta_{\text{max}}(\rho_0, \text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})) := \frac{2\rho_0}{L(\rho_0^2 + 1/\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G}))}.$$

Then there exists a finite threshold

$$\text{SNR}_{\mathcal{V}}^* = \text{SNR}_{\mathcal{V}}^*(\rho_0, \text{SNR}(\mathcal{G}), L, \eta) < \infty$$

such that

$$\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}) > \text{SNR}_{\mathcal{V}}^* \implies \mathbb{E}[\Delta F] > 0.$$

In particular, for any fixed generator noise level $\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2 < \infty$ and any sufficiently small stepsize η , one can always make the expected capability gain positive by increasing the verifier SNR.

Proof. Starting from the sufficient condition in Theorem 4.1,

$$\rho \|g^*\|^2 > \frac{\eta L}{2} (\rho^2 \|g^*\|^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2),$$

and dividing by $\|g^*\|^2$ gives

$$\rho > \frac{\eta L}{2} \left(\rho^2 + \frac{1}{\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})} + \frac{1}{\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})} \right).$$

It suffices to enforce this with ρ replaced by ρ_0 . Rearranging, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})} < \frac{2\rho_0}{\eta L} - \rho_0^2 - \frac{1}{\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})}.$$

The right-hand side is positive precisely when

$$\eta < \frac{2\rho_0}{L(\rho_0^2 + 1/\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G}))},$$

which is our stepsize assumption. In that regime we can define

$$\text{SNR}_{\mathcal{V}}^* := \frac{1}{\frac{2\rho_0}{\eta L} - \rho_0^2 - \frac{1}{\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})}} < \infty,$$

and any $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}) > \text{SNR}_{\mathcal{V}}^*$ satisfies the inequality. This implies $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] > 0$ by Theorem 4.1. \square

4.3 Geometric interpretation on the statistical manifold

Throughout this section we measure norms and inner products on Θ with respect to the Riemannian metric g introduced in Definition 2.4. When g is chosen to be the Fisher information metric induced by the policy family $\{\pi_{\theta}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$, (Θ, g) is a statistical manifold in the sense of Remark 2.5. In that case the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} F$ is the *natural gradient* of F .

Definition 4.4 (Fisher inner product and angle). For $\theta \in \Theta$ let $g_{\theta}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote the inner product induced by the metric g on the tangent space $T_{\theta}\Theta$. For tangent vectors $u, v \in T_{\theta}\Theta$ we write

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\theta} := g_{\theta}(u, v), \quad \|u\|_{\theta}^2 := g_{\theta}(u, u).$$

Given nonzero $u, v \in T_{\theta}\Theta$ we define the *Fisher angle* $\angle_F(u, v) \in [0, \pi]$ between them by

$$\cos(\angle_F(u, v)) := \frac{\langle u, v \rangle_{\theta}}{\|u\|_{\theta} \|v\|_{\theta}}.$$

In these terms, the true ascent direction at θ is the gradient vector $g^* = \nabla_\theta F(\theta)$, and the GVU update produces a random tangent vector \hat{g} with mean $v(\theta) := \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}]$. Theorem 4.1 can be read as a statement about the competition, in the Fisher geometry, between: (i) the *alignment* between $v(\theta)$ and g^* , and (ii) the *spread* of the noise around $v(\theta)$.

Proposition 4.5 (Fisher angle and alignment coefficient). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, write $g^* := \nabla_\theta F(\theta)$ and $v := \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}]$. Let θ_F be the Fisher angle between g^* and v ,*

$$\cos \theta_F := \frac{\langle g^*, v \rangle_\theta}{\|g^*\|_\theta \|v\|_\theta}.$$

If the bias term b_{bias} in (2) is negligible and the noise terms are uncorrelated with g^ , the alignment coefficient ρ in (2) can be expressed as*

$$\rho = \frac{\langle g^*, v \rangle_\theta}{\|g^*\|_\theta^2} = \frac{\|v\|_\theta}{\|g^*\|_\theta} \cos \theta_F.$$

Consequently, the leading (first-order) term in the expected capability gain in Theorem 4.1 can be written as

$$\eta \rho \|g^*\|_\theta^2 = \eta \|g^*\|_\theta \|v\|_\theta \cos \theta_F,$$

i.e. it is proportional to the cosine of the Fisher angle between the GVU drift v and the true gradient g^ .*

Proof. Taking expectations in (2) and neglecting b_{bias} gives $v = \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}] \approx \rho g^*$. Taking the inner product with g^* and using Definition 4.4 yields

$$\langle g^*, v \rangle_\theta \approx \rho \langle g^*, g^* \rangle_\theta = \rho \|g^*\|_\theta^2,$$

so $\rho = \langle g^*, v \rangle_\theta / \|g^*\|_\theta^2$. On the other hand, by Definition 4.4,

$$\cos \theta_F = \frac{\langle g^*, v \rangle_\theta}{\|g^*\|_\theta \|v\|_\theta},$$

which rearranges to $\langle g^*, v \rangle_\theta = \|g^*\|_\theta \|v\|_\theta \cos \theta_F$. Combining the two identities gives the claimed expression for ρ and the first-order term in $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F]$. \square

Proposition 4.5 shows that, on the statistical manifold (Θ, g) , a self-improvement trajectory $\gamma : r \mapsto \theta_r$ is driven by a noisy vector field whose *drift* is the mean update $v(\theta)$ and whose *usefulness* is governed by the Fisher angle θ_F between $v(\theta)$ and the true gradient $g^*(\theta)$. The Variance Inequality (Theorem 4.1) then constrains which noisy, sample-based vector fields can yield positive drift in the battery score $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$ while respecting this geometry: for fixed curvature (through L) and step size η , we must simultaneously ensure

1. *geometric alignment*: θ_F is acute, so that $v(\theta)$ points mostly along $g^*(\theta)$ in the Fisher metric;
2. *spectral control*: the noise variances $\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$ remain small enough that the quadratic curvature penalty does not overwhelm the linear alignment term.

In other words, a κ -flow is a stochastic curve on the statistical manifold whose drift must stay close, in Fisher angle, to the natural gradient of F and whose diffusion must be controlled by a verifier with sufficiently high signal-to-noise ratio. The GVU design problem is precisely to engineer V and the induced update field $v(\theta)$ so that these geometric and spectral conditions can be satisfied across the relevant fibers of the moduli space.

4.4 Design levers and special cases

The Variance Inequality (Theorem 4.1) does more than diagnose failure modes: it exposes concrete design levers for constructing self-improving agents. In this subsection we record a few generic special cases that cover many architectures in Section 5.

Corollary 4.6 (Step-size window). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, suppose b_{bias} in (2) is negligible. Then for any fixed θ with $\rho > 0$ there exists a non-trivial stepsize interval $(0, \eta_{\max})$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] > 0$ for all $0 < \eta < \eta_{\max}$. In particular, from (3) we may take*

$$\eta_{\max} = \frac{2\rho\|g^*\|^2}{L(\rho^2\|g^*\|^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2)}.$$

For fixed curvature L and gradient norm $\|g^*\|$, improving either alignment ρ or the verification SNR (reducing $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$) widens this safe stepsize window.

Proof. Rearranging (3) for $\eta > 0$ gives

$$\eta < \frac{2\rho\|g^*\|^2}{L(\rho^2\|g^*\|^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^2 + \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2)},$$

which defines a non-empty interval $(0, \eta_{\max})$ whenever $\rho > 0$. \square

Ensemble verifiers. A natural way to reduce verification noise is to aggregate multiple judges. The next result isolates the effect of such ensembles in an idealized setting.

Theorem 4.7 (Ensemble verifier scaling). *Fix $\theta \in \Theta$ and a batch size $B \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, B$ let $(x_i, y_i) \sim \mu \otimes \pi_\theta$ be i.i.d. and write $s_i := s_\theta(x_i, y_i) = \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y_i | x_i)$ for the score function from Definition 3.4. Let the ideal (oracle) potential be the external score $S_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y)$ of Definition 3.1.*

For each judge $m = 1, \dots, M$ suppose we have an internal potential

$$V^{(m)}(x, y) = S_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y) + \epsilon_m(x, y),$$

where the noise terms ϵ_m satisfy, for all (x, y) :

1. $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_m(x, y) | x, y] = 0$;
2. $\text{Var}(\epsilon_m(x, y) | x, y) = \tau^2$ for some constant $\tau^2 < \infty$ independent of (x, y) and m ;
3. the collection $\{\epsilon_m(x, y)\}_{m=1}^M$ is conditionally independent given (x, y) and independent of $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^B$.

Define the ensemble potential

$$\bar{V}(x, y) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M V^{(m)}(x, y) = S_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y) + \bar{\epsilon}(x, y), \quad \bar{\epsilon}(x, y) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \epsilon_m(x, y).$$

Consider the REINFORCE-style Monte Carlo gradient estimators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_{\text{single}} &:= \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B V^{(1)}(x_i, y_i) s_i, \\ \hat{g}_{\text{ensemble}} &:= \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \bar{V}(x_i, y_i) s_i, \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding ideal oracle estimator

$$\hat{g}^* := \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B S_{\mathcal{B}}(x_i, y_i) s_i.$$

Define the verification noise components by

$$\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}} := \hat{g}_{\text{single}} - \hat{g}^*, \quad \xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}} := \hat{g}_{\text{ensemble}} - \hat{g}^*,$$

and write

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}}^2 := \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}}\|^2], \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}}^2 := \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}}\|^2].$$

Then

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}}^2 = \frac{1}{M} \sigma_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}}^2.$$

In particular, for fixed $\|g^*\|^2$ the verification signal-to-noise ratio scales linearly with M :

$$\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}_{\text{ensemble}}) = M \cdot \text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}_{\text{single}}),$$

and the admissible stepsize η_{\max} from Corollary 4.6 grows linearly with M , all else being equal.

Proof. By construction,

$$\hat{g}_{\text{single}} - \hat{g}^* = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B (V^{(1)}(x_i, y_i) - S_{\mathcal{B}}(x_i, y_i)) s_i = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \epsilon_1(x_i, y_i) s_i,$$

so

$$\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \epsilon_1(x_i, y_i) s_i.$$

Similarly,

$$\hat{g}_{\text{ensemble}} - \hat{g}^* = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i) s_i = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \epsilon_m(x_i, y_i) \right) s_i,$$

so

$$\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i) s_i.$$

We first compute the second moment of the ensemble noise. Conditional on (x_i, y_i) , the random variables $\{\epsilon_m(x_i, y_i)\}_{m=1}^M$ are independent, zero-mean, with variance τ^2 by assumption. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i)^2 \mid x_i, y_i] = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_m(x_i, y_i)^2 \mid x_i, y_i] = \frac{1}{M^2} \cdot M \tau^2 = \frac{\tau^2}{M}.$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i) \mid x_i, y_i] = 0$, so $\bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i)$ is conditionally zero-mean with variance τ^2/M for each i .

Using the definition of $\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}}$ and independence across batch elements, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}}\|^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i) s_i \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{B^2} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathbb{E}[\bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i)^2 \|s_i\|^2] \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the facts that different i are independent and $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i)] = 0$, so cross terms vanish. Taking expectations over (x_i, y_i) and applying the conditional variance computation above yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}}\|^2] = \frac{1}{B^2} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\bar{\epsilon}(x_i, y_i)^2 \mid x_i, y_i] \|s_i\|^2] = \frac{1}{M} \cdot \frac{1}{B^2} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathbb{E}[\tau^2 \|s_i\|^2].$$

For the single-judge case we have

$$\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \epsilon_1(x_i, y_i) s_i,$$

and an identical calculation (using $\text{Var}(\epsilon_1(x_i, y_i) \mid x_i, y_i) = \tau^2$) gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}}\|^2] = \frac{1}{B^2} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathbb{E}[\tau^2 \|s_i\|^2].$$

Comparing the two expressions, we obtain

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}}^2 = \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{ensemble}}\|^2] = \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}}\|^2] = \frac{1}{M} \sigma_{\mathcal{V}, \text{single}}^2.$$

Finally, the SNR relation follows directly from

$$\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}) := \frac{\|g^*\|^2}{\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2},$$

holding $\|g^*\|^2$ fixed and substituting the scaling of $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$. The dependence of η_{\max} on $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$ is given in Corollary 4.6, so η_{\max} scales linearly with M as well. \square

Remark 4.8. The key point in Theorem 4.7 is that it relates the variance of the *potential* V to the variance of the *gradient estimator* via the REINFORCE structure. Under the assumptions stated, the $1/M$ reduction in the potential noise directly induces a $1/M$ reduction in the verification noise term $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$ in the update decomposition (2).

This idealized calculation formalizes the intuition behind LLM councils and ensemble judges (Constitutional AI, RLAIIF): under mild independence assumptions, adding more diverse judges directly improves $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ and widens the stable self-improvement regime.

Group-based verification and GRPO-style schemes. A second generic lever is to normalize rewards within groups of co-generated trajectories. This covers GRPO and related algorithms.

Proposition 4.9 (Group-based verification reduces variance). *Fix $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and suppose rewards $R_i := R(x, y_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, G$, are i.i.d. with mean μ_R and variance $\text{Var}(R_i) = \sigma_R^2 < \infty$. Let $s_i := s_\theta(x, y_i) = \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y_i \mid x)$ denote the score function, and assume (R_i) and (s_i) are independent with $\mathbb{E}[s_i] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}\|s_i\|^2 \leq C_s < \infty$.*

Define population-normalized advantages

$$A_i := \frac{R_i - \mu_R}{\sigma_R},$$

and consider the verification contribution to the policy-gradient estimator

$$\hat{g}_G := \frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G A_i s_i.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_G\|^2 \leq \frac{C_s \sigma_R^2}{G},$$

so the corresponding verification variance satisfies

$$\sigma_{V,G}^2 := \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_G\|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma_R^2}{G}\right).$$

Proof. We have

$$\hat{g}_G = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G A_i s_i = \frac{1}{G \sigma_R} \sum_{i=1}^G (R_i - \mu_R) s_i.$$

Using independence of (R_i) and (s_i) and the zero-mean property $\mathbb{E}[s_i] = 0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_G\|^2 = \frac{1}{G^2 \sigma_R^2} \sum_{i=1}^G \mathbb{E} \|(R_i - \mu_R) s_i\|^2 = \frac{1}{G^2 \sigma_R^2} \sum_{i=1}^G \mathbb{E} [(R_i - \mu_R)^2] \mathbb{E} \|s_i\|^2$$

where we used independence to factor expectations. Since each R_i has variance σ_R^2 and $\mathbb{E} \|s_i\|^2 \leq C_s$, this gives

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_G\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{G^2 \sigma_R^2} \cdot G \sigma_R^2 C_s = \frac{C_s}{G}.$$

Absorbing C_s into the big-O constant yields the result. \square

Thus GRPO-style schemes can be viewed as instances of GVU where the verifier explicitly exploits *local batch geometry* to reduce its own variance, explaining the empirical robustness of group-normalized updates on the Planning fiber.

Oracle verifiers. At the opposite extreme, some architectures (AlphaZero, code execution with unit tests, formal proof checkers) have essentially noiseless verifiers.

Corollary 4.10 (Oracle verifier regime). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, suppose $\sigma_V^2 = 0$ (or is negligibly small) and $\rho > 0$. Then there exists a non-trivial stepsize interval $(0, \eta_{\max}^{\text{oracle}})$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F] > 0$ for all $0 < \eta < \eta_{\max}^{\text{oracle}}$, with*

$$\eta_{\max}^{\text{oracle}} = \frac{2\rho \|g^*\|^2}{L(\rho^2 \|g^*\|^2 + \sigma_G^2)}.$$

In particular, even when the generator is highly noisy (σ_G^2 large), a sufficiently low-variance oracle-like verifier guarantees a stable self-improvement window.

Proof. Set $\sigma_V^2 = 0$ in the expression for η_{\max} from Corollary 4.6. \square

This regime captures the geometric advantage enjoyed by AlphaZero-like self-play and code agents with strong execution feedback: the verifier lies near the oracle limit, so the main constraint on κ comes from curvature L and generator noise, not from verification error.

Diagonal GVV with a “cold” verifier. Finally, we return to the diagonal regime where generator and verifier share parameters. Even in this case one can separate their noise statistics via temperature or prompting asymmetries.

Remark 4.11 (Diagonal GVV with a “cold” verifier). Consider a diagonal GVV in which both the policy π_θ and the potential V are derived from the same underlying model, but:

- the generator samples from π_θ at temperature $\tau_G > 0$;
- the verifier uses a deterministic or low-temperature interface with effective temperature $\tau_V \ll \tau_G$.

In a stylized Gaussian-noise model where the stochasticity of each role scales as $\sigma_G^2 \propto \tau_G^2$ and $\sigma_V^2 \propto \tau_V^2$, we obtain

$$\frac{\sigma_V^2}{\sigma_G^2} \approx \left(\frac{\tau_V}{\tau_G} \right)^2 \ll 1.$$

This should be read not as a theorem about real networks but as a simple parametric model for the empirical heuristic that “cold” verifier interfaces (low temperature, strict prompts) can reduce verification variance relative to generation variance, moving the system away from the Hallucination Barrier.

This remark provides a simple mathematical lens on empirical heuristics such as using strict, low-temperature judge prompts for Reflexion, Self-Instruct, and debate: even when $G = V = U$ at the parameter level, interface asymmetries can induce a spectral advantage for verification and thereby open up a regime of positive expected κ .

Goodhart drift and collapse. Finally, we note that the alignment coefficient ρ is not static. As the parameter θ_r evolves to maximize the internal potential V , the agent may exploit the proxy V at the expense of the true external score S_B , a phenomenon often described as reward hacking or Goodhart’s law. We model this heuristically as a decay

$$\dot{\rho} \approx -\gamma \|\dot{\theta}_r\|, \quad \gamma > 0,$$

so that more aggressive updates accelerate misalignment.

In the small- ρ regime, if we neglect the $\rho^2 \|g^*\|^2$ term in (3), the boundary where the expected gain $\mathbb{E}[\Delta F]$ crosses zero is approximately

$$\rho_{\text{crit}} \approx \frac{\eta L(\sigma_G^2 + \sigma_V^2)}{2\|g^*\|^2}.$$

Thus, as optimization pressure increases (larger η) or noise grows, the critical alignment ρ_{crit} rises: once $\rho(r)$ decays below this threshold, the Variance Inequality can no longer guarantee $\kappa(r) > 0$. Sustaining positive self-improvement therefore requires periodically refreshing or strengthening the potential V (e.g., via new human data, stronger teachers, or richer verifiers) to reset ρ closer to 1.

4.5 AI slop formally defined

AI slop is a popular term for generic output produced by models (mostly LLMs and video generators). In our GVV framework, there is a natural way to define AI slop formally.

Definition 4.12 (AI slop event at parameter θ). Fix a battery \mathcal{B} and an internal potential V . For $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ write

$$S(x, y) := S_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y), \quad V(x, y) := V(x, y).$$

Let (S, V) denote the random pair induced by $(x, y) \sim \mu \otimes \pi_\theta$.

For fixed quantile levels $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$, define the Verifier high-score threshold $v_{\text{hi}}(\theta)$ as the $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of V , and the Battery low-score threshold $s_{\text{lo}}(\theta)$ as the β -quantile of S :

$$\mathbb{P}(V \geq v_{\text{hi}}(\theta)) = \alpha, \quad \mathbb{P}(S \leq s_{\text{lo}}(\theta)) = \beta.$$

The *AI slop region* at θ is

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \beta}(\theta) := \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} : V(x, y) \geq v_{\text{hi}}(\theta) \text{ and } S(x, y) \leq s_{\text{lo}}(\theta)\}.$$

We say that an individual trace (x, y) is (α, β) -*AI slop* (or simply *AI slop*, when the parameters are implicit) if $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \beta}(\theta)$.

Definition 4.13 (AI slop mass and slop regime). With $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \beta}(\theta)$ as in Definition 4.12, define the *slop mass*

$$\text{Slop}_{\alpha, \beta}(\theta) := \mathbb{P}_{(x, y) \sim \mu \otimes \pi_\theta}[(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \beta}(\theta)].$$

Equivalently,

$$\text{Slop}_{\alpha, \beta}(\theta) = \mathbb{P}(V \geq v_{\text{hi}}(\theta), S \leq s_{\text{lo}}(\theta)).$$

We say that the agent is in an *AI slop regime* on battery \mathcal{B} (at parameters θ) if

$$\text{Slop}_{\alpha, \beta}(\theta) \geq \delta$$

for some fixed tolerance $\delta > 0$, e.g. $\delta = 0.1$. In words: a non-trivial fraction of the outputs that the internal Verifier ranks among its top α fraction actually lie in the bottom β fraction of the true battery score.

Remark 4.14 (AI slop as a maximum-entropy attractor (heuristic)). Fix an internal potential V and let

$$\mathcal{K}(V) := \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \mid V(x, y) \text{ is (approximately) maximal and locally flat}\}$$

denote the Verifier’s *indifference set*: a region in which V cannot distinguish between different traces. When the Variance Inequality (Theorem 4.1) fails, for example because $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}) \lesssim \text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$, the Gvu flow $(\theta_r)_{r \geq 0}$ cannot reliably climb the gradient of the external battery score $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$. In many entropy-regularized update schemes (e.g. with a KL penalty in \mathcal{U}) one expects the induced representation $\nu_r = \rho_{\mathcal{B}}(\theta_r)$ to drift toward a high-entropy distribution supported on $\mathcal{K}(V)$:

$$\nu_{\text{slop}} \approx \arg \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(X_{\mathcal{B}})} \{H(\nu) : \nu(\mathcal{K}(V)) = 1\},$$

i.e. a nearly maximum-entropy measure on the Verifier’s indifference set.

Informally, we use the term *AI slop* for this regime: the agent has converged to generating traces that satisfy the Verifier’s superficial heuristics but still fail the battery’s deeper scoring map S . Spectrally, this corresponds to a kind of high-frequency cutoff: the model preserves low-frequency statistics of the training data (texture, grammar, style) that V can cheaply recognize, while the high-frequency structure (logical consistency, fine detail) is lost because the Verifier’s SNR is too low to constrain it.

Fisher-geometry collapse. On the statistical manifold (Θ, g) with Fisher information $G(\theta)$, consider the condition number

$$\text{cond}(G(\theta)) := \frac{\lambda_{\max}(G(\theta))}{\lambda_{\min}(G(\theta))}.$$

A large condition number indicates that the policy is highly sensitive along a few directions in parameter space but almost flat along most others. In the extreme slop regime, $\text{cond}(G(\theta)) \rightarrow \infty$: the model responds only along a small set of “template” directions, producing nearly identical outputs for many distinct inputs.

5 Topological Realizations in Literature

In this section we demonstrate that a wide range of existing self-improvement methods—from RLHF and Constitutional AI to Self-Instruct and code agents—are specific realizations of the GVV operator. We analyze them through the lens of the Variance Inequality (Theorem 4.1), emphasizing how each architecture *shapes* the relative signal-to-noise of the Generator and Verifier. Successful schemes either exploit external structure to make verification substantially easier than generation, or use ensembles, localization, or topology reduction to improve $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ relative to $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$.

Definition 5.1 (Moduli Fibers). Let the task set T be partitioned into axes or families $\mathcal{F} = \{F_k\}$ (e.g., Sociality, Planning, Embodiment, Alignment). For each family F_k we define a *fiber* of the moduli space as the subset $\mathfrak{M}_k \subset \mathfrak{M}$ of batteries whose sampling law μ is supported entirely on F_k . Given a battery \mathcal{B} with $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq F_k$, we say an architecture is *spectrally stable on the fiber* F_k if the sufficient condition of Theorem 4.1 holds for the restriction of $F = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B}}$ to that family.

5.1 The Sociality Fiber: Adversarial Self-Play (SPIN, LSP)

The “Sociality” axis involves multi-agent interactions and zero-sum games.

Literature: *AlphaZero* [3], *Self-Play Fine-Tuning (SPIN)* [5], *Language Self-Play (LSP)* [6].

Example 5.2 (AlphaZero as a High-SNR Sociality GVV). In AlphaZero [3], a single self-play iteration on Go can be written in GVV form:

- Θ is the parameter space of the dual-head policy/value network.
- \mathcal{G} (Generator): starting from an initial board state x , the agent uses Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) guided by the current network to sample complete self-play games ω and associated move distributions (improved policies) along the visited states.
- \mathcal{V} (Verifier): after each game terminates, the environment returns a ground-truth outcome $z \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ (loss, draw, win) according to the rules of Go. This outcome is propagated back along the trajectory and combined with the MCTS policies to define an internal potential $V(x, \omega)$.
- \mathcal{U} (Updater): the network parameters are updated by stochastic gradient descent on the loss

$$\mathcal{L}(w) = (z - v_w)^2 - \pi^\top \log p_w + \lambda \|w\|^2,$$

where v_w and p_w are the value and policy outputs of the network, and π is the MCTS-improved policy.

Here the Verifier is tied directly to the discrete, noiseless rules of Go: conditioned on a final board position, the outcome z is deterministic. Thus the verification noise $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}$ is essentially zero compared to the exploration noise $\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ from MCTS, so $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V}) \gg \text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$. In the language of Theorem 4.1, AlphaZero sits in an extreme high-SNR regime on the Sociality fiber where the GVV flow yields $\kappa > 0$ without external data: capability increases purely from self-play against a perfect-rule environment.

Example 5.3 (Adversarial Self-Play (SPIN, LSP) as a GVV Instance). Consider self-play schemes where the current policy π_{θ} interacts with a reference policy $\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}$ (e.g., a frozen checkpoint). A single self-play round can be written in GVV form as follows:

- \mathcal{G} : given a prompt or game state x , the generator samples trajectories or responses $y \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot | x)$, and optionally trajectories from the reference policy $y' \sim \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\cdot | x)$ to form comparison pairs.
- \mathcal{V} : a discriminator-style Verifier computes a potential based on relative likelihood under the two policies, for instance

$$D(x, y) = \log \pi_{\theta}(y | x) - \log \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(y | x),$$

and sets $V(x, y) := D(x, y)$ (or a monotone transform). Outputs that are more likely under the current policy than under the reference receive higher scores.

- \mathcal{U} : the updater performs a policy-gradient or PPO-style update on π_θ using $V(x, y)$ as a reward or advantage signal, nudging the policy toward trajectories that are preferred by the discriminator and away from those preferred by $\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}$.

In this topology, *discrimination is easier than generation*: the Verifier solves a lower-level classification problem (distinguish π_θ from $\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}$) compared to open-ended sequence generation. Empirically this tends to yield $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}} \ll \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ and thus a higher $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$, pushing the system into the regime favored by the Variance Inequality on the Sociality fiber.

Remark 5.4 (GANs and adversarial GVV). The adversarial topology of SPIN and Language Self-Play is closely related to that of Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs). In a standard GAN, the generator G and discriminator D can be viewed as an instance of the GVV decomposition:

- \mathcal{G} corresponds to G , which produces samples ω from a latent prior;
- \mathcal{V} corresponds to the discriminator D , which learns a potential $V(\omega) = \log D(\omega)$ (or related logits) to distinguish the generator’s distribution from a target data distribution;
- \mathcal{U} executes alternating gradient steps on G and D in a minimax game.

Self-play methods such as SPIN adapt this adversarial pattern by replacing the external “real data” distribution with the agent’s own historical policy π_{old} . The discriminator is then trained to distinguish trajectories generated by the current policy π_θ from those generated by π_{old} , and its output defines the internal potential V used by \mathcal{V} . This makes explicit that adversarial self-play is a *GAN-like* GVV where discrimination is structurally easier than generation, thereby increasing $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ relative to $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$ on the Sociality fiber.

5.2 The Planning Fiber: Reasoning and Search

Literature: *STaR* [4], *Let’s Verify Step by Step* [14].

Example 5.5 (Reasoning Bootstrapping (STaR) as a GVV Instance). Consider the STaR framework [4]:

- \mathcal{G} samples rationales (chain-of-thought) τ ending in an answer a .
- \mathcal{V} acts as a deterministic filter based on the ground truth y^* : only traces with $a = y^*$ are retained.
- \mathcal{U} performs supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on the filtered traces.

In this topology \mathcal{V} is effectively noise-free: conditioned on (x, y^*) the decision of whether a trace is accepted is deterministic, so $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}} \approx 0$ and $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ is very large relative to $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$. The GVV loop distills the high-cost search process (sampling many rationales) into the policy network on the Planning fiber, but is restricted to domains with ground-truth answers.

Example 5.6 (Process Supervision (PRMs) as Dense Verification). Process Reward Models (PRMs) [14] provide a complementary Planning example with *dense* feedback.

- \mathcal{G} samples multi-step traces $\omega = (s_1, \dots, s_T)$ representing intermediate reasoning steps.
- \mathcal{V} is a PRM that assigns probabilities v_t to each step s_t being valid. A natural potential is $V(\omega) = \sum_t \log v_t$, which rewards trajectories whose individual steps are locally endorsed by the model.
- \mathcal{U} updates the policy to maximize $V(\omega)$, e.g. via step-wise likelihood weighting.

By providing feedback at each intermediate step, PRMs reduce the variance of the credit assignment problem for long-horizon tasks: gradients no longer depend solely on a single terminal reward. This effectively increases $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ on the Planning fiber compared to sparse end-of-trajectory supervision.

Example 5.7 (RAG Self-Training as a Hybrid GVU). Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) systems that self-train provide a hybrid Planning/Embodied example.

- \mathcal{G} generates retrieval queries, selects documents from an external corpus, and synthesizes answers conditioned on the retrieved context.
- \mathcal{V} checks evidence-based consistency: agreement across multiple retrievals, overlap with supporting spans, or cross-model agreement in a small council, inducing a potential $V(x, y)$.
- \mathcal{U} updates the policy or retrieval index by storing high-confidence triples $(x, \text{context}, y)$ and fine-tuning or distilling a student model on them.

Here the external corpus acts as a noisy but independent source of grounding. Verification SNR depends on retrieval quality and the strength of evidence-based heuristics: better retrieval and consistency checks reduce $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$, pushing the system toward the regime where the Variance Inequality allows sustained self-improvement on information-seeking tasks.

5.3 The Embodied Fiber: Grounding via Execution

Literature: *Voyager* [11], *AutoIf* [9].

Example 5.8 (Self-debugging Code Assistant). Consider a self-debugging coding agent.

- \mathcal{G} proposes code patches y for a bug report or specification x .
- \mathcal{V} compiles and runs the code against unit tests, type-checkers, or static analyzers. The potential $V(y)$ is derived from pass/fail outcomes and possibly coverage metrics.
- \mathcal{U} adds successful patches to a training buffer or skill library and periodically fine-tunes or distills the model on this buffer.

The execution environment plays the role of a high-SNR verifier: conditioned on a fixed test suite the outcome is essentially deterministic, so $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}} \approx 0$ and $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ dominates $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$ on this fiber. The resulting GVU loop strongly favors $\kappa > 0$ by steadily enriching the agent’s code library with verified solutions.

5.4 The Recursive Fiber: Verbal Reinforcement

Literature: *Reflexion* [8], *Multiagent Debate* [10].

Mechanism: The Verifier is the model itself (or a small ensemble), prompted to critique previous outputs and suggest improvements.

Analysis: This architecture is spectrally fragile. It can satisfy the sufficient condition of the Variance Inequality only if the “Critic” interface induces a genuinely more rigorous, lower-entropy evaluation mode than the “Actor” interface, so that $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ exceeds $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{G})$ despite sharing parameters. If $\mathcal{V} \approx \mathcal{G}$ in both behavior and noise structure, then $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}} \approx \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ and the system lies near the Hallucination Barrier: the loop tends toward self-confirmation and hallucination unless additional structure (ensembles, explicit rules, external tools) is introduced. Debate-style architectures partially mitigate this by averaging across multiple agents, thereby reducing $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \approx \sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2/N$ in an ideal N -agent limit.

5.5 The Alignment Fiber: Normative Verification

Literature: *RLHF*, *Constitutional AI* [15].

Example 5.9 (RLHF as a Parametric-Verifier GVU). Standard RLHF fits naturally into the GVU template.

- \mathcal{G} : the policy π_{θ} generates traces y for prompts $x \sim \mu$.

- \mathcal{V} : a reward model $R_\phi(x, y)$, trained on human preference data, produces scores. Combined with a KL penalty to a reference policy, this yields an internal potential $V(x, y)$.
- \mathcal{U} : a PPO-style update adjusts π_θ using R_ϕ -based advantages, and optionally updates R_ϕ itself.

Here the Verifier is parametric and its SNR, $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$, depends critically on how well R_ϕ generalizes beyond the human-labeled dataset. When R_ϕ is undertrained or out-of-distribution (e.g., reward hacking), $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$ can become large and the sufficient condition of Theorem 4.1 may fail, leading to brittle or unstable improvements (small or even negative effective κ) on the Alignment fiber.

Example 5.10 (Constitutional AI as an Ensemble Verifier). In Constitutional AI and related RLAIIF methods, human feedback is replaced or augmented by AI judges guided by a written constitution.

- \mathcal{G} : a base policy model π_θ produces candidate answers y to prompts x .
- \mathcal{V} : one or more judge models evaluate (x, y) against constitutional principles (e.g., helpfulness, harmlessness, honesty). Their scores or pairwise preferences are aggregated into a potential $V(x, y)$.
- \mathcal{U} : the policy is updated by RL on these scores or by direct preference optimization on AI-judged pairs, and possibly distilled into a student model.

When multiple heterogeneous judges are used, \mathcal{V} becomes an ensemble verifier: averaging or voting across judges tends to reduce the variance of the verification signal, with $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$ decreasing roughly like $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2/N$ in an ideal N -judge regime. This improves $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ relative to a single reward model and thereby improves the local κ -slope on the Alignment fiber. In the diagonal limit where the same model acts as both actor and judge (up to prompting), additional asymmetries (stricter judge prompts, temperature settings, or diverse councils) are required to avoid the Hallucination Barrier.

5.6 Synthetic Data Bootstrapping: Diagonal GVV

Literature: *Self-Instruct* [16].

Example 5.11 (Self-Instruct as Diagonal GVV). Consider a model M_θ expanding its own training set.

- \mathcal{G}_θ : generates new instruction–response pairs (and optionally rationales) from a small seed set.
- \mathcal{V}_θ : the same model, with a different prompt, filters or ranks examples (e.g., “Is this instruction sensible?” “Is this answer correct?”), possibly with additional heuristic filters.
- \mathcal{U}_θ : fine-tunes M_θ or a student model on the filtered synthetic dataset.

This is a diagonal regime with $\mathcal{G}_\theta \approx \mathcal{V}_\theta \approx \mathcal{U}_\theta$. Generation and verification noises are tightly coupled, so $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}} \approx \sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ and the verifier inherits the generator’s biases. Unless strong external filters or grounded checks are applied, this setup lies near the Hallucination Barrier: for realistic step sizes the curvature penalty from noisy self-judgement can overwhelm the signal, and the effective κ may stagnate or drift negative, explaining why purely self-generated corpora often exhibit semantic drift.

5.7 Critic-Less Architectures: GRPO

Literature: *DeepSeek-R1* [13].

Example 5.12 (GRPO as a Variance-Reduced GVV Operator). Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) removes the learned value function (Critic) used in PPO.

- \mathcal{G} : for each input x , the policy π_θ samples a group of G traces $\{y_1, \dots, y_G\} \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | x)$.

- \mathcal{V} : computes ground-truth rewards $r_i = R(x, y_i)$ (e.g., correctness) and constructs relative advantages via group statistics

$$A_i = \frac{r_i - \mu_{\text{group}}}{\sigma_{\text{group}} + \varepsilon},$$

where μ_{group} and σ_{group} are the mean and standard deviation across the group. This defines a local potential $V(x, y_i) := A_i$.

- \mathcal{U} : maximizes a PPO-style clipped objective using A_i as advantages, without a separate value-network loss.

Remark 5.13 (Spectral Advantage of GRPO). The empirical success of GRPO can be read through the lens of the Variance Inequality (Theorem 4.1) in three ways:

1. **Validation.** In complex reasoning tasks (the Planning Fiber), the mapping from initial tokens to final correctness is highly chaotic. A parametric Critic network V_ϕ attempts to predict this value *ex ante*. Often this predictor fails to converge or hallucinates, leading to high verification noise $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}_\phi}$. By removing the Critic, GRPO ensures that $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}$ is driven only by the ground-truth reward variance, which is often lower than the error variance of a learned proxy.
2. **Mechanism.** GRPO substitutes a noisy *prediction* of value with the *empirical realization* of value over a group. By reinforcing traces relative to the group baseline (“winners vs. losers” in the current batch), it extracts a positive alignment $\rho > 0$ without requiring a value network to generalize across the entire input space \mathcal{X} .
3. **Topological Interpretation.** In our framework, GRPO is a GUV operator that computes the update vector $\dot{\theta}$ using *local batch geometry* (relative differences between co-generated traces $\{y_1, \dots, y_G\}$) rather than a global value function defined everywhere on Θ . This localization reduces $\sigma_{\mathcal{V}}^2$ analytically (roughly by a factor $1/G$ under mild assumptions) and thus improves $\text{SNR}(\mathcal{V})$ in the sense of Theorem 4.1.

6 Operationalization

To measure κ in practice, we propose a differential evaluation protocol.

1. Fix a base agent θ_0 and a battery \mathcal{B} .
2. Allocate a "compute budget" R (e.g., 10^9 tokens of self-play).
3. Execute the GUV operator $\theta_{i+1} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{GUV}}(\theta_i)$ until cost R is consumed.
4. Measure $\Delta\Phi = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(\theta_R)) - \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\rho_{\mathcal{B}}(\theta_0))$.
5. The empirical self-improvement rate is $\hat{\kappa} = \Delta\Phi/R$.

This metric separates "knowledge" (static score) from "autonomy" (derivative). An AGI candidate must demonstrate $\hat{\kappa} > 0$ across the entire moduli space, not just on Math fibers.

7 Conclusion

We have provided a unified theory of autonomous self-improvement. By viewing the agent as a flow ν_r on the moduli space of batteries, we identified the GUV operator as the infinitesimal generator of this flow.

The Variance Inequality (Theorem 4.1) provides a spectral constraint on AGI architectures: in our framework, capability cannot be bootstrapped from noise unless the alignment ρ , step size, curvature, and the joint SNRs of generation and verification fall into a favorable regime. In practice, many successful self-play architectures achieve this by arranging for verification to be spectrally easier (that is, higher effective SNR) than generation.

The literature on Self-Play (SPIN), Reasoning Bootstrapping (STaR), and Reflexion are not distinct algorithms, but topological variations of the same GVU operator acting on different fibers of the moduli space. Achieving true AGI corresponds to closing the loop: constructing a Verifier \mathcal{V} that is universally robust ($\rho \approx 1$) across the entire moduli space, allowing $\kappa > 0$ to be sustained indefinitely.

References

- [1] P. Chojek. An Operational Kardashev-Style Scale for Autonomous AI - Towards AGI and Superintelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.13411*.
- [2] P. Chojek. Psychometric Tests for AI Agents and Their Moduli Space. *arXiv preprint*, 2025.
- [3] D. Silver et al. Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 550(7676):354–359, 2017.
- [4] E. Zelikman, Y. Wu, J. Mu, and N. Goodman. STaR: Bootstrapping Reasoning With Reasoning. *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [5] Z. Chen et al. Self-Play Fine-Tuning Converts Weak Language Models to Strong Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01335*, 2024.
- [6] H. Hritu et al. Language Self-Play For Data-Free Training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.07414*, 2025.
- [7] Y. Yang et al. SPELL: Self-Play Reinforcement Learning for evolving Long-Context Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23863*, 2025.
- [8] N. Shinn, B. Labash, and A. Gopinath. Reflexion: Language Agents with Verbal Reinforcement Learning. *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [9] H. Dong et al. Self-play with Execution Feedback: Improving Instruction-following Capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13542*, 2024.
- [10] Y. Du et al. Improving Factuality and Reasoning in Language Models with Multiagent Debate. *ICML*, 2023.
- [11] G. Wang et al. Voyager: An Open-Ended Embodied Agent with Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- [12] Q. Xu et al. On the Trajectory of Self-Improvement in Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [13] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [14] Lightman et al. Let’s Verify Step by Step. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [15] Bai et al. Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI Feedback. *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [16] Wang et al. Self-Instruct: Aligning Language Models with Self-Generated Instructions. *ACL*, 2023.