

Taming the Tail: Stable LLM Reinforcement Learning via Dynamic Vocabulary Pruning*

Yingru Li, Jiawei Xu, Jiakai Liu, Yuxuan Tong, Ziniu Li,
Tianle Cai, Ge Zhang, Qian Liu, Baoxiang Wang

Abstract

Reinforcement learning for large language models (LLMs) faces a fundamental tension: high-throughput inference engines and numerically-precise training systems produce different probability distributions from the same parameters, creating a training-inference mismatch. We prove this mismatch has an asymmetric effect: the bound on log-probability mismatch scales as $(1 - p)$ where p is the token probability. For high-probability tokens, this bound vanishes, contributing negligibly to sequence-level mismatch. For low-probability tokens in the tail, the bound remains large, and moreover, when sampled, these tokens exhibit systematically biased mismatches that accumulate over sequences, destabilizing gradient estimation. Rather than applying post-hoc corrections, we propose constraining the RL objective to a dynamically-pruned “safe” vocabulary that excludes the extreme tail. By pruning such tokens, we trade large, systematically biased mismatches for a small, bounded optimization bias. Empirically, our method achieves stable training; theoretically, we bound the optimization bias introduced by vocabulary pruning.

1 Introduction

1.1 The Speed-Stability Dilemma

Reinforcement learning has emerged as a key technique for training large language models on complex reasoning and multi-turn agentic tasks, where outcome-based rewards provide the primary learning signal. However, applying RL to LLMs at scale faces a critical computational bottleneck: *rollout generation*. Producing the large number of sample trajectories needed to estimate policy gradients requires high throughput. Modern inference engines (e.g., vLLM [4], SGLang [8]) achieve this through aggressive optimizations including paged attention, low-precision KV-cache (INT8/FP8), and fused CUDA kernels—all designed to maximize tokens per second.

Meanwhile, training systems (e.g., FSDP, Megatron-LM) must prioritize numerical stability and gradient precision, typically operating at higher precision (FP32 or mixed precision with careful accumulation). This creates a **training-inference mismatch**: the inference policy $\pi_{\theta}^{\text{infer}}$ used to sample trajectories differs subtly but systematically from the training policy $\pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}$ used to compute gradients.

One might propose enforcing identical computations across both systems. However, this defeats the purpose of using a high-speed inference engine, potentially reducing throughput by orders of magnitude. The speed-versus-consistency tradeoff appears fundamental: as inference engines become faster through more aggressive optimization, this gap will only widen. Training instability is therefore not a transient implementation bug but a persistent challenge inherent to the modern LLM-RL stack.

*First version: September 8, 2025

1.2 Our Approach: Objective Redesign over Reactive Patching

This work takes a principled stance: we view training instability not as a technical bug requiring reactive correction, but as a symptom of a poorly-specified learning objective. Specifically, any objective requiring accurate gradient estimation over the extremely low-probability tail of a 100,000+ token vocabulary is fragile because the log-probability mismatch bound does not shrink for low-probability tokens as it does for high-probability tokens.

We propose a different approach: redesign the learning objective itself to operate only over a dynamically-pruned “safe” vocabulary at each generation step. This achieves stability by excluding the problematic tail from the objective, rather than applying reactive patches or ad-hoc clipping after the fact.

1.3 Contributions

Our work makes three primary contributions:

1. **Rigorous diagnosis:** We characterize the mathematical structure of instability in off-policy gradient estimation for LLMs. We prove that vulnerability is asymmetric—the log-probability mismatch bound scales as $(1 - p)$, vanishing for high-probability tokens but remaining significant for low-probability tokens. Moreover, we show that sampled low-probability tokens have systematically biased mismatches that accumulate over sequences (Section 3).
2. **Principled solution:** We propose dynamic vocabulary pruning using min-p filtering [6] to define constrained policies. This addresses the source of instability at the objective level rather than through post-hoc corrections (Section 4).
3. **Empirical validation:** We demonstrate that our method achieves stable training and significant performance improvements on mathematical reasoning tasks (Section 5).

2 Preliminaries

We formalize autoregressive text generation as a Markov Decision Process (MDP).

Definition 2.1 (LLM Generation MDP). *The generation process is defined by:*

- **State:** $s_t = [x; y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}]$ is the prompt x concatenated with tokens generated so far.
- **Action:** $a \in \mathcal{V}$ is a token from the vocabulary.
- **Policy:** $\pi_\theta(a|s_t)$ is the LLM’s next-token distribution.
- **Trajectory:** $y = (y_1, \dots, y_T)$ is a complete generation.
- **Reward:** $R(x, y) \in \{0, 1\}$ is typically the correctness of the solution, applicable to both single-turn reasoning and multi-turn agentic tasks.

Standard RL objective. The goal is to maximize expected reward:

$$J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta} [R(x, y)]. \quad (1)$$

Policy gradient. The gradient is:

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(y|x) \cdot R(x, y)], \quad (2)$$

where $\log \pi_\theta(y|x) = \sum_{t=1}^T \log \pi_\theta(y_t|s_t)$ by the chain rule. The challenge arises when we must sample from one policy but compute gradients with respect to another—the off-policy setting underlying the training-inference mismatch.

3 Diagnosis: The Fundamental Instability

Training instability in LLM reinforcement learning has deep mathematical roots. We diagnose this instability by analyzing the training-inference mismatch scenario.

3.1 The Training-Inference Mismatch

We have two policies sharing parameters θ but differing in computational implementation:

- $\pi_\theta^{\text{train}}$: The training policy (high precision, used for gradients).
- $\pi_\theta^{\text{infer}}$: The inference policy (high speed, used for sampling).

The ideal gradient uses $\pi_\theta^{\text{train}}$ for both sampling and gradient computation. In practice, we sample from $\pi_\theta^{\text{infer}}$ but compute gradients using $\pi_\theta^{\text{train}}$, introducing bias.

Theorem 3.1 (Gradient Bias from Mismatch). *Let $g = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta^{\text{train}}} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta^{\text{train}}(y|x) \cdot R(x, y)]$ be the ideal gradient and $g' = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta^{\text{infer}}} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta^{\text{train}}(y|x) \cdot R(x, y)]$ the practical gradient. The bias $b = g' - g$ satisfies:*

$$b = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_\theta^{\text{train}}} [(\exp(-\Delta_y) - 1) \cdot \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta^{\text{train}}(y|x) \cdot R(x, y)], \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta_y = \log \pi_\theta^{\text{train}}(y|x) - \log \pi_\theta^{\text{infer}}(y|x)$ is the sequence-level log-probability mismatch.

Proof in Appendix A.1. The key observation: the bias magnitude is governed by $\exp(-\Delta_y) = \pi_\theta^{\text{infer}}(y)/\pi_\theta^{\text{train}}(y)$, the ratio of sequence probabilities. When Δ_y becomes large and negative (meaning $\pi_\theta^{\text{infer}}(y) \gg \pi_\theta^{\text{train}}(y)$), this ratio explodes. While importance sampling can correct for this distributional shift, doing so requires weighting samples by $\pi_\theta^{\text{train}}(y)/\pi_\theta^{\text{infer}}(y)$ —the inverse ratio—which becomes vanishingly small for the same problematic trajectories, causing high variance. Either way, large probability ratios destabilize gradient estimation.

3.2 Modeling the Mismatch: Logit Perturbations

To analyze *which* tokens are vulnerable, we must understand how the training-inference mismatch manifests at the token level. Even with identical parameters θ , the two systems produce different logits due to a fundamental property of floating-point arithmetic: **non-associativity**. We have $(a \oplus b) \oplus c \neq a \oplus (b \oplus c)$ in finite precision, so different computation orders yield different results [3].

In practice, inference engines (vLLM [4], SGLang [8]) and training frameworks (Megatron-LM, FSDP) differ in multiple ways: (1) *attention implementations*—PagedAttention [4] vs. FlashAttention-2 [2] use different reduction orders for the softmax denominator $\sum_j \exp(q \cdot k_j / \sqrt{d})$; (2) *numerical precision*—FP8/INT8 KV-cache quantization vs. BF16/FP32 accumulation; (3) *operator fusion*—different kernel boundaries change intermediate rounding. We model the aggregate effect as:

$$\mathbf{z}^{\text{infer}} = \mathbf{z}^{\text{train}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad \text{where } \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{|\mathcal{V}|}) \quad (4)$$

represents the perturbation vector. Since these numerical errors arise from bounded-precision arithmetic, the perturbations satisfy $|\varepsilon_k| \leq \epsilon_{\text{max}}$ for some small ϵ_{max} .

3.3 Asymmetric Vulnerability

With this perturbation model, we can now characterize which tokens are most vulnerable. Crucially, vulnerability is not uniform across the vocabulary.

Proposition 3.2 (Asymmetric Vulnerability). *Under the logit perturbation model $\mathbf{z}^{infer} = \mathbf{z}^{train} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ with $|\varepsilon_k| \leq \epsilon_{\max}$, the token-level log-probability mismatch satisfies:*

$$|\Delta_a| \leq 2\epsilon_{\max}(1 - p_a), \quad (5)$$

where $p_a = \pi_{\theta}^{train}(a|s)$ is the training policy probability.

Proof in Appendix A.2. This reveals the asymmetric structure: **high-probability tokens** ($p_a \rightarrow 1$) have $(1 - p_a) \rightarrow 0$, so the bound vanishes; **low-probability tokens** ($p_a \rightarrow 0$) have $(1 - p_a) \approx 1$, so the bound remains at its maximum value $2\epsilon_{\max}$.

To understand the *typical* magnitude of mismatch (not just the worst case), we model the perturbations as i.i.d. with mean zero and variance σ^2 .

Proposition 3.3 (Signature of Failure). *Under the perturbation model with $\varepsilon_k \stackrel{iid}{\sim} (0, \sigma^2)$, given that action a is sampled from π_{θ}^{infer} , the mode of the mismatch $\Delta'_a = -\Delta_a$ is approximately:*

$$\text{Mode}[\Delta'_a \mid a \text{ sampled}] \approx \sigma^2 \left[(1 - p_a)(1 - p'_a) + \sum_{k \neq a} p_k p'_k \right], \quad (6)$$

where $p_a = \pi_{\theta}^{train}(a|s)$ and $p'_a = \pi_{\theta}^{infer}(a|s)$.

Proof in Appendix A.3. For high-probability tokens, the mode is near zero (benign mismatch). For low-probability tokens, the mode is strictly positive, implying the probability ratio $\pi_{\theta}^{infer}/\pi_{\theta}^{train}$ is systematically inflated. This theoretical prediction aligns with prior empirical observations: Liu et al. [5] found that sampled low-probability tokens exhibit $\pi_{\theta}^{infer} \gg \pi_{\theta}^{train}$ in practice, contributing to training collapse.

3.4 Summary

The diagnosis is clear: (1) the vocabulary tail is a region of high instability risk; (2) vulnerability is asymmetric—the mismatch bound vanishes for high-probability tokens but remains at $2\epsilon_{\max}$ for low-probability tokens; (3) when a low-probability token is sampled, the token-level mismatch Δ_a tends to be negative (Proposition 3.3), meaning $\pi_{\theta}^{infer}(a|s) \gg \pi_{\theta}^{train}(a|s)$. Crucially, these per-token mismatches accumulate over sequences: $\Delta_y = \sum_t \Delta_{y_t}$. Sequences containing many low-probability tokens therefore have systematically negative Δ_y , leading to large sequence-level probability ratios $\exp(-\Delta_y) \gg 1$. This motivates a solution that excludes the tail from the learning objective.

4 Solution: Constrained Optimization via Vocabulary Pruning

We pursue objective redesign over reactive patching: constrain the learning objective to a dynamically-pruned “safe” vocabulary.

4.1 Dynamic Vocabulary Pruning via Min-P Filtering

Min-p sampling [6] retains tokens whose probability exceeds a fraction ρ of the maximum probability. We adapt this for defining safe action sets.

Definition 4.1 (Min-P Safe Action Sets). *Given threshold $\rho \in (0, 1]$, the safe action sets are:*

$$\mathcal{V}_S(s) = \left\{ a \in \mathcal{V} : \pi_{\theta}^{train}(a|s) \geq \rho \cdot \max_k \pi_{\theta}^{train}(k|s) \right\}, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{V}'_S(s) = \left\{ a \in \mathcal{V} : \pi_{\theta}^{infer}(a|s) \geq \rho \cdot \max_k \pi_{\theta}^{infer}(k|s) \right\}. \quad (8)$$

The threshold ρ is typically extremely small (e.g., $\rho = e^{-13} \approx 2.3 \times 10^{-6}$), retaining a broad set of plausible tokens while pruning only the extreme tail.

4.2 Constrained Policies and Objective

Definition 4.2 (Min-P Constrained Policies). *The constrained policies are:*

$$\pi_{mp}^{train}(a|s) = \frac{\pi_{\theta}^{train}(a|s)}{Z_{\theta}(s)} \cdot \mathbf{1}[a \in \mathcal{V}_S(s)], \quad (9)$$

$$\pi_{mp}^{infer}(a|s) = \frac{\pi_{\theta}^{infer}(a|s)}{Z'_{\theta}(s)} \cdot \mathbf{1}[a \in \mathcal{V}'_S(s)], \quad (10)$$

where $Z_{\theta}(s) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_S(s)} \pi_{\theta}^{train}(k|s)$ and $Z'_{\theta}(s) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}'_S(s)} \pi_{\theta}^{infer}(k|s)$.

Our constrained RL objective is $J_{mp}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{mp}^{train}}[R(x, y)]$ —a *different objective* from $J(\theta)$ that avoids the unstable tail by design.

4.3 The Stable Gradient Estimator

Theorem 4.3 (Constrained Gradient Estimator). *When sampling $y \sim \pi_{mp}^{infer}$, an estimator of $\nabla_{\theta} J_{mp}(\theta)$ is:*

$$\hat{g}_{mp} = \frac{\pi_{mp}^{train}(y|x)}{\pi_{mp}^{infer}(y|x)} \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{mp}^{train}(y|x) \cdot R(x, y), \quad (11)$$

well-defined whenever $y_t \in \mathcal{V}_S(s_t)$ for all t .

Remark 4.4 (Support Condition). *When $y_t \in \mathcal{V}'_S(s_t)$ but $y_t \notin \mathcal{V}_S(s_t)$, the probability ratio $\pi_{mp}^{train}/\pi_{mp}^{infer}$ is zero—no bias, just wasted samples. The converse case (bias-inducing) is rare: by Proposition 3.2, high-probability tokens have small $|\Delta_a|$, so $\pi_{\theta}^{train}(a|s) \approx \pi_{\theta}^{infer}(a|s)$, ensuring $\mathcal{V}_S(s) \approx \mathcal{V}'_S(s)$ for tokens that matter.*

Remark 4.5 (Fixed Safe Sets in Gradient Computation). *We treat $\mathcal{V}_S(s)$ as fixed during back-propagation (via `torch.no_grad()`), a standard approximation that introduces negligible error. See Appendix C for implementation details.*

4.4 Why It Works: Avoiding Systematic Bias

By constraining the objective to J_{mp} instead of J , we trade a small optimization bias for stable gradient estimation. The key benefit of vocabulary pruning is that it excludes tokens where the mismatch Δ_a is systematically biased. By Proposition 3.3, when a low-probability token is sampled from π_{θ}^{infer} , the mismatch Δ_a tends to be negative, meaning $\pi_{\theta}^{infer}(a|s) \gg \pi_{\theta}^{train}(a|s)$. These systematically negative mismatches accumulate over sequences: if many tokens have $\Delta_{y_t} < 0$, then $\Delta_y = \sum_t \Delta_{y_t} \ll 0$, causing $\exp(-\Delta_y) \gg 1$. By excluding the extreme tail, we avoid sampling tokens with systematically biased mismatches, preventing this accumulation.

The optimization bias is bounded (proof in Appendix B):

$$|J_{mp}(\theta) - J(\theta)| \leq R_{\max} \cdot T \cdot (1 - Z_{\min}), \quad (12)$$

where $Z_{\min} = \min_s Z_{\theta}(s)$ is the minimum retained probability mass. With $\rho = e^{-13}$, we have $Z_{\theta}(s) \approx 1$ in nearly all contexts, making the optimization bias negligible.

5 Experiments

We evaluate **Dynamic Vocabulary Pruning (DVP)** on the mathematical reasoning task, employing the RLOO [1] as the base algorithm. For our experimental setup, we utilize the filtered DAPO dataset¹ for training and assess performance on the AIME25. We conduct full

¹https://huggingface.co/datasets/Jiawei415/DPA0_filter/tree/main/train

on-policy training using the Qwen3-14B-Base, with both the rollout batch size and mini-update size set to 32. The maximum response length is 16,384, and the group size is 16. For our DVP, we employ a min-p threshold of $\rho = e^{-13}$. For importance sampling, we adopt token-level Truncated Importance Sampling (TIS) [7] and Masked Importance Sampling (MIS) [5]. To mitigate variance and ensure reproducibility, we report avg@16 scores in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Training-Inference PPL Gap (Left) and AIME25 scores (Right) across training steps.

As shown in Figure 1, naive RLOO suffers from early collapse due to a massive training-inference PPL gap. While TIS attempts to mitigate this instability, it still exhibits a substantial PPL gap and fails to achieve competitive results. With DVP, the PPL gap remains stable throughout training, yielding significantly higher scores. Notably, the combination of MIS and DVP achieves a **26.55% improvement** over naive RLOO’s peak performance.

6 Conclusion

We analyzed training instability in LLM reinforcement learning, showing that it arises from distributional mismatch between inference and training systems. The vulnerability is asymmetric: the log-probability mismatch bound scales as $(1 - p)$, vanishing for high-probability tokens but remaining large for low-probability tokens. Moreover, sampled low-probability tokens have systematically biased mismatches that accumulate over sequences, causing sequence-level probability ratios to grow large. Rather than applying post-hoc corrections, we propose dynamic vocabulary pruning—constraining the objective to a “safe” vocabulary that excludes the extreme tail. This avoids tokens with systematically biased mismatches at the cost of a small, bounded optimization bias. Our approach offers a principled path toward stable reinforcement learning for LLMs.

References

- [1] A. Ahmadian, C. Cremer, M. Gallé, M. Fadaee, J. Kreutzer, O. Pietquin, A. Üstün, and S. Hooker. Back to basics: Revisiting reinforce style optimization for learning from human feedback in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14740*, 2024.
- [2] T. Dao. FlashAttention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08691*, 2023.

- [3] H. He and Thinking Machines Lab. Defeating nondeterminism in LLM inference. *Thinking Machines Lab: Connectionism*, 2025. <https://thinkingmachines.ai/blog/defeating-nondeterminism-in-llm-inference/>.
- [4] W. Kwon, Z. Li, S. Zhuang, Y. Sheng, L. Zheng, C. H. Yu, J. E. Gonzalez, H. Zhang, and I. Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with PagedAttention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 611–626, 2023.
- [5] J. Liu, Y. Li, Y. Fu, J. Wang, Q. Liu, and Y. Shen. When speed kills stability: Demystifying RL collapse from the training-inference mismatch, Sept. 2025. <https://richardli.xyz/rl-collapse>.
- [6] N. N. Minh, A. Baker, C. Neo, A. G. Roush, A. Kirsch, and R. Shwartz-Ziv. Turning up the heat: Min-p sampling for creative and coherent LLM outputs. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [7] F. Yao, L. Liu, D. Zhang, C. Dong, J. Shang, and J. Gao. Your efficient rl framework secretly brings you off-policy rl training, Aug. 2025. <https://fengyao.notion.site/off-policy-rl>.
- [8] L. Zheng, L. Yin, Z. Xie, C. Sun, J. Huang, C. H. Yu, S. Cao, C. Kober, Y. Sheng, J. E. Gonzalez, I. Stoica, and H. Zhang. SGLang: Efficient execution of structured language model programs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07104*, 2024.

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1: Gradient Bias

Proof. Transform g' by importance sampling:

$$g' = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\theta}^{\text{infer}}} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(y|x) \cdot R(x, y)] \quad (13)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}} \left[\frac{\pi_{\theta}^{\text{infer}}(y|x)}{\pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(y|x)} \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(y|x) \cdot R(x, y) \right] \quad (14)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}} [\exp(-\Delta_y) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(y|x) \cdot R(x, y)]. \quad (15)$$

Thus $b = g' - g = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}} [(\exp(-\Delta_y) - 1) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(y|x) \cdot R(x, y)]$. \square

A.2 Proof of Proposition 3.2: Asymmetric Vulnerability

Proof. Let $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z} + \varepsilon$ be perturbed logits with $|\varepsilon_k| \leq \epsilon_{\max}$. Define $f_a(\mathbf{z}) = \log \text{softmax}(\mathbf{z})_a = z_a - \log \sum_j e^{z_j}$.

By the Mean Value Theorem: $\Delta_a = f_a(\mathbf{z}) - f_a(\mathbf{z}') = -\nabla f_a(\mathbf{z}_c) \cdot \varepsilon$ for some \mathbf{z}_c .

The gradient is $\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial z_k} = \delta_{ak} - p_k(\mathbf{z}_c)$. Therefore:

$$-\Delta_a = (1 - p_a(\mathbf{z}_c))\varepsilon_a - \sum_{k \neq a} p_k(\mathbf{z}_c)\varepsilon_k. \quad (16)$$

By the triangle inequality:

$$|\Delta_a| \leq \epsilon_{\max} \left[(1 - p_a(\mathbf{z}_c)) + \sum_{k \neq a} p_k(\mathbf{z}_c) \right] = 2\epsilon_{\max}(1 - p_a(\mathbf{z}_c)). \quad (17)$$

\square

A.3 Proof of Proposition 3.3: Signature of Failure

Proof. Let E_a denote “action a sampled from $\pi_{\theta}^{\text{infer}}$.” Using Bayes’ theorem with Gaussian prior on perturbations:

$$\log P(\varepsilon|E_a) = (z_a + \varepsilon_a) - \log \sum_j e^{z_j + \varepsilon_j} - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_j \varepsilon_j^2 + \text{const}. \quad (18)$$

Setting derivatives to zero: $\varepsilon_k^* = \sigma^2(\delta_{ak} - p'_k)$.

Substituting into $\Delta'_a = -\Delta_a \approx (1 - p_a)\varepsilon_a - \sum_{k \neq a} p_k \varepsilon_k$:

$$\text{Mode}[\Delta'_a|E_a] = \sigma^2 \left[(1 - p_a)(1 - p'_a) + \sum_{k \neq a} p_k p'_k \right]. \quad (19)$$

\square

B Bias-Variance Analysis Details

B.1 Contrastive Gradient Form

Proposition B.1 (Contrastive Gradient Decomposition). *For $a \in \mathcal{V}_S(s)$:*

$$\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{mp}^{\text{train}}(a|s) = \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(a|s) - \mathbb{E}_{k \sim \pi_{mp}^{\text{train}}} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(k|s)]. \quad (20)$$

Proof. From $\log \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(a|s) = \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(a|s) - \log Z_{\theta}(s)$:

$$\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(a|s) = \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(a|s) - \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_S} \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(k|s) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(k|s)}{Z_{\theta}(s)} \quad (21)$$

$$= \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(a|s) - \mathbb{E}_{k \sim \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(k|s)]. \quad (22)$$

□

Expressing in terms of logits z_a : both standard and constrained gradients have the form $\nabla_{\theta} z_a - b$, where the baseline b is an expectation over the respective distribution. The constrained baseline is focused on relevant tokens rather than diluted across 100,000+ tail tokens.

B.2 Proof of Bias Bound

Proof. By total variation bounds: $|\mathbb{E}_P[f] - \mathbb{E}_Q[f]| \leq \|f\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{TV}(P, Q)$.

For trajectory distributions: $\text{TV}(\pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}, \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{s_t} [\text{TV}(\pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(\cdot|s_t), \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(\cdot|s_t))]$.

For a single step:

$$\text{TV}(\pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(\cdot|s), \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(\cdot|s)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_a |\pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(a|s) - \pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(a|s)| \quad (23)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} [(1 - Z_{\theta}(s)) + (1 - Z_{\theta}(s))] = 1 - Z_{\theta}(s). \quad (24)$$

Thus $|J_{\text{mp}} - J| \leq R_{\text{max}} \cdot \sum_t \mathbb{E}_{s_t} [1 - Z_{\theta}(s_t)] \leq R_{\text{max}} \cdot T \cdot (1 - Z_{\text{min}})$. □

C Implementation Details

C.1 Logit Masking

The constrained policy $\pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}$ involves selecting the safe set $\mathcal{V}_S(s)$, a non-differentiable operation. We show that simple logit masking correctly implements the required gradient.

Define masked logits:

$$z_{\text{mp},k} = \begin{cases} z_k & \text{if } k \in \mathcal{V}_S(s) \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (25)$$

Proposition C.1 (Masked Logit Correctness). *For all $a \in \mathcal{V}_S(s)$:*

1. $\text{softmax}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{mp}})_a = \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(a|s)$.
2. $\nabla_{\theta} \log(\text{softmax}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{mp}})_a) = \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(a|s)$, treating $\mathcal{V}_S(s)$ as fixed.

Proof. Part 1 (Policy equivalence):

$$\text{softmax}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{mp}})_a = \frac{e^{z_{\text{mp},a}}}{\sum_j e^{z_{\text{mp},j}}} \quad (26)$$

$$= \frac{e^{z_a}}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_S(s)} e^{z_k} + \sum_{l \notin \mathcal{V}_S(s)} e^{-\infty}} \quad (27)$$

$$= \frac{e^{z_a}}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_S(s)} e^{z_k}} = \frac{\pi_{\theta}^{\text{train}}(a|s)}{Z_{\theta}(s)} = \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(a|s). \quad (28)$$

Part 2 (Gradient equivalence): Treating $\mathcal{V}_S(s)$ as fixed, the gradient of log-softmax is $\nabla_{\theta} z_a - \mathbb{E}_{k \sim \text{softmax}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{mp}})} [\nabla_{\theta} z_k]$. Since $\text{softmax}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{mp}}) = \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}$, this equals $\nabla_{\theta} z_a - \mathbb{E}_{k \sim \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}} [\nabla_{\theta} z_k] = \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(a|s)$. □

C.2 PyTorch Implementation

```
1 import math
2 import torch
3
4 def apply_minp_masking(logits, rho=math.exp(-13), mask_value=-50.0):
5     """
6     Apply min-p masking to logits.
7
8     Safe set:  $V_S(s) = \{a \mid \pi(a|s) \geq \pi_{\max}(s) * \rho\}$ 
9     Equivalent in logit space:  $\text{logit}(a) \geq \text{logit}_{\max} + \log(\rho)$ 
10
11     Args:
12         logits: Logits tensor (... , vocab_size)
13         rho: Min-p threshold (default:  $e^{-13}$ )
14         mask_value: Value for masked logits (-50.0 is safe for BF16)
15     """
16     with torch.no_grad():
17         # Safe set:  $\text{logit} \geq \text{logit}_{\max} + \log(\rho)$ 
18         threshold = logits.max(dim=-1, keepdim=True).values + math.log(rho)
19         mask = logits < threshold
20     return torch.where(mask, mask_value, logits)
```

Listing 1: Min-p masking implementation.

C.3 Key Implementation Details

1. **Mask creation in `no_grad()` context:** The selection of $V_S(s)$ happens inside `torch.no_grad()`, implementing the fixed safe set approximation (Remark 4.5).
2. **Logit-space threshold:** We compute the threshold as $z_{\max} + \log(\rho)$ to avoid numerical issues with small probabilities.
3. **Mask value:** The mask value -50.0 is effectively zero after softmax but avoids NaN gradients in mixed-precision (BF16) training.
4. **Gradient-safe masking:** We use `torch.where` instead of in-place `masked_fill_` for a cleaner computation graph.
5. **Importance weight computation:** The ratio $\pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{train}}(y)/\pi_{\text{mp}}^{\text{infer}}(y)$ is computed by getting log-probabilities from both training and inference systems and exponentiating their difference.

C.4 Choice of ρ

The threshold ρ controls the bias-variance tradeoff:

- **Larger ρ :** More aggressive pruning, smaller safe set, lower variance but higher bias.
- **Smaller ρ :** Less aggressive pruning, larger safe set, lower bias but less variance reduction.

In our experiments, we use $\rho = e^{-13} \approx 2.26 \times 10^{-6}$, which prunes the extreme tail while retaining sufficient diversity for mathematical reasoning.