

Understanding Parameter Sharing in Transformers

Ye Lin¹, Mingxuan Wang², Zhexi Zhang², Xiaohui Wang², Tong Xiao^{1,3}, Jingbo Zhu^{1,3}

¹NLP Lab, School of Computer Science and Engineering,

Northeastern University, Shenyang, China

²ByteDance

³NiuTrans Research, Shenyang, China

{linye2015}@outlook.com

{wangxiaohui.ne, zhangzhexi, wangmingxuan.89}@bytedance.com

{xiaotong, zhujingbo}@mail.neu.edu.cn

Abstract

Parameter sharing has proven to be a parameter-efficient approach. Previous work on Transformers has focused on sharing parameters in different layers, which can improve the performance of models with limited parameters by increasing model depth. In this paper, we study why this approach works from two perspectives. First, increasing model depth makes the model more complex, and we hypothesize that the reason is related to **model complexity** (referring to FLOPs). Secondly, since each shared parameter will participate in the network computation several times in forward propagation, its corresponding gradient will have a different range of values from the original model, which will affect the model convergence. Based on this, we hypothesize that **training convergence** may also be one of the reasons. Through further analysis, we show that the success of this approach can be largely attributed to better convergence, with only a small part due to the increased model complexity. Inspired by this, we tune the training hyperparameters related to model convergence in a targeted manner. Experiments on 8 machine translation tasks show that our model achieves competitive performance with only half the model complexity of parameter sharing models.

1 Introduction

As a simple and effective strategy in parameter-efficient research, parameter sharing has been extensively studied in recent years (Ullrich et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2019; Hao et al., 2019; Dabre and Fujita, 2021). Previous work on Transformer has focused on sharing parameters along model depth for better performance with limited parameters (Dehghani et al., 2019; Li and Li, 2021; Takase and Kiyono, 2021; Lan et al., 2020).

While sharing parameters to stack more layers achieves better performance than not sharing, there hasn't been a clear explanation of why it works. In this paper, we hypothesize that the reason may




Figure 1: Comparison of different parameter sharing methods (Different colors denote parameters from different sources. \oplus denotes the average/concatenation operation when sharing in branches/matrices.).

come from two perspectives: 1) model complexity and 2) training convergence. First, to explore the impact of complex structures on performance, we propose increasing model complexity by sharing parameters in two other dimensions: model branches and weight matrices. The comparison of these three structures can be seen in Fig. 1. Experiments in Section 3 show that all three models can achieve better performance than models without parameter sharing, which shows that model complexity does have a positive impact on performance with limited performance. However, so far, we have not been able to quantify the impact of model complexity, because the above experiments will affect both model complexity and convergence.

Through further analysis in Section 4, we verify the phenomenon that the parameter sharing model converges faster and better than the original model. To achieve a similar convergence state, we tune training hyperparameters, i.e., the initial learning rate, warmup steps, training batches, and training steps, in a targeted manner. In addition, L_2 regularization is applied for training stability. Our experiments show that the simpler original model with hyperparameter tuning can achieve competi-

tive performance ($\Delta\text{BLEU} < 0.5$, the gap can be attributed to model complexity) with only half the complexity of parameter sharing models.

To summarize, our contributions are as follows:

- In this paper, we study the parameter sharing approach from two perspectives: model complexity and training convergence. We find that its success depends largely on the optimized training convergence and a small part on the increased model complexity.
- For better convergence, we tune the related training hyperparameters in a targeted manner. Our experiments on 8 WMT tasks show that the original model can achieve competitive performance against the sharing model, but with only half the model complexity.
- By tuning hyperparameters, our original Transformer model can achieve 1.00 higher BLEU points on average (e.g., a BLEU score of 28.62/29.87 of Transformer-base/big on WMT14 English-German). It inspires us that the original Transformer model still has room for improvement, and studies on efficient methods need a strong baseline.

2 Background

2.1 Transformer

In this work, we choose Transformer for study because it is one of the state-of-the-art neural networks in many sequence learning tasks (Vaswani et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2020b). The Transformer model consists of multiple stacked layers, mainly including the embedding layer, the output layer and multiple hidden layers.

The hidden layers in Transformer consist of three kinds of sublayers, including the self-attention, the cross-attention and the feed-forward network (FFN) sublayers. Both the self-attention and the cross-attention sublayers are based on the multi-head attention (MHA) mechanism. The multi-head attention takes the output of the previous sublayer as its input and computes a vector of attention scores (i.e., a distribution). Then the FFN sublayer performs a non-linear transformation on the attention scores.

All sublayers are coupled with the residual connections (He et al., 2016a), i.e., $Y = f(X) + X$, where X denotes the layer input and f could be any sublayer. Their inputs or outputs are also preprocessed by the layer normalization (Ba et al., 2016).

2.2 Parameters Sharing

Although the large Transformer model has shown its effectiveness (Vaswani et al., 2017; Baevski and Auli, 2019; Brown et al., 2020), only models with very limited parameters can be deployed on resource-limited devices (Han et al., 2016; Deng et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020). As a simple and effective approach, parameter sharing can improve the model performance under the limited parameters (Dehghani et al., 2019; Li and Li, 2021; Takase and Kiyono, 2021; Lan et al., 2020). Most research in Transformers focuses on sharing parameters along model depth, and models with parameter sharing will generally achieve better performance than those without sharing. Here we further study this approach and hypothesize its success may come from two perspectives:

- Model complexity (Section 3).
- Training convergence (Section 4).

3 Model Complexity

To explore the impact of increasing model complexity, in this section, we first propose increasing model complexity by sharing parameters in two other dimensions: model branches and weight matrices. Then, we analyze the results of sharing parameters and draw the preliminary conclusion that:

Model complexity does have a positive impact on performance in parameter sharing.

3.1 Model Structure

For sharing parameters in branches, we adopt a sublayer-level multi-branch network (Ahmed et al., 2017; Fan et al., 2020; Shazeer et al., 2017; So et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2019). We take the feed-forward sublayer for an example in Fig. 2. The original FFN applies non-linear transformation to its input X and can be denoted as:

$$\text{FFN}(X) = \text{ReLU}(XW_1 + b_1)W_2 + b_2 \quad (1)$$

where $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 4d}$, $b_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{4d}$, $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{4d \times d}$ and $b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Suppose there is a 2-layer Transformer, we share parameters from these two sublayer to the two branches in every layer (denoted by the dashed red lines with arrows in Fig. 2), and every parameter from the original model will be reused twice. To combine information from different branches,




Figure 2: Comparison of sharing parameters in branches and matrices (A running example of the feed-forward network. Different colors denote parameters from different sources. For simplicity, we omit b_1 and b_2 in Eq. 1.).

here we adopt a simple average operation. For regularization and ease of training, we place an additional normalization unit on each average operation. Such a newly constructed multi-branch feed-forward sublayer BFFN can be denoted as:

$$\text{BFFN}(X) = \text{Norm}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{FFN}_i(X)}{n}\right) \quad (2)$$

where X and Y are the input and output of the current sublayer, n is the number of branches, and $\text{FFN}_i(\cdot)$ denotes the i -th branch of the newly constructed feed-forward sublayer.

For sharing parameters in weight matrices, we concatenate parameters from different layers together to form a weight matrix with larger dimension. In the lower right corner of Fig. 2, we take W_1 in Eq. 1 for example. Let $W_1^{l_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 4d}, \dots, W_1^{l_n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 4d}$ denote weights from different layers, then the newly generated weight matrix $W_1^{\text{cat}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 8d}$ can be rewritten as:

$$W_1^{\text{cat}} = \text{Concat}(W_1^{l_1}, \dots, W_1^{l_n}) \quad (3)$$

$W_2, b_1,$ and b_2 are computed in the same way as W_1 . The newly constructed sublayer with larger matrices MFFN can be denoted as:

$$\text{MFFN}(X) = \text{ReLU}(XW_1^{\text{cat}} + b_1^{\text{cat}})W_2^{\text{cat}} + b_2^{\text{cat}} \quad (4)$$

3.2 Comparison of Different Models

To better understand the advantages and disadvantages of different models in Table 1, here we com-

Model Structure	Params	Complexity	Parallelism
Original	$O(d)$	$O(d)$	$O(1/d)$
Sharing in layers	$O(d)$	$O(nd)$	$O(1/nd)$
Sharing in branches	$O(d)$	$O(nd)$	$O(1/d)$
Sharing in matrices	$O(d)$	$O(nd)$	$O(1/d)$

Table 1: The parameters, model complexity (FLOPs) and computational parallelism of different models. d is the depth of the original model. n means that each parameter is shared n times, $n > 1$.

pare the original model with three parameter sharing models. We take the reciprocal value of the model depth to measure the computational parallelism of each model. As shown in the last three lines of Table 1, although the parameter sharing models have the same number of parameters as the original model, the model complexity will increase proportionally with shared times n . Compared to sharing parameters in layers, sharing parameters in branches and matrices can provide higher computational parallelism ($O(1/d) > O(1/nd)$) to be efficiently computed on modern GPUs, which can be also reflected in our experimental results.

3.3 Experiments in Section 3

We evaluate the experiments in Section 3 on WMT14 English-German (En-De) and English-French (En-Fr) machine translation tasks. Detailed data statistics as well as the URLs are shown in Table 3 and Appendix A. We experiment with the Transformer-base and Transformer-deep settings in Table 2. Experiments on Transformer-big

System	Depths	WMT14 En-De			WMT14 En-Fr			FLOPs	Steps	Costs
		Params	Test	Valid	Params	Test	Valid			
Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017)	6-6	213M	28.40	-	222M	41.00	-	6.27G	300K	40.00
ADMIN (Liu et al., 2020b)	60-12	262M	30.01	-	-	43.80	-	-	-	-
Depth Growing (Wu et al., 2019)	8-8	270M	29.92	-	-	43.27	-	-	-	-
MUSE (Zhao et al., 2019)	12-12	-	29.90	-	-	43.50	-	-	-	-
MAT (Fan et al., 2020)	6-6	206M	29.90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evolved Transformer (So et al., 2019)	6-6	222M	29.30	-	221M	41.30	-	-	-	-
Scaling NMT (Ott et al., 2018)	6-6	210M	29.30	-	222M	43.20	-	-	-	-
DLCL (Wang et al., 2019)	30-6	137M	29.30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Weighted (Ahmed et al., 2017)	6-6	213M	28.90	-	-	41.40	-	-	-	-
Universal (Dehghani et al., 2019)	-	-	28.90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transformer-base	6-6	63M	27.56	25.94	111M	40.72	46.80	1.81G	100K	8.68
+ SIL (Takase and Kiyono, 2021)	24-6	63M	28.27	26.70	112M	41.84	47.81	3.51G	100K	17.08
+ SIB (discussed in Section 3)	6-6	63M	28.32	26.50	112M	41.71	47.83	3.51G	100K	18.20
+ SIM (discussed in Section 3)	6-6	63M	28.32	26.70	112M	41.64	47.66	3.51G	100K	12.88
+ Tuning Hyper. (discussed in Section 4)	6-6	63M	28.62	26.67	112M	42.01	47.92	1.81G	100K	13.33
Transformer-deep-12l	12-6	83M	28.45	26.82	111M	41.48	47.88	2.38G	100K	11.76
+ SIL (Takase and Kiyono, 2021)	48-6	83M	29.13	27.11	112M	42.31	48.45	5.78G	100K	28.28
+ SIB (discussed in Section 3)	12-6	83M	28.81	26.90	112M	41.94	48.57	5.78G	100K	29.96
+ SIM (discussed in Section 3)	12-6	83M	28.86	26.92	112M	42.38	48.48	5.78G	100K	19.32
+ Tuning Hyper. (discussed in Section 4)	12-6	83M	29.49	26.97	112M	42.40	48.55	2.38G	100K	17.50

Table 2: Results of different systems on WMT14 En-De and WMT14 En-Fr (SIL: Sharing parameters in different layers; SIB: Sharing parameters in different branches; SIM: Sharing parameters in different weight matrices; Costs: Training costs that are normalized to GPU hours on a single NVIDIA Tesla V100 GPU on WMT14 En-De; FLOPs is measured on a sample with src/tgt length of 30 and 32K vocabulary.).

Lang.	Train		Test		Valid	
	Sent.	Word	Sent.	Word	Sent.	Word
En-De	4.5M	262M	3003	164K	3000	156K
En-Fr	35M	2.4G	3003	175K	26K	1.8M

Table 3: Data statistics (# of sentences and # of words).

are shown in Table 4. The standard Transformer-base and Transformer-big systems both consist of a 6-layer encoder and a 6-layer decoder. The Transformer-deep system has 12 layers. We also adopt the relative positional representation (RPR) (Shaw et al., 2018) to construct stronger baselines. All experiments are tested on the model ensemble by averaging the last 5 checkpoints.

All parameter sharing approaches are parameter-efficient. Table 2 shows the results of various Transformer benchmarks and these three sharing strategies. SIL, SIB and SIM all have significantly higher parameter efficiency compared to several state-of-the-art systems. For example, compared to the Transformer with 213M parameters (28.40), SIM obtains a similar performance (28.32) with less than 1/3 parameters (63M) on WMT14 En-De test data. With the base configuration, SIL/SIB/SIM achieves 28.27/28.32/28.32 BLEU points on En-De, which is 0.71/0.76/0.76 higher than the standard Transformer-base. Experi-

ments on Transformer-deep and Transformer-big also show similar results.

Sharing in matrices has the highest training efficiency. Among these three sharing strategies, SIM has higher computational parallelism and shows the highest training efficiency. Compared to SIL, SIM can save 24.59%/31.68% of training time on Transformer-base/12l. As for SIB, although the multi-branch network has an inherent advantage of high computational parallelism as discussed in Table 1, due to the limitations of practical computational libraries, the computational efficiency of this structure does not reach its theoretical height.

Model complexity does have a positive impact. As shown in Table 2 and Table 4, SIL, SIB, and SIM show better performance than the original model in several different settings. It reflects that, under a constant number of parameters, increasing model complexity does have a positive impact on model performance. However, due to the impact of parameter sharing on model convergence, we need further experiments to verify whether model complexity is the decisive factor.

4 Training Convergence

This section focuses on the relationship between parameter sharing, hyperparameter tuning, and train-

System	Depths	WMT14 En-De			WMT14 En-Fr			FLOPs	Steps	Costs
		Params	Test	Valid	Params	Test	Valid			
Transformer-big	6-6	213M	28.98	26.92	311M	41.95	48.26	6.27G	300K	40.00
+ SIL (Takase and Kiyono, 2021)	24-6	213M	loss-exploding \times		316M	43.22	49.91	13.06G	-	-
+ L_2 Regularization	24-6	213M	29.70	27.14	316M	43.23	49.76	13.06G	300K	80.00
+ SIB (discussed in Section 3)	6-6	213M	loss-exploding \times		316M	42.98	49.81	13.06G	-	-
+ L_2 Regularization	6-6	213M	29.50	26.94	316M	43.09	49.84	13.06G	300K	83.33
+ SIM (discussed in Section 3)	6-6	213M	loss-exploding \times		316M	loss-exploding \times		13.06G	-	-
+ L_2 Regularization	6-6	213M	29.98	26.94	316M	43.15	49.68	13.06G	300K	70.00
+ Tuning Hyper. (discussed in Section 4)	6-6	213M	loss-exploding \times		316M	loss-exploding \times		6.27G	-	-
+ L_2 Regularization	6-6	213M	29.87	27.15	316M	42.88	49.62	6.27G	240K	58.67

Table 4: Results of Transformer-big systems on WMT14 En-De and WMT14 En-Fr.




Figure 3: Loss vs. the number of epochs on En-De (learning rate:0.001; warmup:8,000; batch:4,096).

System	Depths	Params	Test	Valid
Transformer-base	6-6	63M	27.56	25.94
+ Tuning Hyper.	6-6	63M	28.62	26.67
+ SIL	24-6	63M	28.27	26.70
+ Tuning Hyper.	24-6	63M	loss-exploding \times	
+ L_2 Regular.	24-6	63M	28.69	26.75

Table 5: Results of systems in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4.

ing convergence. Experimental results show that:

The success of parameter sharing on performance depends largely on training convergence ($\Delta\text{BLEU} \approx 1.0$) and a small part on model complexity ($\Delta\text{BLEU} < 0.5$).

4.1 Parameter Sharing vs. Convergence

In the parameter sharing models, since each parameter is shared multiple times, one parameter will participate in the network computation several times in a single training step. Its corresponding gradient will accumulate larger in back propagation, so the convergence speed of the parameter sharing model is always faster than the original model under the same learning rate schedule. To verify this, we plot validation loss curves for the original baseline, SIL, SIB, and SIM to observe their convergence. As shown in Fig. 3, SIL/SIB/SIM always has a lower loss than the baseline model, and the lower loss does reflect better performance in our experiments.




Figure 4: Loss vs. the number of epochs on En-De (learning rate:0.002; warmup:16,000; batch:8,192).

4.2 Hyperparameter Tuning vs. Convergence

To achieve a similar convergence state, in this section, we tune the training hyperparameters of learning rate, warmup steps, training batches, and training steps. L_2 regularization is also applied for training stability.

Tuning hyperparameters helps the original Transformer model perform better. Inspired by Ott et al. (2018), here we adopt the larger learning rate (0.002 vs. 0.001), the larger warmup steps (16,000 vs. 8,000), and the larger batch size (8,192 tokens vs. 4,096 tokens) for all of the Transformer-base/big/deep "tuning hyperparameters" models. For Transformer-big models, we additionally adopt the L_2 regularization for stable training. For training steps, the model with hyperparameter tuning has the same or fewer steps than the original model (100K vs. 100K on Transformer-base/deep, 240K vs. 300K on Transformer-big). As shown in Fig. 4, with an optimized learning rate schedule, the original model can reach a convergence state close to that of the parameter sharing model even if the latter uses the same training hyperparameters. Results in Table 5 further verify the phenomenon in Fig. 4. Although the SIL with hyperparameter tuning ($+L_2$ regularization for training stability) can outperform the original SIL by 0.42 BLEU points, it performs about the same as the original model




Figure 5: Results on WMT17 translation tasks (The first/second row shows results on the test/validation sets.).

Lang.	Train		Valid		Test	
	sent.	word	sent.	word	sent.	word
En↔De	5.9M	276M	8171	356K	3004	128K
En↔Ru	25M	1.2B	8819	391K	3001	132K
En↔Cs	52M	1.2B	8658	354K	3005	118K

Table 6: Data statistics (# of sentences and # of words).

with hyperparameter tuning.

L_2 regularization helps to converge stably. As shown in Table 4, due to larger learning rates or sharing parameters for multiple times, the loss exploding problem will occur when parameter sharing is applied to Transformer-big models and models with hyperparameter tuning. In order to solve the above problems, this paper adopts L_2 regularization applied to weight (also called weight decay). It adds the squared magnitude of the network weights as the penalty term to the original loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda(w) = \mathcal{L}(w) + \lambda \|w\|_2^2 \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the original cross-entropy loss, λ is the penalty factor that we set to 0.02. This penalty term will encourage the network weights w to be smaller. Experiments in Table 4 show that with the L_2 penalty, all experiments can converge stably.

4.3 Experiments in Section 4

For more convincing experiments, besides WMT14 En-De and WMT14 En-Fr, we additionally evaluate our method on 6 WMT17 tasks in Fig. 5. We use *newstest2017* as the test set and use the concatenation of all available preprocessed validation

sets as the validation set for all WMT17 datasets. Detailed data statistics as well as the URLs are shown in Table 6 and Appendix A.

The success of parameter sharing depends largely on the optimized training convergence. All Transformer-base/deep/big experiments in Table 2, Table 4 and Fig. 5 show that, compared to SIL, SIB, and SIM, models with hyperparameters tuning can also achieve competitive performance. On some tasks, there is still a small gap between the results of hyperparameter tuning and parameter sharing ($\Delta\text{BLEU} < 0.5$), such as Cs→En in Fig. 5. This performance gap can be attributed to model complexity as discussed in Section 3. Combining Section 3 and Section 4, we show that the success of parameter sharing can be largely attributed to better convergence during training rather than the increased model complexity.

5 Analysis

To better understand the above conclusions, we conduct a series of analysis mainly on the WMT14 En-De dataset. For the clarity of these tables and figures, we mainly choose SIL for parameter sharing experiments.

5.1 Experiments on Smaller Models

Previous experiments have focused on parameter sharing on the encoder, which is due to the fact that the model performance is more sensitive to the encoder. Here, we shrink the model depth on both the encoder and decoder to compare the approaches of parameter sharing and hyperparameter tuning




Figure 6: Performance (BLEU) vs. training costs (measured by GPU hours) on WMT14 En-De.

System	Enc		Dec		BLEU		FLOPs	Costs
	D	S	D	S	Test	Valid		
Transformer-base	6	-	6	-	27.56	25.94	1.81G	8.68
Original-11 (25M)	1	-	1	-	21.42	20.87	0.71G	2.80
+ SIL-share2	1	2	1	2	22.01	21.34	0.93G	3.92
+ SIL-share4	1	4	1	4	19.88	18.70	1.37G	6.44
+ SIL-share6	1	6	1	6	16.20	16.78	1.81G	8.68
+ Tuning Hyper.	1	-	1	-	22.27	21.43	0.71G	5.33
Original-21 (33M)	2	-	2	-	25.05	24.14	0.93G	3.92
+ SIL-share2	2	2	2	2	25.13	23.70	1.37G	6.44
+ SIL-share4	2	4	2	4	22.69	21.55	2.25G	10.92
+ SIL-share6	2	6	2	6	19.58	18.68	3.13G	21.56
+ Tuning Hyper.	1	-	1	-	25.59	24.63	0.93G	7.67
Original-31 (40M)	3	-	3	-	25.95	25.02	1.15G	5.04
+ SIL-share2	3	2	3	2	26.03	24.30	1.81G	8.68
+ SIL-share4	3	4	3	4	23.35	22.32	3.13G	21.56
+ SIL-share6	3	6	3	6	19.18	17.99	4.46G	22.68
+ Tuning Hyper.	3	-	3	-	26.74	25.43	1.15G	9.67

Table 7: Experiments of various depths (D) of both encoder (Enc) and decoder (Dec) on WMT14 En-De. For SIL we also test the effect of different numbers for parameter sharing (S).

on smaller models. In particular, we build three smaller baselines named original-11, original-21, and original-31 of different sizes. Each baseline uses a layer 1/2/3 encoder and a layer 1/2/3 decoder, respectively. Based on the three smaller baselines, we share the encoder and decoder 2/4/6 times in SIL (named SIL-share2/4/6).

As shown in Table 7, the model with hyperparameter tuning consistently outperforms the best SIL model (SIL-share2) by 0.26~0.71 BLEU points at various model sizes and can save about $1.57\times$ FLOPs. To our surprise, SIL does not perform well on smaller models, with only SIL-share2 showing a slight improvement in performance, while SIL-share4 and SIL-share6 drop significantly. It suggests that choosing an appropriate number to share parameters is important, especially when parameters are very limited.




Figure 7: Performance (BLEU) vs. the number to share parameters on WMT14 En-De.

5.2 Training Efficiency Analysis

To compare the average training costs for each approach, Fig. 6 shows the actual runtime and the corresponding BLEU scores (The original model converges near the red circle ●, other models converge near the blue circle ◆). One can observe that although the performance of the original model ● cannot be improved as the training time increases, the original model with hyperparameter tuning ■ can achieve almost the same performance as SIL ◆. To achieve convergence, Original+Tuning Hyperparameters ■, SIL ◆, and SIL+Tuning Hyperparameters ▲ take approximately the same time, but the model complexity of the original model ● is only half that of the parameter sharing model ◆▲ (1.81G vs. 3.51G as shown in Table 2). In other words, the parameter sharing model and our model can achieve similar performance with the same training costs, but the model complexity of the latter is only half of the former.

5.3 Experiments on Sharing More Times

In Fig. 7, we further compare the best performance that can be achieved by all methods. It can be seen that as the number to share parameters increases, the performance of SIL, SIB, and SIW systems first




Figure 8: The frequency ($\times 10^5$) of BLEU score [%].

increases rapidly and then tends to stabilize or even decline. The highest point of these curves is very close to the model with hyperparameter tuning (the red dotted line above), which further validates our conclusion that the success of parameter sharing depends largely on the optimized training convergence.

5.4 Translation Analysis

The Transformer model with hyperparameter tuning always performs better than the original model in the above experiments. Here we conduct experiments to better understand this phenomenon. We first evaluate the sentence-level BLEU score¹ for each translation (3-grams), then group these translations according to their BLEU scores (in Fig. 8) or lengths (in Fig. 9). Fig. 8 shows that the model with hyperparameter tuning has more high-scoring sentences (BLEU [%]: 50+), which indicates that it does have a better translation ability. Fig. 9 shows that compared to the original model, the model with hyperparameter tuning translates better on short sentences (Length: <50). As for long sentences (Length: 50+), these two models have almost the same performance. This may be due to the fact that long sentences are usually hard ones, and these sentences are often difficult to solve even with improved models.

6 Related Work

6.1 Transformer Variants

Increasing model complexity can be a straightforward way to improve model performance. By stacking more layers, deep models have been shown to be effective in recent studies (He et al., 2016a; Zagoruyko and Komodakis, 2017; Telgarsky, 2015; Liu et al., 2020a,b). For the Transformer model, Wang et al. (2019) have studied deep encoders and successfully trained a 30-layer Transformer system. Liu et al. (2020b) train a 60-layer transformer that

¹https://www.nltk.org/_modules/nltk/translate/bleu_score.html




Figure 9: BLEU score [%] vs. translation length.

outperforms the 6-layer counterpart by 2.5 BLEU points. Wang et al. (2022) prove that the Transformer model can even be trained to 1000 layers. From another perspective, increasing the model width can also improve Transformer performance. In addition to increasing the matrix dimension like Transformer-big (Vaswani et al., 2017), the multi-branch structure widens the model by implementing multiple parallel computing threads (Ahmed et al., 2017; Fan et al., 2020).

6.2 Efficient Methods

There are several solutions to improve parameter efficiency or computational efficiency in neural networks. Among them, knowledge distillation treats predictions of the larger teacher network as learned knowledge that can be transferred to the smaller student network (Hinton et al., 2015; Freitag et al., 2017; Kim and Rush, 2016; Lin et al., 2020b). Quantization represents the model with lower-precision numbers such as 8-bit integers (Hubara et al., 2016; Micikevicius et al., 2018; Quinn and Ballesteros, 2018; Lin et al., 2020a). Our work follows another line of research called parameter sharing to help the model learn more with limited parameters (Gao et al., 2019; Ullrich et al., 2017; Dabre and Fujita, 2021; Hao et al., 2019; Takase and Kiyono, 2021).

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we study the parameter sharing approach from two perspectives: model complexity and training convergence. Experiments on 8 WMT machine translation tasks show that the success of this approach depends largely on the optimized training convergence and a small part on the increased model complexity. Inspired by this, we further tune the training hyperparameters for better convergence. With this strategy, the original model without parameter sharing can achieve competitive performance against the sharing model, but with only half the model complexity.

Limitations

Training Costs. We demonstrate that the success of the parameter sharing approach can be largely attributed to its optimization of model convergence and prove that the original model without sharing can also achieve competitive performance by tuning training hyperparameters. Compared to parameter sharing models, it can save half the model complexity to make the model easier to deploy on mobile devices. It can also save about 30% training costs. But compared to the original model, it still requires additional computational costs (the total training time is about $1.5\times$ of the original model).

More Possibilities. We analyze two factors that may play an important role in the parameter sharing approach: model complexity and training convergence. In a sense, a neural network can be seen as a black box, and it is very likely that there are other factors that we have not realized. Other factors hidden inside the black box may require a more microscopic perspective and related work on neural network visualization.

References

- Karim Ahmed, Nitish Shirish Keskar, and Richard Socher. 2017. [Weighted transformer network for machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/1711.02132.
- Lei Jimmy Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2016. [Layer normalization](#). *CoRR*, abs/1607.06450.
- Alexei Baevski and Michael Auli. 2019. [Adaptive input representations for neural language modeling](#). In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Raj Dabre and Atsushi Fujita. 2021. [Recurrent stacking of layers in neural networks: An application to neural machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2106.10002.
- Mostafa Dehghani, Stephan Gouws, Oriol Vinyals, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Lukasz Kaiser. 2019. [Universal transformers](#). In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net.
- Lei Deng, Guoqi Li, Song Han, Luping Shi, and Yuan Xie. 2020. [Model compression and hardware acceleration for neural networks: A comprehensive survey](#). *Proc. IEEE*, 108(4):485–532.
- Yang Fan, Shufang Xie, Yingce Xia, Lijun Wu, Tao Qin, Xiang-Yang Li, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. [Multi-branch attentive transformer](#). *CoRR*, abs/2006.10270.
- Markus Freitag, Yaser Al-Onaizan, and Baskaran Sankaran. 2017. [Ensemble distillation for neural machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/1702.01802.
- Shangqian Gao, Cheng Deng, and Heng Huang. 2019. [Cross domain model compression by structurally weight sharing](#). In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, pages 8973–8982. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE.
- Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J. Dally. 2016. [Deep compression: Compressing deep neural network with pruning, trained quantization and Huffman coding](#). In *4th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2016, San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 2-4, 2016, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Jie Hao, Xing Wang, Baosong Yang, Longyue Wang, Jinfeng Zhang, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2019. [Modeling recurrence for transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 1198–1207. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016a. [Deep residual learning for image recognition](#). In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2016, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 27-30, 2016*, pages 770–778. IEEE Computer Society.
- Geoffrey E. Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeffrey Dean. 2015. [Distilling the knowledge in a neural network](#). *CoRR*, abs/1503.02531.
- Itay Hubara, Matthieu Courbariaux, Daniel Soudry, Ran El-Yaniv, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016. [Binarized neural networks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, pages 4107–4115.
- Yoon Kim and Alexander M. Rush. 2016. [Sequence-level knowledge distillation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*, pages 1317–1327. The Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2020. [ALBERT: A lite BERT for self-supervised learning of language representations](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.
- GuoLiang Li and Yiyang Li. 2021. [Recurrent multiple shared layers in depth for neural machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2108.10417.
- Zhuohan Li, Eric Wallace, Sheng Shen, Kevin Lin, Kurt Keutzer, Dan Klein, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2020. [Train large, then compress: Rethinking model size for efficient training and inference of transformers](#). *CoRR*, abs/2002.11794.
- Ye Lin, Yanyang Li, Tengbo Liu, Tong Xiao, Tongran Liu, and Jingbo Zhu. 2020a. [Towards fully 8-bit integer inference for the transformer model](#). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2020*, pages 3759–3765. ijcai.org.
- Ye Lin, Yanyang Li, Ziyang Wang, Bei Li, Quan Du, Tong Xiao, and Jingbo Zhu. 2020b. [Weight distillation: Transferring the knowledge in neural network parameters](#). *CoRR*, abs/2009.09152.
- Liyuan Liu, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, Weizhu Chen, and Jiawei Han. 2020a. [Understanding the difficulty of training transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2020, Online, November 16-20, 2020*, pages 5747–5763. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaodong Liu, Kevin Duh, Liyuan Liu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020b. [Very deep transformers for neural machine translation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2008.07772.
- Paulius Micikevicius, Sharan Narang, Jonah Alben, Gregory F. Diamos, Erich Elsen, David Garcia, Boris Ginsburg, Michael Houston, Oleksii Kuchaiev, Ganesh Venkatesh, and Hao Wu. 2018. Mixed precision training. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, Alexei Baevski, Angela Fan, Sam Gross, Nathan Ng, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2019. [fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Demonstrations*, pages 48–53. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2018. [Scaling neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers, WMT 2018, Belgium, Brussels, October 31 - November 1, 2018*, pages 1–9. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jerry Quinn and Miguel Ballesteros. 2018. [Pieces of eight: 8-bit neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2018, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, June 1-6, 2018, Volume 3 (Industry Papers)*, pages 114–120.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016, August 7-12, 2016, Berlin, Germany, Volume 1: Long Papers*. The Association for Computer Linguistics.
- Peter Shaw, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Ashish Vaswani. 2018. [Self-attention with relative position representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, June 1-6, 2018, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 464–468. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc V. Le, Geoffrey E. Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2017. [Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer](#). In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- David R. So, Quoc V. Le, and Chen Liang. 2019. [The evolved transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA, volume 97 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5877–5886. PMLR.
- Sho Takase and Shun Kiyono. 2021. [Lessons on parameter sharing across layers in transformers](#). *CoRR*, abs/2104.06022.
- Matus Telgarsky. 2015. [Representation benefits of deep feedforward networks](#). *CoRR*, abs/1509.08101.
- Karen Ullrich, Edward Meeds, and Max Welling. 2017. [Soft weight-sharing for neural network compression](#). In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, 4-9 December 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008.

Hongyu Wang, Shuming Ma, Li Dong, Shaohan Huang, Dongdong Zhang, and Furu Wei. 2022. [Deepnet: Scaling transformers to 1, 000 layers](#). *CoRR*, abs/2203.00555.

Qiang Wang, Bei Li, Tong Xiao, Jingbo Zhu, Changliang Li, Derek F. Wong, and Lidia S. Chao. 2019. [Learning deep transformer models for machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, July 28- August 2, 2019, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 1810–1822. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Lijun Wu, Yiren Wang, Yingce Xia, Fei Tian, Fei Gao, Tao Qin, Jianhuang Lai, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2019. [Depth growing for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, July 28- August 2, 2019, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 5558–5563. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tong Xiao, Jingbo Zhu, Hao Zhang, and Qiang Li. 2012. [NiuTrans: An open source toolkit for phrase-based and syntax-based machine translation](#). In *The 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Proceedings of the System Demonstrations, July 10, 2012, Jeju Island, Korea*, pages 19–24. The Association for Computer Linguistics.

Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. 2017. [Diracnets: Training very deep neural networks without skip-connections](#). *CoRR*, abs/1706.00388.

Guangxiang Zhao, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, Zhiyuan Zhang, and Liangchen Luo. 2019. [MUSE: parallel multi-scale attention for sequence to sequence learning](#). *CoRR*, abs/1911.09483.

A Details of Datasets

We evaluate our experiments on 8 WMT14 and WMT17 machine translation tasks.

WMT14 tasks. We choose WMT14 English-German (En-De) and English-French (En-Fr) as the datasets for our main experiments. Detailed data statistics as well as the URLs are shown in Table 3. For the En-De task, we share the source and target vocabularies. We choose *newstest-2013* as the validation set and *newstest-2014* as the test set. For the En-Fr task, we validate the system on the combination of *newstest-2012* and *newstest-2013*, and test it on *newstest-2014*.

WMT17 tasks. For more convincing experiments, besides WMT14 En-De and WMT14 En-Fr, we additionally evaluate our method on 6 WMT17 tasks. Detailed data statistics as well as the URLs are shown in Table 6. All datasets are the official preprocessed version from WMT17 website. We

use *newstest2017* as the test set and use the concatenation of all available preprocessed validation sets as the validation set for all WMT17 datasets:

- For WMT17 En \leftrightarrow De, we use the concatenation of *newstest2014*, *newstest2015* and *newstest2016* as the validation set.
- For WMT17 En \leftrightarrow Ru, we use the concatenation of *newstest2014*, *newstest2015* and *newstest2016* as the validation set.
- For WMT17 En \leftrightarrow Cs, we use the concatenation of *newstest2014*, *newstest2015* and *newstest2016* as the validation set.

We tokenize every sentence using the script in the Moses toolkit and segment every word into subword units using Byte-Pair Encoding (Sennrich et al., 2016). BPE with 32K merge operations is applied to all these datasets. In addition, we remove sentences with more than 250 subword units (Xiao et al., 2012) and evaluate the results using multi-bleu.perl².

B Details of Model Setups

Our baseline system is based on the open-source implementation of the Transformer model presented in Ott et al. (2019)’s work. We experiment with the Transformer-base and Transformer-deep settings in Table 2 and experiment with the Transformer-big in Table 4. The standard Transformer-base and Transformer-big systems both consist of a 6-layer encoder and a 6-layer decoder. The Transformer-deep system has 12 layers. The embedding size (width) is set to 512 for Transformer-base/deep and 1,024 for Transformer-big. The FFN hidden size equals to $4 \times$ embedding size in all settings. Dropout with the value of 0.1 is used in Transformer-base/deep and 0.3 in Transformer-big. We also adopt the relative positional representation (RPR) (Shaw et al., 2018) to construct stronger baselines. For all models, we use Adam optimizer with $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and $\beta_2 = 0.997$, we stop training until the model stops improving on the validation set. All experiments reported in this paper are trained on 8 NVIDIA Tesla V100 GPUs with mixed-precision training (Micikevicius et al., 2018) and tested on the model ensemble by averaging the last 5 checkpoints.

²<https://github.com/moses-smt/mosesdecoder/blob/master/scripts/generic/multi-bleu.perl>