
Not All Attention is Needed: Parameter and Computation Efficient Tuning for Multi-modal Large Language Models via Effective Attention Skipping

Qiong Wu^{1,2}, Weihao Ye^{1,2}, Yiyi Zhou^{1,2}, Xiaoshuai Sun^{1,2}, Rongrong Ji^{1,2*}

¹ Key Laboratory of Multimedia Trusted Perception and Efficient Computing, Ministry of Education of China, Xiamen University, 361005, P.R. China.

² Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Xiamen University, 361005, P.R. China.

{qiong, weihaoye}@stu.xmu.edu.cn, {zhouyiyi, xssun, rrji}@xmu.edu.cn

Abstract

Recently, *Multi-modal Large Language Models* (MLLMs) have garnered an influx of interest from both academia and industry. However, for the downstream task applications, MLLMs not only require to update a large number of parameters but also consume excessive computation. In this paper, we propose a novel parameter and computation efficient tuning method for MLLMs, termed *Effective Attention Skipping* (EAS). Concretely, we first reveal that *multi-head attentions* (MHAs) in MLLMs, the primary source of computation, are often redundant to downstream tasks. Based on this observation, EAS evaluates attention redundancy and skips the less important MHAs to speed up inference. Besides, we also propose a novel *propagation-of-information adapter* (PIA) to serve the attention skipping while maintaining parameter efficiency. More importantly, PIA can be further re-parameterized into *feed-forward networks* (FFNs) for zero-extra latency. To validate EAS, we apply it to a recently proposed MLLM called LaVIN, and conduct extensive experiments on a vision-language benchmark, namely ScienceQA. The experimental results show that EAS can not only retain the high performance of LaVIN but also reduce the updated parameters scale greatly while speeding up the inference speed to a large extent. For instance, LaVIN-EAS can obtain 89.98% accuracy while accelerating the inference speed by 2.2 times. Our code is given in <https://github.com/DoubtedSteam/EAS>

1 Introduction

Recently, the great success of *Large Language Models* (LLMs) also sparks an influx of interest in extending these giant models to more modalities, *i.e.*, *Multi-modal Large Language Models* (MLLMs) [38, 32, 25]. However, compared with the unimodal LLMs, MLLMs inevitably require much more computation with the introduction of new modalities [3, 1, 25, 32], and their adaptations to downstream tasks also take more training and parameter expenditure [22, 28, 27]. In this case, numerous efforts have been recently devoted to the efficient tuning of MLLMs [54, 12, 53].

Among these advancements, Wu *et al.*[53] propose a non-trivial task for large-scaled pre-trained models, termed *parameter and computation efficient transfer learning* (PCETL). A key intuition behind PCETL is that the sheer size of model parameters and computation is critical for large-scale pre-training but redundant to specific tasks. In this case, for downstream task adaptations, PCETL not only requires to reduce the number of updated parameters, akin to PETL [16, 17, 47], but also needs to remove the redundant modules for better efficiency. Wu *et al.*[53] also propose a strong baseline

*Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: (a) Running time of LaVIN [38], DAS [53] and our EAS. (b) Performance and speed comparisons of skipping different numbers of MHA and FFN by our EAS on ScienceQA.




Figure 2: Illustrations of LaVIN, DAS and our EAS. (a) LaVIN inserts lightweight adapters before MHAs for multi-modal adaption. (b) DAS skips redundant Transformer layers of LaVIN, but still incurs extra latency. (c) EAS resort to skipping MHAs, to achieve true model acceleration with the proposed PIA.

called *dynamic architecture skipping* (DAS) to evaluate and skip the redundant Transformer layers with lightweight adapters, saving both parameter and computation overhead on downstream tasks.

Despite the effectiveness, we argue that this strong baseline still leaves ample room to improve. Above all, DAS [53] only considers the entire Transformer layer for redundancy evaluation, and a granular scheme deserves more explorations. As shown in Fig. 1-(a), *multi-head attention* (MHA) consumes 35% more time than *feed-forward network* (FFN), while its parameter size is only half. From existing literature [40, 49], we also notice that MHA is mainly in charge of dependency modeling, and FFN is often used to improve model capacity. As shown in Fig. 1-(b), skipping a certain number of MHAs does not affect performance, while it will result in a drastic drop when skipping FFNs. In this case, we think that FFN stores more pre-training knowledge for downstream task adaption. In contrast, for a simple task, the repeated attention modeling may be of limited significance. Based on these observations, we make an argument in this paper:

“Not all attention is needed for the parameter and computation efficient tuning of MLLMs.”

Another shortcoming of DAS is its skip connections with adapters, which still incurs non-negligible latency during inference. As revealed in recent progresses [38, 12], the additional branches added by adapters inevitably slow down inference although they only brings some FLOPs[38]. The same as shown in Fig.1, the latency caused by adapters takes up to 37.9% inference time of LaVIN [38]. This drawback somewhat undermines DAS’s efficiency for MLLMs.

To overcome these limitations, we propose a novel approach for the parameter and computation efficient tuning of MLLMs in this paper, termed *Effective Attention Skipping* (EAS). The principle of EAS is to only skip the redundant attention modeling for better efficiency and performance. To avoid the latency caused by adapters, we also equip EAS with an innovative parameter efficient module called *propagation-of-information adapter* (PIA), which can not only replace the skipped MHAs for adaption, but also can be seamlessly re-parameterized into FFNs for extra zero cost during inference. With these innovative designs, EAS can help MLLMs achieve better PCETL results on vision-language tasks, *i.e.*, true model acceleration with a small number of trainable parameters.

To validate EAS, we first apply it to a recent MLLM called LaVIN [38], and conduct extensive experiments on the open-set multi-modal question answer benchmark, namely ScienceQA [36]. To align DAS [53], we also apply EAS to a representative VL pre-trained model called METER [10] on three VL benchmarks, *i.e.*, VQA2.0 [13], NLVR² [45] and Flickr30K [43]. The experimental results show that EAS can not only retain high performance and parameter efficiency against existing PETL and PCETL methods [54, 38, 53], but also significantly speed up inference speed on downstream tasks. For instance, EAS can improve the inference speed by 1.90× to DAS [53] and 2.18× to the default LaVIN [38] without performance degradations.

Overall, our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel parameter and computation efficient tuning method for MLLMs, termed *Effective Attention Skipping* (EAS), which retains the high performance of MLLMs and reduces both parameter and computation expenditures on downstream tasks.
- We propose a novel *propagation-of-information adapter* (PIA) that can be used to serve attention skipping and be fully re-parameterized into MLLMs for true model acceleration.
- We apply our EAS to a recent MLLM and a representative VLP model, *i.e.*, LaVIN and METER, on four VL benchmarks. The experiments show the obvious merits of EAS in both parameter and computation efficiencies, *e.g.*, speeding up LaVIN by 2.18 \times without performance degradations.

2 Related Work

2.1 Vision-language pre-trained models

Recent years have witnessed the rapid development of *vision-language pre-trained* (VLP) models [29, 35, 44, 6, 51] on various vision-language tasks [14, 46, 36]. To facilitate vision-language alignment and learn generalized multi-modal representations, VLP models also adopt self-supervised objects and conduct pre-training on massive image-text pairs, such as *masked language modeling* [21, 34], *masked image modeling* [2, 5, 8] and *image-text matching* [10, 23].

With the advent of *large language models* (LLMs) [55, 50, 42], recent advance [38, 32, 25] focus on extending these LLMs to vision-language tasks, *i.e.*, *multi-modal large language models* (MLLMs). For instance, BLIP-2[26] introduces a QFormer, to bridge the gap between vision and language modalities, selecting relevant visual semantics as additional tokens for LLMs. MINI-GPT4[57] uses a projection layer to map visual features into the language model. LLaVA [33] also follows this principle, but proposes a carefully designed training scheme in addition. Meanwhile, some efforts are also devoted to parameter-efficiently transfer learning of LLMs to vision-language tasks [14, 36]. These methods insert lightweight modules like adapter [54] for downstream adaption instead of fully tuning LLMs [17]. Meanwhile, the use of visual tokens greatly exacerbates the already high computation of MLLMs [32, 54]. In this paper, we focus on both parameter and computation efficient tuning for MLLMs.

2.2 Parameter and Computation Efficient Tuning

Parameter-efficient transfer learning (PETL) is proposed to save the training and storage costs of LLMs [4, 30, 17]. The principle of PETL is to transfer the pre-trained models to downstream tasks with only a small number of trainable parameters [4, 30], and its methodologies can be roughly divided into three main categories, *i.e.* *prompt tuning* [18, 56], *adapter* [20, 11] and the *re-parameterized methods* [17, 37]. Very recently, Wu *et al.*[53] propose a new learning task called *parameter and computation efficient transfer learning* (PCETL), which further requires to reduce model redundancy based on the setting of PETL. Wu *et al.*[53] also propose a strong baseline called *Dynamic Architecture Skipping* (DAS) for PCETL, which evaluates the redundancy of Transformer layers by a reinforcement learning method and replaces the most redundant layers with adapters [47]. Motivated by [17, 53], we also focus on PCETL for MLLMs in this paper. We propose a granular exploration for MLLMs, and address the latency caused by using adapters for skip connections.

3 Preliminary

We first recap the principle of *parameter and computation efficient transfer learning* (PCETL) [53] for *multi-modal large language models* (MLLMs). Concretely, given an MLLM $G(\cdot|\theta)$, which consists n Transformer layers, and its whole parameters denoted as $\theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n\}$, the objective of PCETL can be defined by

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\sigma, \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{L}(G(I, T|\theta_{\mathcal{K}}, \sigma)), \quad (1)$$

where $\theta_{\mathcal{K}} = \{\theta_{k_1}, \theta_{k_2}, \dots, \theta_{k_m}\} \in \theta$ are the parameters of a sub-network of MLLM and σ is a small number of parameters for model tuning.




Figure 3: Illustrations of the main components of the proposed *Effective Attention Skipping* (EAS). (a) The architecture of *propagation-of-information adapter* (PIA). PIA uses a multi-path design for up- and down-samplings, which can help to perform information exchange, like MHA, and modality routing [38] for MLLMs. (b) The deployment of PIA. PIA can serve to replace the skipped MHA as a parameter efficient method for task adaption. After training, its parameters can be re-parameterized into FFN, incurring no extra latency. (c) The process of attention redundancy evaluation. Similar with DAS [53], EAS also adopts a k -armed bandit based algorithm for the automatic redundancy evaluation on MHAs of MLLMs. After evaluation, we skip the redundant MHAs with PIAs.

From Eq.1, we can see that PCETL needs to reduce parameter cost during adaption, just like PETL [30, 17, 47]. Meanwhile, it also requires practitioners to speed up inference by evaluating and removing the redundant modules. Compared with previous model compression and acceleration tasks [24, 41, 7], one difference of PCETL is that the original model weights should keep unchanged, so as to facilitate more task adaptations, which is essential for the giant models that are expensively pre-trained with massive data.

Wu *et al.*[53] also propose a strong baseline called *dynamic architecture skipping* (DAS), which considers the entire Transformer layer for redundancy evaluation. As discussed above, the components in MLLMs often serve different roles, *i.e.*, MHA and FFN. In this case, more detailed evaluations are beneficial for PCETL. Besides, the skip connections in DAS are aided by adapters [16, 47] which also incur non-negligible latency during the inference [53, 17].

4 Effective Attention Skipping

4.1 Overview

To achieve parameter and computation efficient tuning for MLLMs, we propose an *Effective Attention Skipping* (EAS) approach in this paper, as illustrated in Fig. 3.

Concretely, given an MLLMs $G(\cdot|\theta)$, EAS aims to remove its redundant components for downstream task adaption. Different to DAS [53], the evaluation target of EAS is more specific, *i.e.*, MHAs of a MLLM. Thus, the objective can be defined by

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{L}(G(I, T|\theta_{\mathcal{K}}^A, \theta^F)), \quad (2)$$

where $\theta_{\mathcal{K}}^A$ represent a subset of MHA modules and θ^F denote all FFN modules. In practice, similar to DAS [53], we first conduct a reinforcement learning based redundancy evaluation on MHAs for downstream tasks. Afterwards, given the redundancy scores, we determine which MHAs to skip, and replace them with an adapter-based connection.

However, adapters will account for excessive inference time, as shown in Fig. 1-(a). The widely used re-parameterized methods like LoRA [17] can approximate the QKV projections but cannot replace the entire MHA for skip connections.

To this end, we propose a novel *Propagation-of-Information Adapter* (PIA) to achieve zero-cost skip connections, which can propagate averaged global features for information exchange, and be reparameterized into FFNs during inference.

In this case, the objective of EAS can be formulated as

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\sigma, \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{L}(G(I, T|\theta_{\mathcal{K}}^A, \theta^F + \sigma)), \quad (3)$$

where, σ is the reparameterizable parameters of PIA. With PIA, we can adapt MLLM to downstream tasks while speeding up inference.

4.2 Propagation-of-Information Adapter

When the redundant MHAs are identified, the next key step is how to effectively skip them without additional latency. To approach this target, we propose a novel re-parameterizable adapter for EAS, termed *Propagation-of-Information Adapter* (PIA).

As shown in Fig. 3-(a), PIA also adopts a bottleneck structure to scale down the hidden dimension of the inputs, akin to existing adapters [47, 37], thereby achieving a low-rank approximation of full tuning [17, 37, 52]. However, it also differs in its inner path designs.

Concretely, given the input features of the i^{th} layer, denoted as $\mathbf{X}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, PIA first projects $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$ onto two separate low-dimensional semantic spaces, and obtain the hidden features $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}$ of PIA by

$$\mathbf{H}^{(i)} = f_{d1}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)}) + avg(f_{d2}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)})), \quad (4)$$

where $f_{d1}(\cdot)$ and $f_{d2}(\cdot)$ are the two linear projections, and $avg(\cdot)$ refers to average pooling. $\mathbf{H}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ has a much smaller dimension than $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$, i.e., $r \ll d$.

In addition to the low-dimension projection, Eq. 4 also realizes information exchange among all input tokens via the combination with the averaged feature.

During up-sampling, we also use two separate linear projections for the hidden features, and adopt a path router for their weighted combination. Thus, the output features $\mathbf{X}^{(i)'}$ is obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}^{(i)'} &= \alpha_1 f_{u1}(\mathbf{H}^{(i)}) + \alpha_2 f_{u2}(\mathbf{H}^{(i)}), \\ \text{where } \boldsymbol{\alpha} &= [\alpha_1, \alpha_2], \quad \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \text{router}(avg(\mathbf{X}^{(i)})). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here, $f_{u1}(\cdot)$ and $f_{u2}(\cdot)$ are two linear projections, and $\text{router}(\cdot)$ is the routing function defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} \mathbf{W}_r + \mathbf{b}_r}{\tau}\right), \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} = avg(\mathbf{X}^{(i)})$, $\mathbf{W}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2}$ is the weight matrix, τ is the temperature of *softmax*.

Overall, the multi-path design can still hold parameter efficiency via low-dimensional projections, acting the role of MHA in information exchange.

Re-parameterization. With the effective structure, PIA also needs to re-parameterize its weights into the models to further improve computation efficiency. Here, we embed PIA into FFN, and avoid the skip connections [53] to retain network complexity.

Concretely, we first place PIA in the residual connection of FFN, as shown in Fig. 3-(b):

$$\mathbf{X}^{(i+1)} = \mathbf{X}^{(i)} + \text{FFN}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)} + \text{PIA}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)})). \quad (7)$$

To re-parameterize PIA into the nearby projection weights of FFN [17, 39], we still need to convert PIA into one linear layer:

$$\text{PIA}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)}) = \mathbf{X}^{(i)} \mathbf{W}_p + \mathbf{b}_p. \quad (8)$$

More specifically, we aim to simplify the definition of PIA in Eq. 4 and 5 by

$$\mathbf{X}^{(i)'} = (\mathbf{X}^{(i)} \mathbf{W}_d + \mathbf{b}_d) \mathbf{W}_u + \mathbf{b}_u, \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{W}_d and \mathbf{W}_u are new projection matrices for down- and up-sampling, and \mathbf{b}_d , \mathbf{b}_u are biases.

In particular, the down-sampling for the hidden state $\mathbf{H}^{(i)}$ is expected to be

$$\mathbf{H}^{(i)} = \mathbf{X}^{(i)} \mathbf{W}_d + \mathbf{b}_d. \quad (10)$$

However, in Eq.4, the down-sampling uses a two-path design for information exchange. In this case, we obtain \mathbf{W}_d and \mathbf{b}_d via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_d &= \mathbf{W}_{d1}, \\ \mathbf{b}_d &= \mathbf{b}_{d1} + avg(f_{d2}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)})), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{d1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{d1} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ are the projection matrix and bias vector of $f_{d1}(\cdot)$ in Eq. 4. Via Eq.11, we can merge the two-path design in one linear projection.

In practice, \mathbf{b}_d is frozen after the first decoding step of MLLMs regardless of the change of $\mathbf{X}^{(i)}$. This design can enable PIA to achieve information exchange during inference without hindering re-parameterization.

Similar to down-sampling, up-sampling in Eq.5, is redefined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}^{(i)'} &= \mathbf{H}^{(i)} \mathbf{W}_u + \mathbf{b}_u, \\ \text{where } \mathbf{W}_u &= \alpha_1 \mathbf{W}_{u1} + \alpha_2 \mathbf{W}_{u2}, \\ \mathbf{b}_u &= \alpha_1 \mathbf{b}_{u1} + \alpha_2 \mathbf{b}_{u2}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here, α_1 and α_2 are the routing weights in Eq. 5. $\mathbf{W}_{u1} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$, $\mathbf{W}_{u2} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$ are projection matrices of $f_{u1}(\cdot)$ and $f_{u2}(\cdot)$ in Eq.5, and $\mathbf{b}_{u1}, \mathbf{b}_{u2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are bias vectors.

After obtaining the merged \mathbf{W}_d and \mathbf{W}_u , we can then transform PIA into one linear layer via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}^{(i)'} &= (\mathbf{X}^{(i)} \mathbf{W}_d + \mathbf{b}_d) \mathbf{W}_u + \mathbf{b}_u \\ &= \mathbf{X}^{(i)} \mathbf{W}_d \mathbf{W}_u + \mathbf{b}_d \mathbf{W}_u + \mathbf{b}_u \\ &= \mathbf{X}^{(i)} \mathbf{W}_p + \mathbf{b}_p. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Here, \mathbf{W}_p is the approximated low-rank weight matrix, and it then can be re-parameterized into the nearby weight matrices of FFN, like [17, 37].

Note that, the average feature in Eq. 4, *i.e.* $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} = \text{avg}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)})$, and the path router are example-dependent. In this case, the re-parameterization of PIA will be executed after the first decoding step of MLLMs. Considering the fact that most MLLMs often needs to decode a long sequence [38, 54], PIA can still save massive computation during inference.

4.3 Attention Redundancy Evaluation

In EAS, we adopt a k -arm bandit based algorithm to automatically evaluate the redundancy of MHAs in MLLMs for downstream task.

Concretely, given a MLLM, we first randomly sample and tune the subnetworks with PIAs as adapters for a few epochs. Afterwards, we initialize a numerical action vector, denoted as $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and then we keep training and testing the MLLM with PIAs. In each evaluation step, we skip k MHAs according to \mathbf{s} , based on which the action policy at the t step is obtained by

$$\pi_i^{(t)} \sim U\left(0, \frac{e^{s_i^{(t-1)}}}{\sum_k e^{s_k^{(t-1)}}}\right), \quad (14)$$

where $U(a, b)$ is the uniform distribution between a and b . In this way, the effective modules are more likely to obtain a higher preference score. And then we skip k MHA modules with the lowest preference scores:

$$\rho^{(t)} = \underset{\{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_k\}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i \in \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_k\}} \pi_i^{(t)}, \quad (15)$$

where $|\rho| = k, 1 \leq \mu_j \leq n$.

Here, $\rho^{(t)}$ is the index of the skipped MHA modules. The MHA with a greater $s_i^{(t)}$ will be kept.

Then, we update the action preference of each MHA through comparisons. For each T step, we sample m distinct subnetworks, *i.e.* $\Phi^{(t)} = \{\rho_1^{(t)}, \rho_2^{(t)}, \dots, \rho_m^{(t)}\}$, according to Eq.14 and Eq.15. Based on the loss values $l_i^{(t)}$, the reward of a subnetwork is defined as $e^{-l_i^{(t)}}$, which is proportional to subnetwork performance.

According to the rewards, the action preference of MHA modules can be updated by

$$\begin{aligned} s_i^{(t)} &= s_i^{(t-1)} + \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{h=1}^m e^{-l_h^{(t)}} - e^{-l_j^{(t)}}\right) \pi_i^{(t)} (1 - \pi_i^{(t)}), \\ \text{where } i &\in \rho_j^{(t)}, \rho_j^{(t)} \in \Phi^{(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

When the reward of the sampled subnetwork is larger than the average one $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m e^{-l_j^{(t)}}$, it suggests that the skipped MHA modules are less important. The change of their action preference in this step can be obtained by $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m e^{-l_j^{(t)}} - e^{-l_i^{(t)}}$. To smooth optimization, we introduce $\pi_i^{(t)}(1 - \pi_i^{(t)})$ to control the learning rate.

Via a large number of trails, most subnetworks can be well evaluated. Finally, according to the action preference s , which is used to reflect the redundancy, we can select that the most redundant MHA modules to skip, thereby reducing the computation complexity of MLLMs.

5 Experiment

5.1 Datasets and Metrics

ScienceQA [36] is a multi-modal dataset for science question answering. This dataset is divided into three subsets, *i.e.*, train, val, and test, which have 12, 726, 4, 241, and 4, 241 examples, respectively. The questions can be categorized into *Natural Science* (NAT), *Social Science* (SOC), *Language Science* (LAN), *Text Context* (TXT), *Image Context* (IMG), *No Context* (NO), *Grades 1-6* (G1-6) and *Grades 7-12* (G7-12), respectively. **VQA2.0** [13] has 204, 721 images, each accompanied by at least three open-ended questions. We report the *test-dev* results from the online evaluation⁴. **NLVR**² [45] is tailored for classifying triplets consisting of two images and a question, and it has 107, 292 examples of human-written sentences grounded with pairs of images. **Flickr30K** [43] is a cross-modal retrieval dataset, comprising 31, 000 images collected from Flickr.

5.2 Implementation Details

The base model employed in our study is LaVIN [38], a recently introduced MLLM. Following its default settings, we use LLaMA-7B [50] as the main network, and adopt ViT-L [9] as the image encoder. In terms of PIA, we set the hidden dimension to 32. Besides, we employ PIAs for parameter-efficient adaptations, similar to [38, 54]. These PIAs have a hidden dimension of 8, and only one path for adaptation is used, *i.e.*, f_{d1} in Eq. 4. We insert these PIAs before each attention module. For redundancy evaluation, we first train the subnetworks with randomly skipped modules for 5 epochs. Then we introduce redundancy evaluation in the next 5 epochs, where 3 subnetworks are sampled every 10 training steps. In addition, we also validate the proposed EAS on a conventional VL pre-trained model named METER [10]. Its attention modules in a co-attention layer are considered as independent potential skipped components. The PIAs for skipping attention modules are configured with a hidden dimension of 144, with the remaining settings following the defaults in DAS [53].

5.3 Experimental Results

5.3.1 Quantitative Analysis

Comparison with DAS. We first compare our EAS with DAS [53] on LaVIN and METER on four VL benchmarks, of which results are given in Tab. 1 and Tab. 2. We first observe that both DAS and EAS can achieve competitive performance, while retaining parameter and computation efficiency. Specifically, in Tab. 1, DAS can skip 4 Transformer layers of LaVIN for better efficiency while retraining comparable performance, *i.e.* -0.26 accuracy while $+14.8\%$ efficiency. Meanwhile, EAS-7B₂ can improve the average accuracy and inference speed by $+0.62$ and $1.52\times$ under the same parameter scale. With a little extra parameter cost, our EAS can skip 12 MHAs while achieving better performance than both DAS and LaVIN. Notably, compared with LaVIN and DAS, EAS-7B₁₂ can improve the inference speeds by 2.18 and 1.90 times, respectively. In Tab.2, we compare to DAS on three classic VL benchmarks, *i.e.* VQA, NLVR and Flickr30K. Compared with DAS, our EAS can update 23.8% fewer parameters and improve inference by $+33.44\%$ with only -0.54% performance drop on average. Overall, these results well validate EAS towards the target of PCETL for MLLMs.

Comparison with the state-of-the-arts. In Tab. 1 and Tab. 2, we also compare EAS with more recent advancements of MLLMs and PETL methods. We can first observe that PETL methods achieve competitive or even better performance than the fully tuned methods, while retaining a very small

³Tested on ScienceQA with one A100 GPU.

⁴<https://eval.ai/web/challenges/challenge-page/830/overview>

Table 1: Comparison among EAS and other LLM-Based methods on ScienceQA. The corner marks of PCETL methods represent the number of skipped modules. The best and second best results are marked in **bold** and underline, respectively.

Method	Updated Parameters	Inference Time ³	Subject			Context Modality			Grade		Average
			NAT	SOC	LAN	TXT	IMG	NO	G1-6	G7-12	
<i>Fully tuned methods</i>											
LLaVA-7B [32]	100.00%	2.19s	90.36	95.95	88.00	89.49	88.00	90.66	90.93	90.90	90.92
<i>Parameter-efficient methods</i>											
LLaMA-Adapter [54]	0.03%	4.35s	84.37	88.30	84.36	83.72	80.32	86.90	85.83	84.05	85.19
LaVIN-7B [38]	0.06%	3.70s	89.25	94.94	85.24	88.51	87.46	88.08	90.16	88.07	89.41
LaVIN-7B-LoRA [17]	0.08%	2.22s	84.06	77.95	85.73	82.84	74.12	88.64	83.77	82.20	83.21
<i>Parameter and computation efficient methods</i>											
DAS-7B ₄ [53]	0.07%	3.23s	88.99	94.60	85.09	87.88	86.51	88.36	89.72	88.13	89.15
EAS-7B ₂ (Ours)	0.07%	2.13s	89.48	93.93	87.00	88.32	87.36	89.76	90.20	88.99	89.77
EAS-7B ₁₂ (Ours)	0.11%	1.69s	89.52	95.61	<u>86.36</u>	88.71	88.25	<u>88.85</u>	91.26	87.67	89.98

Table 2: Comparison among EAS, DAS and PETL methods for METER on VQA, NLVR² and Flickr30K. The best and second performance is **bold** and underlined.

Method	Updated Parameters	VQA		NLVR ²		Flickr30K		Average	
		test-dev	+FLOPs	test-P	+FLOPs	IR/TR R@1	+FLOPs	Acc.	+FLOPs
Full Tuning	323.31M	77.43	+0.00	83.05	+0.00	82.22/94.30	+0.00	84.25	+0.00
Classifier Only	-	69.93	+0.00	73.23	+0.00	78.80/89.00	+0.00	77.74	+0.00
Shallow Prompt [31]	0.30M	68.51	+28.71G	65.69	+26.84G	74.20/88.60	+28.71G	74.25	+28.71G
Deep Prompt [19]	1.84M	70.78	+6.53G	72.64	+5.59G	78.84/89.40	+6.53G	77.92	+6.53G
LoRA [17]	0.29M	74.00	+0.00	78.82	+0.00	79.86/92.60	+0.00	81.32	+0.00
Adapter [48]	5.34M	74.70	+1.64G	79.93	+1.38G	80.38/91.90	+1.64G	81.73	+1.64G
Scaled PA [15]	3.59M	75.11	+1.12G	80.38	+0.66G	<u>80.40</u> / 93.20	+1.12G	82.27	+1.12G
DAS ₄ [53]	5.34M	74.80	<u>-11.16G</u>	80.11	-5.13G	80.12/91.80	<u>-11.16G</u>	81.71	<u>-9.15G</u>
EAS ₈ (Ours)	4.07M	<u>74.85</u>	-10.65G	<u>80.13</u>	<u>-7.38G</u>	80.38/92.20	-9.12G	<u>81.89</u>	-9.05G
EAS ₁₀ (Ours)	4.07M	74.82	-14.53G	80.08	-10.19G	79.78/90.40	-11.90G	81.27	-12.21G

number of parameters to update. However, the use of adapters also obviously slows down their inference speeds. For instance, the inference of LLaMA-Adapter in Tab. 1 consumes more than 4.35 seconds for each example. In contrast, LoRA does not incur any additional overhead during inference, thus only taking 2.22 seconds per example. Compared with these approaches, the results of EAS are more significant in both performance and efficiency. EAS-7B₁₂ improve +8.14% performance of LoRA while improve inference speed up to 1.30× on ScienceQA. Meanwhile, in Tab. 2, we can observe that, EAS₈ achieves 99.53% performance of Scaled PA while decreasing −12.28% FLOPs. Overall, these results well validate the effectiveness of EAS towards the target of PCETL for MLLMs.

Ablation Study. To examine the different designs of PIA, we further conduct extensive ablations in Tab.3-5. In Tab.3, we first ablate the choice of evaluation candidates for EAS on ScienceQA, including “MHA”, “FFN” and “MHA or FFN”. From this table, we can first see that skipping MHA is the best choice among three candidates. Notably, EAS can skip up to 12 MHAs with even better performance, while its efficiency is also much better than the others. In terms of FFN, its removal leads to slower inference speed than that of MHA. More importantly, when dropping more than 8 FFNs, the performance declines significantly, *e.g.*, −6.99% by skipping 12 FFNs. This result well confirms our argument about the roles of MHA and FFN in MLLMs. In terms of “MHA or FFN”, this candidate is suboptimal for EAS, which can obtain a good trade-off between performance and efficiency, but it is still worse than “MHA”. Overall, these results well validate the motivation of EAS, *i.e.*, not all attention is needed for MLLMs.

Tab. 4 ablates the designs of PIA. Here, “Base” refers to using only one path in the downsampling, *i.e.*, only f_{a1} in Eq. 4. We can see that without the two-path design for information exchange, its performance drops greatly, *i.e.*, −3.30% than “+information exchange”. In order to realize re-parameterization, we freeze $avg(f_{a2}(\mathbf{X}^{(i)}))$ in Eq. 11, *i.e.*, frozen bias term in Tab. 4. It can be seen that this setting barely affects performance, *i.e.*, −0.08%. In this case, EAS can conduct re-parameterization without declining performance, while improving inference speed greatly. Overall, Tab. 4 well confirms the design of information exchange and validates the re-parameterization in PIA.

In Tab. 5, we report the results of skipping different numbers of MHAs by EAS. The first observation is that skipping appropriate MHA modules has little impact on performance, *e.g.* skipping up

Table 3: Comparison of different redundancy evaluation candidates for EAS on ScienceQA.

Candidate Modules	Number of Skipped modules	Updated Parameters	Inference Time	Average Performance
MHA	4	0.08%	2.08s	89.44
	8	0.10%	1.91s	89.79
	12	0.11%	1.69s	89.98
FFN	4	0.08%	2.26s	88.30
	8	0.11%	2.18s	84.96
	12	0.13%	2.11s	82.13
MHA or FFN	4	0.08%	2.13s	88.40
	8	0.10%	2.09s	89.18
	12	0.12%	1.78s	88.63

Table 4: Ablation of *Propagate-Information Adapter* (PIA) on EAS-7B₁₂. Here, *Base* refers to using only f_{d1} in Eq. 4.

Setting	Updated Parameters	Inference Time	Average Performance
Base	0.09%	2.94s	87.08
+ information exchange in Eq.4	0.11%	3.23s	90.05
+ frozen bias term in Eq.11	0.11%	2.97s	89.98
+ re-parameterization	0.11%	1.69s	89.98

Table 5: Ablation of the skipping number.

Methods	Updated Parameters	Inference Time	Average Performance
LaVIN-7B	0.06%	3.70s	89.41
EAS-7B ₄	0.08%	2.08s	89.44
EAS-7B ₈	0.10%	1.92s	89.79
EAS-7B ₁₂	0.11%	1.69s	89.98
EAS-7B ₁₆	0.13%	1.56s	88.42

to 16 MHA modules only has about 1.1% performance drops, strongly suggesting that PIA is a good substitute for MHA. Notably, skipping a certain numbers of MHAs can achieve even better performance than the default LaVIN, *e.g.* -12 layers with +2.64 accuracy. It might be due to the great redundancy of MLLMs on ScienceQA, which also suggests that PIA can help MLLMs learn better patterns from VL data. Again, these results confirm the effectiveness of EAS towards PCETL.

5.3.2 Qualitative Analysis

Examples of Science Question Answering. In Fig. 4, we visualize the examples of EAS-7B₁₂ and LaVIN-7B for both language-only (left) and image-language questions (right). From these examples, we can see that both EAS-7B and LaVIN-7B correctly answer the question. Meanwhile, they all inherit the strong language ability of LLaMA [50], and can explain the answers fluently. Notably, for the visual question (right), EAS-7B has better and more detailed explanations for the answer, *e.g.*, “*The colony’s name comes from the fact that it was founded by people from Hampshire, a county in England*”. In contrast, the response of LaVIN is logically incorrect even through its answer is right. Overall, these results confirm again the merits of EAS for the efficient adaption of MLLMs.

6 Limitation

EAS focuses on computation-efficient tuning of MLLMs, thus it has no obvious advantages over PETL methods in parameter efficiency. In this case, EAS is superior in the overall target of PCETL.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel method for parameter and computation efficient tuning of *Multi-modal Large Language Models* (MLLMs), named by *Effective Attention Skipping*. Concretely, we first reveal that not all MHAs are necessary for the efficient adaption of MLLMs, based on which EAS adopts a granular redundancy evaluation scheme. Meanwhile, to avoid the additional computation caused by the adapter-based skip connections, EAS is also equipped with a novel *Propagation-of-Information Adapter* (PIA), which can not only keep parameter efficiency but also can be re-parameterized into the model without extra latency. To validate EAS, we apply it to a recent MLLM called LaVIN, and conduct extensive experiments on the multi-modal benchmark ScienceQA. The experimental results show that EAS can achieve better performance than LaVIN while speeding up inference by up to 2.18 times.




Figure 4: The predictions of EAS-B₁₂ and LaVIN-7B on ScienceQA. The accurate explanations for the answer are highlight in green, while the logically incorrect ones in red.

References

- [1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 35:23716–23736, 2022.
- [2] Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Songhao Piao, and Furu Wei. Beit: BERT pre-training of image transformers. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [3] Hangbo Bao, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Qiang Liu, Owais Khan Mohammed, Kriti Aggarwal, Subhojit Som, Songhao Piao, and Furu Wei. Vlmo: Unified vision-language pre-training with mixture-of-modality-experts. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 35:32897–32912, 2022.
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [5] Mark Chen, Alec Radford, Rewon Child, Jeffrey Wu, Heewoo Jun, David Luan, and Ilya Sutskever. Generative pretraining from pixels. In *ICML*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1691–1703. PMLR, 2020.
- [6] Jaemin Cho, Jie Lei, Hao Tan, and Mohit Bansal. Unifying vision-and-language tasks via text generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1931–1942. PMLR, 2021.
- [7] Yihe Dong, Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier, and Andreas Loukas. Attention is not all you need: Pure attention loses rank doubly exponentially with depth. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2793–2803. PMLR, 2021.
- [8] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- [9] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.*, 2021.
- [10] Zi-Yi Dou, Yichong Xu, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Shuohang Wang, Lijuan Wang, Chenguang Zhu, Pengchuan Zhang, Lu Yuan, Nanyun Peng, et al. An empirical study of training end-to-end vision-and-language transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 18166–18176, 2022.
- [11] Peng Gao, Shijie Geng, Renrui Zhang, Teli Ma, Rongyao Fang, Yongfeng Zhang, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Clip-adapter: Better vision-language models with feature adapters. *IJCV*, pages 1–15, 2023.
- [12] Peng Gao, Jiaming Han, Renrui Zhang, Ziyi Lin, Shijie Geng, Aojun Zhou, Wei Zhang, Pan Lu, Conghui He, Xiangyu Yue, et al. Llama-adapter v2: Parameter-efficient visual instruction model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.15010*, 2023.
- [13] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the V in VQA matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6325–6334, 2017.
- [14] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. In *CVPR*, pages 6904–6913, 2017.
- [15] Junxian He, Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Graham Neubig. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.)*, 2022.
- [16] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019.
- [17] Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.*, 2022.

- [18] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *ECCV*, pages 709–727. Springer, 2022.
- [19] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge J. Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 709–727, 2022.
- [20] Rabeeh Karimi Mahabadi, James Henderson, and Sebastian Ruder. Compacter: Efficient low-rank hypercomplex adapter layers. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 34:1022–1035, 2021.
- [21] Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*, pages 4171–4186, 2019.
- [22] Wonjae Kim, Bokyung Son, and Ildoo Kim. Vilt: Vision-and-language transformer without convolution or region supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5583–5594. PMLR, 2021.
- [23] Wonjae Kim, Bokyung Son, and Ildoo Kim. Vilt: Vision-and-language transformer without convolution or region supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 5583–5594, 2021.
- [24] Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi. Quantizing deep convolutional networks for efficient inference: A whitepaper. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.08342*, 2018.
- [25] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- [26] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C. H. Hoi. BLIP-2: bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *ICML*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023.
- [27] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022.
- [28] Junnan Li, Ramprasaath Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 34:9694–9705, 2021.
- [29] Liunian Harold Li, Mark Yatskar, Da Yin, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Kai-Wei Chang. Visualbert: A simple and performant baseline for vision and language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03557*, 2019.
- [30] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. In *ACL*, pages 4582–4597, 2021.
- [31] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 4582–4597, 2021.
- [32] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485*, 2023.
- [33] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NerulIPS*, 2023.
- [34] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [35] Jiasen Lu, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Stefan Lee. Vilbert: Pretraining task-agnostic visiolinguistic representations for vision-and-language tasks. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 32, 2019.
- [36] Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tanglin Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 35:2507–2521, 2022.
- [37] Gen Luo, Minglang Huang, Yiyi Zhou, Xiaoshuai Sun, Guannan Jiang, Zhiyu Wang, and Rongrong Ji. Towards efficient visual adaption via structural re-parameterization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08106*, 2023.
- [38] Gen Luo, Yiyi Zhou, Tianhe Ren, Shengxin Chen, Xiaoshuai Sun, and Rongrong Ji. Cheap and quick: Efficient vision-language instruction tuning for large language models. In *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 2023.

- [39] Gen Luo, Yiyi Zhou, Xiaoshuai Sun, Yan Wang, Liujuan Cao, Yongjian Wu, Feiyue Huang, and Rongrong Ji. Towards lightweight transformer via group-wise transformation for vision-and-language tasks. *TIP*, 31:3386–3398, 2022.
- [40] André Martins, António Farinhas, Marcos Treviso, Vlad Niculae, Pedro Aguiar, and Mario Figueiredo. Sparse and continuous attention mechanisms. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 33:20989–21001, 2020.
- [41] Fanxu Meng, Hao Cheng, Ke Li, Huixiang Luo, Xiaowei Guo, Guangming Lu, and Xing Sun. Pruning filter in filter. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 33:17629–17640, 2020.
- [42] R OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [43] Bryan A. Plummer, Liwei Wang, Chris M. Cervantes, Juan C. Caicedo, Julia Hockenmaier, and Svetlana Lazebnik. Flickr30k entities: Collecting region-to-phrase correspondences for richer image-to-sentence models. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)*, pages 74–93, 2017.
- [44] Weijie Su, Xizhou Zhu, Yue Cao, Bin Li, Lewei Lu, Furu Wei, and Jifeng Dai. Vi-bert: Pre-training of generic visual-linguistic representations. In *Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.*, 2019.
- [45] Alane Suhr, Stephanie Zhou, Ally Zhang, Iris Zhang, Huajun Bai, and Yoav Artzi. A corpus for reasoning about natural language grounded in photographs. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 6418–6428, 2019.
- [46] Alane Suhr, Stephanie Zhou, Ally Zhang, Iris Zhang, Huajun Bai, and Yoav Artzi. A corpus for reasoning about natural language grounded in photographs. In *ACL*, pages 6418–6428, 2019.
- [47] Yi-Lin Sung, Jaemin Cho, and Mohit Bansal. Vi-adapter: Parameter-efficient transfer learning for vision-and-language tasks. In *CVPR*, pages 5227–5237, 2022.
- [48] Yi-Lin Sung, Jaemin Cho, and Mohit Bansal. VL-ADAPTER: parameter-efficient transfer learning for vision-and-language tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5217–5227, 2022.
- [49] Ilya O Tolstikhin, Neil Houlsby, Alexander Kolesnikov, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Jessica Yung, Andreas Steiner, Daniel Keysers, Jakob Uszkoreit, et al. Mlp-mixer: An all-mlp architecture for vision. *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 34:24261–24272, 2021.
- [50] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [51] Teng Wang, Wenhao Jiang, Zhichao Lu, Feng Zheng, Ran Cheng, Chengguo Yin, and Ping Luo. Vlmixer: Unpaired vision-language pre-training via cross-modal cutmix. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 22680–22690. PMLR, 2022.
- [52] Qiong Wu, Shubin Huang, Yiyi Zhou, Pingyang Dai, Annan Shu, Guannan Jiang, and Rongrong Ji. Approximated prompt tuning for vision-language pre-trained models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15706*, 2023.
- [53] Qiong Wu, Wei Yu, Yiyi Zhou, Shubin Huang, Xiaoshuai Sun, and Rongrong Ji. Parameter and computation efficient transfer learning for vision-language pre-trained models. In *Adv. Neural Inform. Process. Syst.*, 2023.
- [54] Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, Peng Gao, and Yu Qiao. Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16199*, 2023.
- [55] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.01068>, 2022.
- [56] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *IJCV*, 130(9):2337–2348, 2022.
- [57] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigtpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2304.10592, 2023.

A Appendix

A.1 Influence of hidden dimension

Table 6: The impact of different hidden dimensions in PIA for skip-connections of EAS on ScienceQA.

Methods	Hidden Dimension	Updated Parameters	Inference Time	Average Performance
EAS-7B _s	8	0.04%	1.89s	87.64
	16	0.05%	1.91s	87.95
	32	0.08%	1.92s	89.79
	64	0.22%	1.94s	90.07




Figure 5: Comparison between EAS and DAS on ScienceQA.

Tab. 6 reports the impact of different trainable parameter sizes on EAS via setting the hidden dimension. From the table, we can observe that there is a significant performance increase with more updated parameters, *e.g.* the performance is improved by +2.64 with 0.18% updated parameters more. This result also suggests that replacing redundant MHAs still needs a certain model capacity to accommodate. Even so, the optimal solution, *i.e.*, skipping 12 MHAs, still consumes a very small proportion of parameters, *i.e.*, 0.11%, showing high parameter efficiency of EAS.

A.2 Comparison with DAS

We first compare our EAS with the strong baseline DAS under different experimental settings in Fig. 5. The first observation from Fig. 5 is that DAS can skip certain layers of LaVIN with very limited performance drops, *e.g.*, skipping 2-4 layers. Its efficiency gains become more obvious when skipping more than 6 Transformer layers, while the performance also decreases to a certain extent. Compared with DAS, EAS has obvious merits in both performance and efficiency. For instance, with the same number of skipped modules, EAS is consistently faster than DAS by +44.4% to 51.6%. By skipping 8 MHAs, EAS can obtain more obvious performance gains than the default LaVIN, *i.e.*, 89.79 *v.s.* 89.41, while the inference speed is about 1.92 times faster. Overall, these results well validate the motivation and designs of EAS towards PCETL of MLLMs.

A.3 The Detailed Results

Table 7: Comparison between EAS and DAS on ScienceQA. The abbreviations for question categories are *Natural Science* (NAT), *Social Science* (SOC), *Language Science* (LAN), *Text Context* (TXT), *Image Context* (IMG), *No Context* (NO), and *Grades 1-6* (G1-6), *Grades 7-12* (G7-12), respectively. The corner marks of PCETL methods represent the number of skipped modules. The best results of fully supervised and efficient tuning methods are marked in **bold** and underline, separately, for a fair comparison.

Method	Updated Parameters	Training Memory	Inference Time	Subject			Context Modality			Grade		Average
				NAT	SOC	LAN	TXT	IMG	NO	G1-6	G7-12	
LaVIN-7B [38]	3.8M	32.32G	3.70s	89.25	94.94	85.24	88.51	87.46	88.08	90.16	88.07	89.41
DAS-7B ₂ [53]	4.2M	32.44G	3.44s	88.68	94.94	86.45	88.03	86.81	88.92	90.20	88.00	89.41
DAS-7B ₄ [53]	4.6M	31.67G	3.23s	88.99	94.60	85.09	87.88	86.51	88.36	89.72	<u>88.13</u>	89.15
DAS-7B ₆ [53]	5.0M	30.91G	3.06s	87.30	93.36	82.36	86.12	85.97	85.71	88.18	85.70	87.29
DAS-7B ₈ [53]	5.4M	30.05G	2.94s	86.50	89.31	84.27	85.63	83.74	86.55	87.41	84.90	86.51
EAS-7B ₂ (Ours)	4.5M	32.82G	2.13s	88.81	<u>95.16</u>	85.36	87.29	86.32	<u>88.99</u>	90.35	87.28	89.25
EAS-7B ₄ (Ours)	5.1M	32.50G	2.08s	88.81	94.83	<u>86.36</u>	87.68	86.81	89.06	90.42	87.67	89.44
EAS-7B ₆ (Ours)	5.7M	32.05G	1.99s	<u>88.99</u>	94.15	85.36	87.88	87.46	88.92	<u>90.68</u>	86.68	89.35
EAS-7B ₈ (Ours)	6.4M	31.63G	1.92s	90.05	94.04	85.82	89.25	<u>87.56</u>	88.78	<u>90.68</u>	88.20	89.79
EAS-7B ₁₂ (Ours)	7.7M	31.10G	1.69s	89.52	95.61	<u>86.36</u>	<u>88.71</u>	88.25	88.85	91.26	87.67	89.98

We further report the detailed experimental results of DAS and EAS for different numbers of skipped modules. From Tab.7, we observe that the performance of DAS drops faster than the proposed EAS, especially in the TXT benchmark, which states that the skipping of FFN will lead to a weakness in

language ability. Meanwhile, we notice that the improvement of inference efficiency in DAS is much slower than in EAS. Overall, the results further prove the effectiveness of our EAS.




Figure 6: Architecture of acceleration models. (a) LaVIN skipped 4 modules by DAS [53]. (b)-(d) LaVIN skipped 4,8,12 MHAs by the proposed EAS. The modules with red index are skipped by the corresponding algorithm.

A.4 The detailed skipping results

We first visualize the accelerated MLLM searched by DAS [53] and our EAS. From Fig. 6, we can observe that the layers skipped by both DAS and EAS tend to be deep layers. While the layers that are considered to have redundancy in EAS are deeper than those in DAS. Furthermore, we can find out that the skipped modules are concentrated behind the middle of MLLM, and gradually expand forward as the number of skipped modules increases.