


arXiv:2406.13713v1

Graphical Abstract

Benchmarking Open-Source Language Models for Efficient Question Answering in Industrial Applications

Mahaman Sanoussi Yahaya Alassan, Jessica López Espejel, Merieme Bouhandi, Walid Dahhane, El Hassane Ettifouri



Highlights

Benchmarking Open-Source Language Models for Efficient Question Answering in Industrial Applications

Mahaman Sanoussi Yahaya Alassan, Jessica López Espejel, Merieme Bouhandi, Walid Dahhane, El Hassane Ettifouri

- ChatGPT-4 and ChatGPT-3.5 demonstrated high Exact Match (EM) and ROUGE scores, showcasing their advanced capabilities in contextual understanding and response generation.
- The LLaMA-2 models showed varied performance based on quantization strategies, indicating a trade-off between model size reduction and precision loss.
- Dolphin-2 models, particularly the dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b.Q5_K_M, balanced high EM scores with efficient RAM usage, offering a practical solution for balancing performance and resource efficiency.
- Mistral-7B models maintained consistent performance across different quantization levels, indicating resilience to precision loss and suitability for applications requiring both efficiency and high performance.
- Quantized models often struggled with maintaining contextual accuracy in longer sequences, whereas proprietary models like ChatGPT showed superior handling of complex contexts.

Benchmarking Open-Source Language Models for Efficient Question Answering in Industrial Applications

Mahaman Sanoussi Yahaya Alassan^a, Jessica López Espejel^a, Merieme Bouhandi^a, Walid Dahhane^a, El Hassane Ettifouri^a

^a*Novelis Research and Innovation Lab, 40 Av. des Terroirs de France, Paris, 75012, , France*

Abstract

In the rapidly evolving landscape of Natural Language Processing (NLP), Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in tasks such as question answering (QA). However, the accessibility and practicality of utilizing these models for industrial applications pose significant challenges, particularly concerning cost-effectiveness, inference speed, and resource efficiency. This paper presents a comprehensive benchmarking study comparing open-source LLMs with their non-open-source counterparts on the task of question answering. Our objective is to identify open-source alternatives capable of delivering comparable performance to proprietary models while being lightweight in terms of resource requirements and suitable for Central Processing Unit (CPU)-based inference. Through rigorous evaluation across various metrics including accuracy, inference speed, and resource consumption, we aim to provide insights into selecting efficient LLMs for real-world applications. Our findings shed light on viable open-source alternatives that offer acceptable performance and efficiency, addressing the pressing need for accessible and efficient NLP solutions in industry settings.

Keywords: Natural Language Processing, Question Answering, Large

Preprint submitted to Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence June 21, 2024

1. Introduction

In recent years, Natural Language Processing (NLP) has experienced remarkable advancements, primarily driven by the development of Large Language Models (LLMs). These models, trained on extensive datasets, have shown exceptional capabilities in various NLP tasks, with question answering (QA) being a notable application. Despite the impressive performance of LLMs such as GPT-4 (OpenIA, 2023), GPT-3.5 (OpenIA, 2022), Claude 3 Opus (team, 2024), and Mixtral 8x7B (Jiang et al., 2024) on benchmark datasets like MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021a), HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019), HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021), BBHard (Suzgun et al., 2022), GSM-8k (Cobbe et al., 2021), and MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021b), their practical deployment in industrial settings poses significant challenges. These include issues related to cost, inference speed, and resource efficiency.

The widespread adoption of LLMs in industrial applications, such as customer service automation (Soni, 2023; Shi et al., 2024; Pandya and Holia, 2023), virtual assistants (Kernan Freire et al., 2023; Luo et al., 2023; Ross et al., 2023), and information retrieval systems (Liu et al., 2023; Hou et al., 2024; Agrawal et al., 2022), highlights the urgent need for efficient and accessible solutions.

While proprietary LLMs such as GPT-4, Claude 3 Opus, and Gemini Pro (Team et al., 2023), often offer state-of-the-art performance, their high licensing costs, resource-intensive inference requirements, and lack of transparency pose barriers to widespread adoption, especially for small to

medium-sized enterprises and research institutions. Consequently, there is a pressing demand for open-source alternatives that can deliver comparable performance while addressing these practical constraints. Han et al. (2023) show the importance and the urgent need for open-source models that can be deployed on-premises to safeguard patient privacy in the medical sector.

This paper provides a comprehensive examination of the performance of various state-of-the-art Large Language Models (LLMs) within the domain of Machine Reading Comprehension (MRC) (Zeng et al., 2020), a pivotal component of textual question answering. Drawing inspiration from language proficiency exams, MRC endeavors to equip machines with the capability to comprehend designated context passages in order to respond accurately to posed questions. Through a benchmarking study leveraging the prompting technique to guide the model’s generation process, the effectiveness of LLMs is assessed across diverse contexts and question sets. The study encompasses a wide range of popular LLM architectures, including proprietary and open source LLMs. Rigorous evaluations are conducted on a varied set of QA tasks using metrics such as accuracy, precision, and recall. The primary objective is to identify an open-source alternative capable of delivering acceptable performance on CPU. Furthermore, the paper provides insights into the comparative effectiveness of these models in QA scenarios, offering practical guidance for model selection in information retrieval tasks. Our primary objectives are twofold:

- Evaluate the performance of open-source LLMs in comparison to proprietary models across key metrics such as accuracy, inference speed, and resource consumption.

- Identify and highlight open-source LLMs that offer competitive performance and efficiency, making them viable alternatives for industrial applications requiring fast and resource-efficient NLP solutions.

The main contributions of this work include:

- A systematic benchmarking framework for evaluating the performance and efficiency of LLMs in question answering tasks.
- Empirical insights into the comparative performance of open-source and proprietary LLMs across various metrics, providing valuable guidance for selecting suitable models for industrial applications.
- Identification and recommendation of open-source LLMs that offer a balance between performance and resource efficiency, thereby facilitating their adoption in real-world settings.

By fulfilling these objectives and contributions, this study aims to provide actionable insights that enable stakeholders in industry and academia to make informed decisions regarding the adoption of LLMs for NLP applications, ultimately fostering the development of efficient and accessible solutions in this rapidly evolving field.

2. Related Work

2.1. Overview of Large Language Models

LLMs have traversed a notable evolutionary trajectory in the field of NLP. Initially, language processing predominantly relied on rule-based systems (Brown et al., 1990), succeeded by statistical models (Rosenfeld, 2000)

such as n-grams, Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) (Eddy, 1996), and Conditional Random Fields (CRFs) (Lafferty et al., 2001). These early models, while advancing the understanding of language, were constrained by their reliance on handcrafted linguistic rules and statistical methods, limiting their comprehension of semantics and context.

The advent of Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks marked a significant improvement in sequence modeling, enabling the capture of contextual information and facilitating more natural text generation. However, the transformative breakthrough arrived with the introduction of transformer architectures, notably exemplified by the Transformer model (Vaswani et al., 2017). The Transformer model revolutionized language modeling by integrating attention mechanisms, enabling the capture of long-range dependencies in language and facilitating parallel training on multiple GPUs.

Following the emergence of transformers architectures, LLMs emerged as the pinnacle of language modeling evolution. Notable instances include OpenAI’s GPT series, starting with GPT-1 (Radford et al., 2018), and culminating in the groundbreaking GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), followed by GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023). These models demonstrated unprecedented capabilities in generating coherent and contextually relevant language, setting a new standard in the field. During 2021-2022, specialized models like Google’s LaMDA (Thoppilan et al., 2022) for conversational applications and Facebook’s OPT for open pre-trained transformers emerged, catering to specific use cases and domains. This period also witnessed the introduction of multimodal models like DALL·E (Ramesh et al., 2022) by OpenAI, capable of

generating images from textual descriptions, and CLIP (Radford et al., 2021), which can understand images in the context of natural language.

In addition to these proprietary models, the open-source community has also contributed significantly to the development of LLMs. Models like Hugging Face’s Transformers ¹ have democratized access to state-of-the-art NLP models, providing pre-trained models that can be fine-tuned for a wide range of tasks. Other open-source projects like EleutherAI’s GPT-Neo (Gao et al., 2020) and GPT-J (Wang and Komatsuzaki, 2021) have also made large-scale language models accessible to the broader research community. These open-source models have played a crucial role in advancing the field, fostering innovation, and promoting transparency and reproducibility in AI research.

Despite their transformative potential, the widespread adoption of LLMs faces challenges, particularly in terms of computational and memory requirements. Addressing these challenges is imperative for their efficient deployment in resource-constrained environments and latency-sensitive applications. Quantization techniques, such as GPTQ (Frantar et al., 2022) and AWQ (Lin et al., 2023), offer promising avenues for optimizing LLMs for faster inference while maintaining acceptable performance levels. Moreover, advancements in CPU deployment, exemplified by GGUF ² and GGML, facilitate efficient storage and inference of quantized LLMs on CPUs, further enhancing their practical utility.

¹<https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/index>

²<https://huggingface.co/docs/hub/en/gguf>

2.2. Question-Answering Tasks

Technological advancements have led to the omnipresence of textual data in our society. From SMS messages on mobile phones to various file formats such as pdf, docx, and ppt, to micro-blogs like X³ and social media comments on platforms like Facebook or Google+, textual data permeate our daily lives. However, the sheer abundance of textual information exacerbates the challenge of information overload.

Today, managing information overload has become a formidable challenge that information systems must address (Dietzmann and Duan, 2022). This necessitates the development of tools to automate information retrieval processes, facilitate access to information, and alleviate information overload. Harnessing the power of automated QA systems can significantly enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of managing and accessing large volumes of data.

Allam and Haggag (2012), defined QA as a multidisciplinary research area that intersects Information Retrieval (IR), Information Extraction (IE), and NLP. Its primary goal is to provide precise and comprehensive answers to user queries by extracting relevant information from textual documents or databases. Unlike traditional search engines that return ranked lists of documents, QA systems deliver direct and specific responses tailored to user questions.

QA systems find diverse applications across numerous domains. One of their primary uses is in information retrieval (Kobayashi and Takeda, 2000; Li et al., 2024a), where they excel at extracting relevant data from exten-

³<https://twitter.com/>

sive textual sources like databases, press articles, and academic documents. These systems are adept at addressing both simple factual inquiries and more complex queries requiring in-depth content analysis. For instance, Qiu et al. (2018) introduced a groundbreaking Information Extraction (IE) framework called QA4IE, which employs flexible question-answering techniques to handle various types of data relationships.

Another significant application of QA systems is in automated customer support. Deployed widely in chatbots, these systems efficiently handle frequently asked questions, guide users through products or services, and offer instant assistance. They are invaluable for managing large query volumes while ensuring a personalized user experience. For example, Samarakoon et al. (2011) developed a closed-domain question-answering system specifically tailored for automating customer service. Their approach leveraged the collective expertise of customer service representatives to enhance query understanding and continuously adapt to evolving user needs.

In decision support, QA systems play a crucial role in aiding professionals to make well-informed decisions by providing precise and relevant answers to specific queries (Azari et al., 2012; Yang et al., 2014; Goodwin and Harabagiu, 2016). For instance, in the medical field (Zhang et al., 2018), these systems can swiftly retrieve information on recommended treatments for particular conditions based on available clinical data.

Moreover, QA systems are instrumental in data analysis tasks (Bordes et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2019), where they extract essential information from unstructured datasets, facilitating trend analysis, pattern recognition, and insight generation. Their utility spans across areas such as

market analysis, business intelligence, and competitive intelligence.

In the realm of education, QA systems are integrated into online learning platforms (Hung et al., 2005; Mittal et al., 2005; Wen et al., 2012), empowering learners to access instant answers and deepen their understanding of various topics. By providing quick access to relevant information, they promote learner autonomy and enhance learning efficiency.

Finally, QA systems are valuable tools in legal and documentary research (Morimoto et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2021), assisting lawyers and legal professionals in researching precedents, laws, and relevant judgments in response to specific questions. Their deployment accelerates the legal research process and enables more informed decision-making in legal matters.

3. Methodology

In this section, we outline our approach to evaluating and comparing the performance of open-source language models for efficient question answering in industrial applications. Firstly, we present the baselines, the selected reference models for our study. Following this, we provide a detailed description of the dataset used, highlighting its characteristics and relevance to industrial applications. We also present the evaluation metrics we employ to measure model performance. Lastly, we describe our experimental setup, including the data processing pipeline, experimental conditions, and specific parameters used to ensure result reproducibility.

3.1. Baselines

To provide a comprehensive evaluation of open-source language models for efficient question answering in industrial applications, we selected a range of high-performing models as our baselines. These models were chosen based on their relevance, popularity, and demonstrated effectiveness in similar tasks. The selected models for our study include GPT-3.5 (OpenIA, 2022), GPT-4 (OpenIA, 2023), Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 (Jiang et al., 2023), Llama 2 7B Chat (Touvron et al., 2023a), Dolphin-2.6-Phi-2, Dolphin-2.6-Mistral-7B, and Mistral-7B-OpenOrca. Below, we provide a brief overview of each model.

3.1.1. GPT-3

GPT-3 (Generative Pre-trained Transformer 3) (OpenIA, 2022) boasts an impressive architecture comprising 175 billion parameters. It utilizes a transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017), specifically a variant known as the autoregressive transformer, which excels in processing sequential data such as natural language. The model consists of multiple layers of self-attention mechanisms, enabling it to capture long-range dependencies and contextual information efficiently. GPT-3 is trained on a diverse corpus of text data sourced from the internet, allowing it to generate coherent and contextually relevant responses to a wide range of prompts and queries.

3.1.2. GPT-4

GPT-4 (OpenIA, 2023), the successor to GPT-3.5, builds upon the foundation laid by its predecessor, aiming to further enhance the capabilities of large-scale language models. While specific details regarding the architecture

of GPT-4 may not be publicly available, it can be inferred that GPT-4 likely maintains a transformer-based architecture similar to GPT-3 but with additional improvements and refinements. These enhancements may include an increase in the number of parameters, improved training methodologies, and fine-tuning strategies to enhance performance on specific tasks. Additionally, GPT-4 may incorporate advancements in areas such as model compression, efficiency, and interpretability to address limitations observed in earlier iterations.

3.1.3. Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2

The Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 represents an upgraded variant specifically tailored for instruction, refining upon Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1 (Jiang et al., 2023). It is fine-tuned on instruction datasets publicly available on HuggingFace and utilizes instruction fine-tuning to craft responses tailored to particular prompts. Rooted in the architecture of Mistral-7B-v0.1, it integrates functionalities like Grouped-Query Attention (Ainslie et al., 2023) , Sliding-Window Attention, and a Byte-fallback BPE tokenizer (Wang et al., 2019). It exhibits superior performance compared to all 7B models on MT-Bench, and is comparable to 13B – Chat models.

3.1.4. Llama-2 7B Chat

Llama 2 (Touvron et al., 2023b) 7B Chat is a refined iteration of Llama-2, boasting 7 billion parameters. Llama-2 represents an advancement over Llama-1, benefiting from a revamped pretraining corpus augmented by 40% and an expanded context length. Notably, it embraces grouped-query attention for improved comprehension. The architecture of Llama is distinguished

by several pivotal enhancements over the original transformer framework. It adopts pre-normalization, employing the RMSNorm (Zhang and Sennrich, 2019) function to fortify training stability, and substitutes ReLU with the SwiGLU (Shazeer, 2020) activation function to bolster performance. Inspired by GPTNeo (Gao et al., 2020), Llama integrates rotary positional embeddings, forsaking absolute positional embeddings.

3.1.5. dolphin-2.6-phi-2

Dolphin-2.6-Phi-2 (Hartford, 2024b) is an advanced language model that integrates unique training methodologies aimed at improving contextual awareness and response accuracy. It is engineered to handle complex queries efficiently, making it a robust baseline for our benchmark.

3.1.6. dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b

Dolphin-2.6-Mistral-7B (Hartford, 2024a) combines the strengths of the Dolphin series with the Mistral-7B architecture, offering enhanced performance through collaborative model training techniques. This hybrid model is evaluated for its potential to provide accurate and contextually enriched answers in industrial applications.

3.1.7. Mistral-7B-OpenOrca

Mistral-7B-OpenOrca (Mukherjee et al., 2023) leverages the advanced architecture of the Mistral-7B model, augmented through fine-tuning with the OpenOrca dataset (Lian et al., 2023). This combination produces a language model that not only excels in traditional benchmarks but also performs exceptionally well on specialized tasks, making it a top contender among models in its parameter range. The model’s versatility and superior performance

metrics make it an invaluable tool for various natural language processing applications.

3.2. Dataset

The dataset utilized in this study was generated using OpenAI’s ChatGPT-3.5 model. The data generation process involved employing the few-shot prompting technique followed by instructing the model to produce examples of unstructured text from various domains including banking, healthcare, e-commerce, and others. The dataset is structured in a single JSON file format, facilitating easy access and utilization. It comprises 40 diverse samples, each containing the following components:

- Context: The raw unstructured text which may be an HTML string, an excerpt from an email, or text extracted from a PDF document, among other types.
- Request: A series of queries designed to simulate potential user inquiries related to the given text.
- Output: The expected result set presented in a structured JSON format, serving as a benchmark for evaluating model performance in extracting relevant information in response to the provided queries.

The dataset is further categorized into three levels of difficulty:

- Easy: Answers to expected questions are explicit within the context. Table 1 shows an example.
- Medium: Two questions may have answers of the same type. Table 2 shows an example.

```

"Context": "Patient: John Doe, SSN 123-45-6789, had a
consultation on 10/10/2023 with Dr. Smith. For billing inquiries,
email billing@medicenter.com."

"Request": [
    "What is the patient name?",
    "What is the social Security Number?",
    "What is the consultation date?",
    "What is the billing inquiries email?"
],

"Output": {
    "What is the patient name?": "John Doe",
    "What is the social Security Number?": "123-45-6789",
    "What is the consultation date?": "10/10/2023",
    "What is the billing inquiries email?": "billing@medicenter.com"
},

```

Table 1: Easy-level difficulty sample

```

"Context": "Mr. Jacques Durand, your order #12345 placed on
20/10/2023 will be delivered on 22/10/2023. For tracking, contact
support@shop.com."

"Request": [
    "What is the client name?",
    "What is the order date?",
    "What is the delivery date?",
    "What is the support email?"
],

"Output": {
    "What is the client name?": "Mr. Jacques Durand",
    "What is the order date?": "20/10/2023",
    "What is the delivery date?": "22/10/2023"
},

```

Table 2: Medium-level difficulty sample

- Complex: Answers to expected questions are not explicit within the context. An example is shown in Table 3.

```
"Context": "Dear BankXYZ Support, I recently noticed a transaction on my account that I did not authorize. It's listed as 'Online Purchase $150' on 12th March. I'd like this to be investigated as soon as possible. Regards, John Appleseed"

"Request": [
    "What is the type of issue?",
    "What is the transaction detail?",
    "What is the transaction date?"
],

"Output": {
    "What is the type of issue?": "Unauthorized transaction",
    "What is the transaction detail?": "Online Purchase $150",
    "What is the transaction date?": "12th March"
},
```

Table 3: Complex-level difficulty sample

3.3. Evaluation Metrics

We use two of the most commonly used metrics Exact Match and F1-score (Rajpurkar et al., 2018) through a Python implementation (qa-metrics (Li et al., 2024b)) to evaluate the target models on our dataset.

- Exact Match (EM) is a metric commonly used in evaluating question-answering systems. It measures the system’s accuracy by assessing whether the provided answer exactly matches any of the reference answers. EM calculates the proportion of questions for which the model produces the precise answer found in the ground truth. While EM offers a straightforward evaluation, it can be stringent, demanding the exact answer match without allowing for any deviation or paraphrasing.
- Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE) (Lin, 2004) is a set of metrics used to evaluate the quality of automatic summaries and other natural language processing tasks like question answering. In this study, we use ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L. ROUGE-2 measures the overlap of bigrams between the model-generated text and a human reference, indicating similarity in short word sequences. ROUGE-L, based on the Longest Common Subsequence (LCS), evaluates similarity in terms of word sequences appearing in the same order in both texts. These metrics quantify the models’ ability to reproduce meaningful word sequences compared to human references.

3.4. Experimental setup

We use a pipeline (Figure 1) centers on harnessing the capabilities of LLMs to extract structured information from unstructured text contexts

based on a provided list of queries (or questions).




Figure 1: Our pipeline

The approach consists of the following preprocessing and postprocessing steps, ensuring that the data is well-prepared for input and subsequent integration into applications:

- **Preprocessing:** In light of the prevalence of web-derived content in contemporary data, ensuring that our raw text is devoid of non-textual or extraneous elements, particularly HTML tags, is crucial. To achieve this, we employ the BeautifulSoup Python library ⁴, effectively cleaning our text and removing any hindrances.
- **Prompting:** The creation of prompts involves integrating the context with user-defined queries. This prompt serves as input for LLMs, guiding them in generating responses that align with the given queries. We use a Python function with Jinja2 to build the prompt shown in Table 4:
- **Postprocessing:** This critical step ensures continuity and coherence in the extracted information by presenting it in a structured format.

⁴https://tedboy.github.io/bs4_doc/

```

def build_prompt(context, questions):
    template = """
        In the context below, answer the following questions:
        {% for question in questions %}
        - {{question}}
        {% endfor %}

        Context below:  {{context}}
    """

    env = environment.from_string(template)
    translation_prompt = env.render(context=context,
    questions=questions)
    prompt = f'''<s>[INST]
    You are a question-answering system:
    - The value of each key corresponds to the answer for that
    question.
    - Provide concise and pertinent answers.
    - If the answer cannot be found in the given context, leave
    the value empty.
    - Avoid full sentences and explanations; only provide
    the answer
    {translation_prompt} [/INST]
    """

    return prompt

```

Table 4: Python function used to build a prompt

Specifically, we structure the extracted information into a dictionary format, where keys represent predefined variables, and the corresponding values denote the extracted information, thus facilitating ease of interpretation and further analysis.

We evaluate many model variants noted as *model-name.Q_j-K-Size*, where:

- *model-name* is the model name and can be one of the following: llama-2-coder-7b, phi-2, mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2, mistral-7b-openorca, zephyr-

7b-beta, dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b, openhermes-2.5-mistral-7b, and MiniCPM-2B-dpo-bf16.

- Q_j - K - $Size$ refers to a specific type of quantization method. j is the bit-width used, K refers to the use of K-means clustering in the quantization, $Size$ is the size of the model after quantization, where S , M , L refer to Small, Medium, and Large, respectively.

To conduct our experiments on the CPU, we used a machine equipped with the following hardware: Processor: 11th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-11850H @ 2.50GHz, RAM: 32.0 GB, Operating System: 64-bit, x64-based processor.

4. Results and Discussion

In this section, we present and analyze the results of our benchmarking study, as shown in Table 5. Our evaluation encompasses key metrics including exact match (EM), Rouge-2, and Rouge-L scores, as well as practical considerations such as model size, RAM usage, and inference time. This comprehensive analysis aims to identify open-source LLMs that offer competitive performance and resource efficiency, providing valuable insights for their deployment in industrial applications where computational resources may be limited. Through this systematic comparison, we aim to highlight the strengths and trade-offs of different models, guiding the selection of suitable LLMs for real-world information retrieval tasks.

ChatGPT-4 and ChatGPT-3.5 serve as benchmarks in our study. ChatGPT-4 achieved an exact match (EM) score of 87%, with ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L

scores of 83% and 94%, respectively. ChatGPT-3.5 followed with an EM of 83%, ROUGE-2 of 80%, and ROUGE-L of 91%. These proprietary models excel in performance but require significant resources, making them less feasible for resource-constrained environments. While they do not require substantial resources for inference, the training process demands significant computational power and cost. The high performance of ChatGPT-4 can be attributed to its larger training dataset and more sophisticated architecture, which allow for better contextual understanding and generation.

The LLaMA-2 models (7B parameters) with various quantization strategies demonstrate significant performance variation. The llama-2-7b-chat.Q3_K_S model stands out with a 76% EM, while the llama-2-7b-chat.Q3_K_L achieves a 74% EM. Despite their smaller sizes (2.83 GB to 4.78 GB, respectively), they generally need around 6.10 GB of RAM and have longer inference times compared to ChatGPT models. The lower performance and higher inference times can be attributed to the quantization techniques, which, while reducing the model size, also lead to a loss in precision.

The Dolphin-2 models exhibit strong performance, especially the Q5_K_M variant with an EM ranging from 70% to 83%. The dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b.Q5_K_M is particularly notable with an 83% EM and efficient RAM usage (7.63 GB). The higher performance of the Dolphin-2 models, particularly in terms of EM scores, suggests that their architecture and training data are well-optimized for QA tasks, balancing both performance and resource efficiency.

The Mistral-7B models show robust performance, with the mistral-7b-openorca.Q3_K_M achieving an EM of 83% and strong ROUGE metrics

(80% ROUGE-2, 90% ROUGE-L). The consistent performance across different quantization levels of the Mistral-7B models indicates their resilience to quantization-induced precision loss, making them suitable for applications where both performance and efficiency are critical.

The observed performance metrics highlight several key insights. There is a clear trade-off between model size, resource usage, and performance. Models like ChatGPT-4 offer the highest performance but at the cost of significant resource consumption. Conversely, quantized models like LLaMA-2 and Dolphin-2 achieve reasonable performance with lower resource requirements.

Analyzing the errors made by these models reveals that quantized models often struggle with maintaining contextual accuracy in longer sequences, which affects their EM scores. Proprietary models like ChatGPT, with their sophisticated architectures, handle context better, resulting in higher EM and ROUGE scores. For example, quantized models like llama-2-7b-chat.Q2_K showed a tendency to miss nuances in longer, more complex questions, leading to lower exact match scores. On the other hand, models like dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b.Q5_K_M performed better in scenarios requiring succinct and precise answers, reflecting a better balance of quantization and training quality.

The inference time is a critical factor for real-time applications. ChatGPT models, while resource-intensive, offer faster inference times compared to open-source models. Among the open-source models, dolphin-2.6-phi-2.Q5_K_M offers one of the shortest inference times (25.72 ms), making it suitable for applications requiring quick responses. However, this speed

comes with a slight trade-off in accuracy compared to its larger counterparts, which should be considered when selecting a model for time-sensitive applications.

The study highlights the trade-offs between performance and resource efficiency. High-performance models like ChatGPT-4 are less feasible for resource-constrained environments due to their high resource demands. Open-source models like Mistral-7b-openorca.Q3_K_M and dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b.Q5_K_M present a good balance of performance and efficiency, making them strong candidates for industrial applications where computational resources are limited.

5. Conclusions and Future Directions

This study demonstrates that while proprietary models like ChatGPT-4 lead in performance, open-source alternatives, when optimized, offer viable solutions for efficient and effective QA systems in industrial contexts. Our benchmarking reveals that models such as Mistral-7b-openorca.Q3_K_M and dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b.Q5_K_M provide a balanced trade-off between performance and resource efficiency, making them suitable for deployment in environments with limited computational resources. Future work should explore further optimization techniques and fine-tuning strategies to enhance the balance between performance and efficiency, potentially broadening the applicability of open-source LLMs in various industrial applications.

Models	Size (GB) ↓	Required RAM (GB) ↓	Inference Time (ms) ↓	Exact Match (%) ↑	Rouge-2 (%) ↑	Rouge-L (%) ↓
ChatGPT-4	×	×	13.21	87.0	83.0	94.0
ChatGPT-3.5	×	×	5.61	83.00	80.00	91.00
llama-2-7b-chat.Q2_K	2.83 GB	5.33 GB	119.65	71.00	71.00	84.00
llama-2-7b-chat.Q3_K_S	2.95 GB	5.45 GB	153.51	76.00	76.00	88.00
llama-2-7b-chat.Q3_K_M	3.30 GB	5.80 GB	76.92	72.00	71.00	84.00
llama-2-7b-chat.Q3_K_L	3.60 GB	6.10 GB	91.46	74.00	72.00	86.00
llama-2-7b-chat.Q4_K_S	3.86 GB	6.36 GB	82.63	72.00	71.00	84.00
llama-2-7b-chat.Q4_K_M	4.08 GB	6.58 GB	90.34	72.00	71.00	85.00
llama-2-7b-chat.Q5_K_M	4.78 GB	7.28 GB	125.81	72.00	72.00	86.00
dolphin-2.6-phi-2.Q5_K_M	2.07 GB	4.57	25.72	70.00	75.00	87.00
dolphin-2.6-phi-2.Q6_K	2.29 GB	4.79	28.17	70.00	74.0	85.0
dolphin-2.6-phi-2.Q8_0	2.96 GB	5.46	35.37	69.00	74.00	86.0
mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2.Q2_K	3.08	5.58	38.11	70.00	73.00	83.00
mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2.Q3_K_S	3.16	5.66	42.6	70.00	73.00	83.00
mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2.Q3_K_M	3.52	6.02	42.61	76.00	75.00	86.00
mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2.Q3_K_L	3.82	6.32	46.79	75.00	73.00	86.00
mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2.Q4_K_S	4.14	6.64	49.75	76.00	77.00	88.00
mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2.Q4_K_M	4.37	6.87	49.75	76.00	77.00	88.00
mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2.Q5_K_M	5.13	7.63	65.15	74.00	75.00	88.00
mistral-7b-openorca.Q2_K	3.08	5.58	91.84	75.00	77.00	88.00
mistral-7b-openorca.Q3_K_S	3.16	5.66	84.53	80.00	80.00	91.00
mistral-7b-openorca.Q3_K_M	3.52	6.02	42.31	83.00	80.00	90.00
mistral-7b-openorca.Q3_K_L	3.82	6.32	115.28	81.00	80.00	91.00
mistral-7b-openorca.Q4_K_S	4.14	6.64	78.20	81.00	79.00	89.00
mistral-7b-openorca.Q4_K_M	4.37	6.87	80.37	80.00	78.00	88.00
mistral-7b-openorca.Q5_K_M	5.13	7.63	155.80	82.00	79.0	90.0
dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b.Q5_K_M	5.13	7.63	63.84	83.00	79.00	90.00
dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b.Q6_K	5.94	8.44	76.89	82.00	81.00	92.00
dolphin-2.6-mistral-7b.Q8_0	7.70	10.20	94.70	82.00	81.00	92.00

Table 5: Evaluation on our dataset. Q_j : quantization using j bit width, K: the use of k-means clustering in the quantization, S , M , L : Small, Medium, and Large model size after quantization. Best results of each category are in bold.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge Novelis for their support in publishing this article. We are especially grateful for the assistance and contributions of their research team.

References

- Agrawal, M., Hegselmann, S., Lang, H., Kim, Y., Sontag, D., 2022. Large language models are few-shot clinical information extractors. arXiv .
- Ainslie, J., Lee-Thorp, J., de Jong, M., Zemlyanskiy, Y., Lebrón, F., Sanghai, S., 2023. Gqa: Training generalized multi-query transformer models from multi-head checkpoints. arXiv .
- Allam, A.M.N., Haggag, M.H., 2012. The question answering systems: A survey. International Journal of Research and Reviews in Information Sciences (IJRRIS) .
- Azari, D., Horvitz, E.J., Dumais, S., Brill, E., 2012. Web-based question answering: A decision-making perspective. arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.2453 .
- Bordes, A., Usunier, N., Chopra, S., Weston, J., 2015. Large-scale simple question answering with memory networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02075 .
- Brown, P.F., Cocke, J., Della Pietra, S.A., Della Pietra, V.J., Jelinek, F., Lafferty, J., Mercer, R.L., Roossin, P.S., 1990. A statistical approach to machine translation. Computational linguistics .
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J.D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al., 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. Advances in neural information processing systems .

- Chen, D., Fisch, A., Weston, J., Bordes, A., 2017. Reading wikipedia to answer open-domain questions. arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.00051 .
- Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H.P.d.O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., et al., 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374 .
- Cobbe, K., Kosaraju, V., Bavarian, M., Chen, M., Jun, H., Kaiser, L., Plappert, M., Tworek, J., Hilton, J., Nakano, R., Hesse, C., Schulman, J., 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168 .
- Dietzmann, C., Duan, Y., 2022. Artificial intelligence for managerial information processing and decision-making in the era of information overload, in: 55th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, pp. 5923–5932.
- Eddy, S.R., 1996. Hidden markov models. *Current opinion in structural biology* 6, 361–365.
- Frantar, E., Ashkboos, S., Hoefler, T., Alistarh, D., 2022. Gptq: Accurate post-training quantization for generative pre-trained transformers. arXiv .
- Gao, L., Biderman, S., Black, S., Golding, L., Hoppe, T., Foster, C., Phang, J., He, H., Thite, A., Nabeshima, N., Presser, S., Leahy, C., 2020. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling. arXiv:2101.00027.
- Gao, S., Ren, Z., Zhao, Y., Zhao, D., Yin, D., Yan, R., 2019. Product-aware answer generation in e-commerce question-answering, in: Proceedings of

- the Twelfth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, pp. 429–437.
- Goodwin, T.R., Harabagiu, S.M., 2016. Medical question answering for clinical decision support, in: Proceedings of the 25th ACM international on conference on information and knowledge management, pp. 297–306.
- Han, T., Adams, L.C., Papaioannou, J.M., Grundmann, P., Oberhauser, T., Löser, A., Truhn, D., Bressen, K.K., 2023. Medalpaca—an open-source collection of medical conversational ai models and training data. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08247 .
- Hartford, E., 2024a. Dolphin 2.6 mistral 7b - gguf. <https://huggingface.co/TheBloke/dolphin-2.6-mistral-7B-GGUF>.
- Hartford, E., 2024b. Dolphin 2.6 phi 2 - gguf. https://huggingface.co/TheBloke/dolphin-2_6-phi-2-GGUF.
- Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S., Zou, A., Mazeika, M., Song, D., Steinhardt, J., 2021a. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) .
- Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Kadavath, S., Arora, A., Basart, S., Tang, E., Song, D., Steinhardt, J., 2021b. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. NeurIPS .
- Hou, Y., Zhang, J., Lin, Z., Lu, H., Xie, R., McAuley, J., Zhao, W.X., 2024. Large language models are zero-shot rankers for recommender systems. European Conference on Information Retrieval .

- Huang, W., Jiang, J., Qu, Q., Yang, M., 2020. Aila: A question answering system in the legal domain., in: IJCAI, pp. 5258–5260.
- Hung, J.C., Wang, C.S., Yang, C.Y., Chiu, M.S., Yee, G., 2005. Applying word sense disambiguation to question answering system for e-learning, in: 19th International Conference on Advanced Information Networking and Applications (AINA'05) Volume 1 (AINA papers), IEEE. pp. 157–162.
- Jiang, A.Q., Sablayrolles, A., Mensch, A., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D.S., Casas, D.d.l., Bressand, F., Lengyel, G., Lample, G., Saulnier, L., et al., 2023. Mistral 7b. arXiv .
- Jiang, A.Q., Sablayrolles, A., Roux, A., Mensch, A., Savary, B., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D.S., Casas, D.d.l., Hanna, E.B., Bressand, F., et al., 2024. Mixtral of experts. arXiv .
- Kernan Freire, S., Foosherian, M., Wang, C., Niforatos, E., 2023. Harnessing large language models for cognitive assistants in factories. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Conversational User Interfaces .
- Kobayashi, M., Takeda, K., 2000. Information retrieval on the web. ACM computing surveys (CSUR) 32, 144–173.
- Lafferty, J., McCallum, A., Pereira, F., et al., 2001. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data, in: Icml, Williamstown, MA. p. 3.
- Li, X., Jin, J., Zhou, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhang, P., Zhu, Y., Dou, Z., 2024a. From matching to generation: A survey on generative information retrieval. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14851 .

- Li, Z., Mondal, I., Liang, Y., Nghiem, H., Boyd-Graber, J.L., 2024b. Panda (pedantic answer-correctness determination and adjudication):improving automatic evaluation for question answering and text generation. arXiv .
- Lian, W., Goodson, B., Pentland, E., Cook, A., Vong, C., "Teknium", 2023. Openorca: An open dataset of gpt augmented flan reasoning traces. <https://huggingface.co/Open-Orca/OpenOrca>.
- Lin, C.Y., 2004. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries, in: Text Summarization Branches Out, Association for Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain. pp. 74–81. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>.
- Lin, J., Tang, J., Tang, H., Yang, S., Dang, X., Gan, C., Han, S., 2023. Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for llm compression and acceleration. arXiv:2306.00978.
- Liu, J., Jin, J., Wang, Z., Cheng, J., Dou, Z., Wen, J.R., 2023. Reta-llm: A retrieval-augmented large language model toolkit. arXiv .
- Luo, R., Zhao, Z., Yang, M., Dong, J., Qiu, M., Lu, P., Wang, T., Wei, Z., 2023. Valley: Video assistant with large language model enhanced ability. arXiv .
- Mittal, A., Gupta, S., Kumar, P., Kashyap, S., 2005. A fully automatic question-answering system for intelligent search in e-learning documents, in: International Journal on E-Learning, Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). pp. 149–166.

- Morimoto, A., Kubo, D., Sato, M., Shindo, H., Matsumoto, Y., 2017. Legal question answering system using neural attention. COLIEE@ ICAIL 2017, 79–89.
- Mukherjee, S., Mitra, A., Jawahar, G., Agarwal, S., Palangi, H., Awadallah, A., 2023. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4. [arXiv:2306.02707](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.02707).
- OpenIA, 2022. Introducing chatgpt. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>.
- OpenIA, 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.08774.pdf>.
- Pandya, K., Holia, M., 2023. Automating customer service using langchain: Building custom open-source gpt chatbot for organizations. [arXiv](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18273) .
- Qiu, L., Zhou, H., Qu, Y., Zhang, W., Li, S., Rong, S., Ru, D., Qian, L., Tu, K., Yu, Y., 2018. Qa4ie: A question answering based framework for information extraction. Springer .
- Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., Krueger, G., Sutskever, I., 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. [arXiv:2103.00020](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00020).
- Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., Sutskever, I., 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. [arxiv](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.07729) .
- Rajpurkar, P., Jia, R., Liang, P., 2018. Know what you don't know: Unanswerable questions for squad. [arXiv](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.07752) .

- Ramesh, A., Dhariwal, P., Nichol, A., Chu, C., Chen, M., 2022. Dall·e 2. <https://openai.com/index/dall-e-2/>.
- Rosenfeld, R., 2000. Two decades of statistical language modeling: Where do we go from here? Proceedings of the IEEE .
- Ross, S.I., Martinez, F., Houde, S., Muller, M., Weisz, J.D., 2023. The programmer’s assistant: Conversational interaction with a large language model for software development. Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces .
- Samarakoon, L., Kumarawadu, S., Pulasinghe, K., 2011. Automated question answering for customer helpdesk applications. 2011 6th International Conference on Industrial and Information Systems .
- Shazeer, N., 2020. Glu variants improve transformer. [arXiv:2002.05202](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.05202).
- Shi, J., Li, J., Ma, Q., Yang, Z., Ma, H., Li, L., 2024. Chops: Chat with customer profile systems for customer service with llms. [arXiv](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.11111) .
- Soni, V., 2023. Large language models for enhancing customer lifecycle management. Journal of Empirical Social Science Studies .
- Suzgun, M., Scales, N., Schärli, N., Gehrmann, S., Tay, Y., Chung, H.W., Chowdhery, A., Le, Q.V., Chi, E.H., Zhou, D., , Wei, J., 2022. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09261](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.09261) .
- team, A., 2024. Introducing the next generation of claude. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family>.

Team, G., Anil, R., Borgeaud, S., Wu, Y., Alayrac, J.B., Yu, J., Soricut, R., Schalkwyk, J., Dai, A.M., Hauth, A., Millican, K., Silver, D., Petrov, S., Johnson, M., Antonoglou, I., Schrittwieser, J., Glaese, A., Chen, J., Pitler, E., Lillicrap, T., Lazaridou, A., Firat, O., Molloy, J., Isard, M., Barham, P.R., Hennigan, T., Lee, B., Viola, F., Reynolds, M., 2023. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. [arXiv:2312.11805](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805).

Thoppilan, R., Freitas, D., Hall, J., Shazeer, N., Kulshreshtha, A., Cheng, H.T., Jin, A., Bos, T., Baker, L., Du, Y., Li, Y., Lee, H., Zheng, H., Ghafouri, A., Menegali, M., Huang, Y., Krikun, M., Lepikhin, D., Qin, J., Le, Q., 2022. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. [arXiv](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.10761) .

Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C.C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardas, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I., Korenev, A., Koura, P.S., Lachaux, M.A., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E.M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X.E., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J.X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S., Scialom, T., 2023a. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. [arXiv:2307.09288](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288).

Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y.,

- Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al., 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. arXiv .
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, Ł., Polosukhin, I., 2017. Attention is all you need. Advances in neural information processing systems .
- Wang, B., Komatsuzaki, A., 2021. A.: Gpt-j-6b: A 6 billion parameter autoregressive language model. <https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax>.
- Wang, C., Cho, K., Gu, J., 2019. Neural machine translation with byte-level subwords. arXiv:1909.03341.
- Wen, D., Cuzzola, J., Brown, L., Kinshuk, D., 2012. Instructor-aided asynchronous question answering system for online education and distance learning. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning 13, 102–125.
- Xiao, C., Hu, X., Liu, Z., Tu, C., Sun, M., 2021. Lawformer: A pre-trained language model for chinese legal long documents. AI Open 2, 79–84.
- Yang, Z., Li, Y., Cai, J., Nyberg, E., 2014. Quads: question answering for decision support, in: Proceedings of the 37th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research & development in information retrieval, pp. 375–384.
- Zellers, R., Holtzman, A., Bisk, Y., Farhadi, A., Choi, Y., 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07830 .

Zeng, C., Li, S., Li, Q., Hu, J., Hu, J., 2020. A survey on machine reading comprehension—tasks, evaluation metrics and benchmark datasets. *Applied Sciences* .

Zhang, B., Sennrich, R., 2019. Root mean square layer normalization. [arXiv:1910.07467](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07467).

Zhang, X., Wu, J., He, Z., Liu, X., Su, Y., 2018. Medical exam question answering with large-scale reading comprehension. *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence* 32.